

**These are raw transcripts that have not been edited in any way, and may contain errors introduced by the volunteer transcribers. Please refer to the audio on The Knowledge Base website (<http://www.theknowledgebase.com>) for the original teachings.**

**ACI Course IV: Proof of Future Lives**  
**New York, 1994**  
**Geshe Michael Roach**

**ACI Course IV, Class One**  
**Course Overview; History and Purpose of Buddhist Logic**  
**6/30/94**

All right. The subject you're going to study, you don't have to write the Tibetan, but I put it up just, it's a good, so, if anybody says, I always tell the story of meeting the Dalai Lama's teacher on a train station and my teacher was standing next to me, and the Dalai Lama's teacher says, "What are you studying?" and I said, "Uh," [laughs] and I didn't know the name of the subject and my teacher was very embarrassed and he was standing actually behind the Dalai Lama's teacher and he's like [laughter]. He was trying to tell me the name of the subject without [unclear], and, so he says, "What are you studying?" "{Tsema}." Okay, say, "{Tsema}" [repeats]. Okay, and the Sanskrit word for {tsema} is, say, "{Pramana}" [repeats], say, "{Pramana}" [repeats]. Most Westerners say, "{Pramana}."

Okay, this is one of the great five subjects that a monk must study in the monastery in the traditional course. You must finish this to get your {geshe} degree; it's one of the five great subjects. In general, we spend twelve years on The Perfection of Wisdom; then we spend four years on {Madymika}, Higher School; we spend two years on {vinaya}, monk's rules; we spend two years on {Abidharma}. And every winter, we take three months off and we study {pramana}. {Pramana} is the study of how to prove something, okay, reasoning. And the word {pramana} means, means "a correct perception; a normal, unaffected perception." You know, what does that mean? All through the day, all the perceptions you have, all the physical perceptions, all the thoughts you have, are ninety-nine percent {tsema}. They're all {pramana}. They're all okay; they're not screwed up. Okay, they're not affected. What does "affected" mean? You can be affected by alcohol; you can be affected by a drug; you can be affected by an external factor like, when you're, in the Scripture it says when you're rowing in a boat and it looks like the trees are moving; it looks like the trees are going that way, and not that the boat is going this way. You can be affected by, the one I always remember is when I was in a car in, at, near my house and a leaf went across the road at dusk and it looked like a squirrel, a real

squirrel and I slammed on my breaks; you know, that's, that's not a {pramana}. Okay, everything else you have during the day is a {pramana}. Everything else is, is a {tsema}. And that's, {pramana}'s are what makes the world for you. Every time you have a {pramana}, you just created another thing around you; you just saw another thing around you; you, you validated something. You say, "How do you know that exists?" I had a {pramana} towards it. {Pramana} means I had a perception of something; I wasn't drunk; I wasn't crazy; I wasn't very angry or jealous; you know, sometimes you see something when you're real jealous that's not there or when you're very paranoid at work and you think someone's out to get you and it turns out they're trying to help you and you have strong emotion that ruins your {pramana}. So, {pramana} means a kind of normal perception, under normal circumstances, and you have them all the time. That's, that's a very, very important idea because the definition of existence in Buddhism is [pause]

...backwards, and you don't have to know the Tibetan, you don't even know, need to know this, but I'd like to plant a seed in your mind, next life...end up in some Buddhist monastery, somewhere [laughter]; if not in this life. {Tsennyi} means definition. Tibetan goes backwards, all right, Tibetan always starts from the back. {Tsennyi} means "definition" {yupe} means "of existence." Okay, the definition of existence, the definition of existence in, in Tibetan is {tseme mikpa}, say, "{tseme mikpa}" [repeat]. {Tseme mikpa} [repeat]. {Tseme} means "by a {pramana}." What is a {pramana}, Ariel? {Pramana} is a, is a correct perception. Yeah, a normal, unaffected, correct perception; just a normal perception. You know, people write books about {tsema}, they call it valid cognizers. And everyone's wondering, I wonder if I'll ever be able to get a valid cognizer, you know, [laughs] you have them all day long. Your living valid cog, you know, I don't like all these weird translations; it's just a normal perception. Okay, {tseme mikpa}, {mikpa} means "perceived, perceived by a normal perception; perceived by an unaffected, undrunk, uncrazy, unjealous, unangry," you know, just you saw it, therefore what?

[Student: It is.]

It exists. And that's the definition of existence in Buddhism. That's how you prove something exists. Yeah?

[John Stilwell: So, how is {mikpe} different from {tsema}?)

It's a verb.

[J.S.: Oh.]

Okay. {Mikpa} literally means “eyed.” The word for “eye” in Tibetan is {mik} so, {mikpa}, they made a verb out of it, now, “eyed by a {tsema};” “seen by a {tsema}.” Anything seen by a {tsema}; anything seen by a {pramana} exists. Okay. And if you don’t see it by a {pramana}, it doesn’t exist. And that’s interesting. {Keydrup Je} who’s one of {Tsongkhapa}’s two main disciples says, in his text about this, in the opening lines says, “You people taking refuge,” describing five hundred years ago, right, “So, all you Buddhists in Tibet, you’re taking refuge in what? In the Buddha. You have no clue if the Buddha exists; you have no proof; you have no evidence; compelling evidence that you can convince me that there is possible, that there is a being like you describe: someone who, who knows all things; someone who has total compassion; someone who’s watching us all the time in this room hoping we might meet him, you know, ready to come at any moment, you know. How can you pro... you know, he’s, he’s complaining. He’s saying that ninety-nine percent of the Buddhists in Tibet have no inkling of what a Buddha is, they have, if you ask them for three reasons why a Buddha should exist they can’t give it to you; and they say they’re taking refuge. By the way, if you don’t take refuge you’re what?

[J.S.: Not a Buddhist.]

Not a Buddhist. But, he's saying, if you do take refuge, you probably don't even know what you're taking refuge in, and you probably can't give me three good arguments why it even exists. You know, so, you have to have a {tsema} towards the Buddha. Is it possible? Can you get a {pramana} towards the Buddha? Have you ever had a {pramana} towards the Buddha? You can't say he exists if you haven't had a {pramana} towards the Buddha. Have you ever had {pramana} towards the Buddha.

[Student: Yes.]

You've not had a direct {pramana} of the Buddha, unless you're truly to believe the Dalai Lama is a Buddha or something like that or {Khen Rinpoche}. You have not physically seen a Buddha, pr...you know, in a traditional sense. Can you have another kind of {pramana} about a Buddha? Is there any other way to establish that a Buddha exists?

[Student: Deductive reasoning.]

Huh?

[Same Student: Deductive reasoning.]

Yeah, just prove it. You know, can you prove it? Now, now, we're gonna study that. And it's not easy. If you got into a good debate with {Geydrup Je}, and you say, "I, I believe in the Buddha." He says, "Okay, prove it to me." You might have trouble [laughs], you know. And it's great. If, if we can prove it, then you'd be a much better Buddhist. And, and even if we can't prove, we had a Catholic girls' school at the temple a coupla' months ago, [unclear] Girls, silliest girls in New Jersey [laughter]. And they came in, like thirty girls and we, and they, I said, "I'm gonna prove future lives to you." And we got the other three monks and we debated, meaning, you know, I translated as we went. And at the end of the night, there was no person who, who, who would say that they didn't believe that there could be future lives. There was no person who said, "I believe there's not future lives," or that I believe I can prove that there is not future lives. You know, and we asked everybody, we said, "Anybody still," you know people came up and, and we proved that thing, and at the end, nobody, everybody said, "Okay, we believe it's very possible," and that, and that, they believe it's probably not possible that they don't exist. You know, that, that's the way it should be done, and then you know like, four girls call us afterwards and

want to come to class, it's great.

So, [laughter] so, that's the [laughter] that's the way it should be, that's the way, that's the way it should, you're not allowed in Buddhism to give a proof which; you're not allowed to use a reason in a proof that the other person cannot accept. A, a, an argument made to a person who already believes in future lives is, is not allowed in Buddhist logic. If I tried to prove to the Dalai Lama that, that future lives exist, I've made a logical error. And if I try to prove to a person with reasons he cannot accept that there are future lives, that's bad logic, too, even if they're true; see that's interesting. I can, if I give you a reason, which you're not ready to accept, even if it's true, it's, it's a false logic; not allowed to give that logic; a Buddhist monk can throw me out of the debate ground. [If I use a reason...]

[Student: How do you know that...]

...even if it's true. But you, if it doesn't relate to your level of understanding, it's a false reason; it's not acceptable; it doesn't prove anything.

[Student: How do you know that the person isn't going to accept the logic, I mean unless you...]

Talk to them.

[Same student: Oh, okay.]

You get down to their level of experience. You know, you, you relate to them, you must use reasons that come from their world. And you, even if you give a good reason, which is not in their world, it's bad logic and it's thrown out of Buddhist, you're thrown out of the Buddhist, Buddhist, you're not allowed to give this, this reason; even if it's true. That's beautiful, I like that. That's, that's one of the principles of debating and of Buddhist logic. So, anyway,

[Student: unclear]

Excuse me?

[Same student: Did you explain {yupa tsennyi}]

Yeah, I did. {Yupa tsennyi} means "the definition of existence."

[John Stilwell: So, what's the whole thing?]





The definition of existence is “that thing which is perceived with a {pramana}; any object perceived with is perceived by a {pramana}.” {Pramana} meaning “a perception which you have; you’re not drunk; you’re not crazy; you’re not very angry; you’re not jealous; just normal.” All right? Like all the subjects in Buddhism, in the monastery, all the great schools of ancient India, they come down to us in a big long chain. If that chain ever gets broken, if you do not have students that, that will finish [unclear] world. That’s very important, that chain has been going on for two and one half thousand years. There’s always been someone to teach the young, the next generation. You know, if you don’t learn, the, the principles of what we’re going through, and if you don’t pass it on to other people, you might be the people who break the chain. That’s a very big responsibility, and that would be a very terrible thing. You really have to grasp enough of it to pass it on to the next line in the chain, so, I’m gonna show you how the, how the chain came to us.

We have a direct, unbroken chain of these teachings, orally and through debate and through certain writings, but if, there have been schools that are lost. The Sakya’s had a great logic tradition. Sakya Pandita’s, one of his greatest works was on logic. They’ve lost their logic tradition. There are only two people in India who can explain it; they’re very old, they can’t teach very much now; that chain has pretty well been broken. The Kagyu’s were fantastic debaters; Kagyu’s used to be great logicians; that chain’s pretty much broken now. So, it’s up to; it’s really up to you guys. We have a nice, strong Gelupka logic chain, it’s not actually that strong, it’s, it’s actually, right now we’re in pretty bad danger because the books were destroyed in Tibet, a lot of books were destroyed, we’re still looking for some of the books and I’ll talk more about it. But, it’s a big responsibility, you have to know the chain and now you’re the next link and it’s a big responsibility, so I’m gonna write, do you have a question?

[Student: Yeah, I’m not quite sure what {tsema} means. I thought {ma} is a negative.]

No, sometimes it's feminine, and sometimes it's just the second part of any noun [laughter], you know, it doesn't, here it doesn't have anything to do with feminine or negative, it's just the second part of a two part word, it doesn't, by itself it has no meaning here. It's, all Tibetan words, the root of a Tibetan word is in the first syllable, usually, and the second syllable is usually [stuck in]. Okay [laughs]. So, so don't worry about it, it doesn't, the {ma} doesn't mean anything here.

[Same student: So, does {tsema} mean {pramana}?)

Yeah, {tsema} is the Tibetan word and {pramana} is the Sanskrit word and the English is "normal, unscrewed up perception." And you have them all day long. Okay, and that's a very basic thing, and I swear, most people never get it, you know they, they study logic; they study Dharmakirti for a year and they never realize [laughs] they're having {tsema}'s all day. But, {tsema}'s important because it's establishing, what?

[John Stilwell: Reality.]

Reality; truth. You don't have {tsema} if you don't know what's a {tsema} you can't, you don't know if something's true or not; you don't know if you should believe in something. Okay, you have a nice, lucky attraction to Buddhism; you don't know if there's a future life, you don't even know if a Buddha exists. We have to try to establish those things, then you won't be anymore [in] Buddhism because you like to be a Buddhist; it'll be Buddhism because you damn well better be a Buddhist, [laughs] 'cause you're in trouble for your next life, you know, it'll be a little bit different after that. You'll, you'll actually understand why, why you have to do all this stuff, you have no choice. Yeah?

[Student: Does {pramana} go through for all kinds of accurate perceptions or merely for perceiving things the way they normally appear to be?]

All kinds.

[Same student: All kinds.]

And we'll talk more about it; there's a yogic direct perception: the perception of {shunyata} directly in meditation is, is a very special category of {tsema}, it's way up over here somewhere, we'll go through it. We have a chart here, it's kinda nice, we, I collected it from the first [Dalai Lama] {Keydrup Je} [and then]

[unclear], nice. You'll get it.

[Student: Was it translated?]

Yeah.

[Same Student: [unclear].]

We just translated it. Okay, so, I'm gonna teach you; we're gonna take a break in about three minutes. I'm gonna give you the main book we're gonna be studying. Don't forget, you have to read Tibetan backwards, right? You're gonna be studying, say {Tsema Nomdrel} [repeat twice]. Okay, {tsema nomdrel} in Sanskrit which you don't have to know is {Pramana Vartikka} and it's the text which is used in all Buddhist monasteries since, you know, India, for the study of logic, Buddhist logic. It was written by, you're not supposed to call a lama by his raw name; you're not supposed to say, "Hey, {Lobsang Tharchin}." You're supposed to say Master Dharmakirti or {Charya Dharmakirti}; Dharma manners, okay [laughs]. Don't get him confused with, who? Do you know any other {kirti}'s?

[Student: Chandrakirti.]

Chandrakirti, okay. I al...people always get them confused. Great scholars, you know, embarrass themselves in magazines by slipping and calling, you know, I've seen it. This is {Dharmakirti} not {Chandrakirti}. {Chandrakirti} lived in about one hundred years after that and he wrote the basic text [for], on {Madymika}, on emptiness. {Dharmakirti} was the great logician. You don't have to know it, but he belonged to what we call the {Sautrantika} School which is the second of the great four schools. And he had a good dose of Mind Only School.

[John Stilwell: When you say he was part of {Sautrantika} School, does that mean that pretty much everything...]

By the way, there's {Swatantrika} School ...

[J. S.: {Sautrantika}.]

...and a {sautrantrika} school...

[J.S.: Which one...]

And he was part of {Sautrantika}.

[J.S.: {Sau, Sautrantika}.]

People get that mixed up; I did for years.

[J.S.: Does that mean pretty much everything he did is {Sautrantrica?}]

His famous work, for which he's famous and he wrote a few other logic works was written from that viewpoint. We say you can't reach enlightenment unless or Nirvana unless you become a {Madyamika Prasangika} so, we say he was really a {Madymika Prasangika} in sheep's clothing. [laughter]. And, and you know, that's our, that's the viewpoint. That's a long story. We'll do it someday. So, his name is {Dharmakirti}. He lived six-thirty A.D. I'll do one more thing, we got two minutes before the break. Why'd you put that clock there for me. [laughter], [pause]. This is what I call the "onion skin theory?" We'll talk more about it; onion peel? Anyway. The correct perception that {Dharmakirti} was talking about; the correct perception that he wrote his commentary about wasn't the one in your mind, it was a book called "Correct Perception." And that was written by, that was this book. And this is a book that was written two generations earlier by {Dignaga}; {Master Dignaga}.

[Student: Compendium?]

Compendium on direct perception.

[Student: I don't know what compendium means.]

Compendium means like, he collected all the things that the Buddha said about it and put them in one place.

[Same student: Like a collection of it.]

It's like a collection. So, {Dignaga}, Master {Dignaga}, there's a big debate, you know, when did he live, who, we don't know who these guys were. We don't know anything about them, we know very, very little. They are lost in history. We don't know the names of the great kings then, you know there's debates, did they live a thousand years after [unclear]? They argue about it, you know. We don't really know, much. There's a few old histories, but they're mostly, you know, very difficult so we don't really know. Tibetans say maybe {Dhamakirti} was his direct student, maybe there was someone named {Ishvaraseva} between them; we don't really know, it doesn't really matter [laughs]. "Study their books," the Dalai Lama's always saying that. Not so important that we know, you know, who his mother was, you know. The books speak for itself. You could have called it by anyone. Anyway, {Dharmakirti} is explaining {Dignaga}'s book because in between there, some non-Buddhists attacked that book and {Dharmakirti}'s big job is to explain Master {Dignaga}; he's trying to explain what {Dignaga} meant. And, {Dignaga}'s the great founder of Buddhist logic systems;

he's the, he's the ultimate source, for almost [laughs] for all our studies in logic.  
Okay, we'll take a break. [Geshe-la speaks of class "business".]

[John Stilwell: What is, what is {choklam}?]

What's that?

[J.S.: {choklam}?]

{Choklam} is his Tibetan name.

[J.S.: Oh.]

They translated because of his name, like Stilwell, they would, they wouldn't call you Stilwell, they would call you Quiet Water or something, see what I mean? They would make a new name. That's what the [Tibetan's would do]. [More class business].

You can't understand, well I'll tell you about it later, first I'll write it on the board.

Say {tel seljay} [repeat]. {Tal seljay} [repeat]. What does {tarpa} mean? [unclear] {Tarpa} means "freedom." It's a synonym for {Nirvana}. {Tar, Tar} means "freedom." {La}, you know.

[Students: At.]

At, okay, so {ta la} means "at the freedom." {Seljay} means "light," light; {seljay} means "light." Literally, it means "clear maker." {Sel} means "clear" {je} means "maker." And, and that's what a lan, a lantern does. So, you think of a dark night out in Arizona, no electricity for [fifty] miles; it's very dark. And, you, you kill yourself in a few feet and to have a lantern is very nice. So this is like a lantern on a dark path, very beautiful. "Lantern, Light for the Path of Freedom." That's a commentary by {Gyalsup Je}, by the way, tonite's the boring part, I mean more boring than usual, 'cause we're just doing books, we'll get into {tsema} next week, next [unclear]

[More class business]. Okay, {Gyalsup Je} he was the number one disciple of {Tsongkhapa}. He's always on the right side, on {Tsongkhapa}'s right, in any picture of {Tsongkhapa}, you can always see him there, on the right.

[Student: Student of {Tsongkhapa}?]



Yeah, he was the number one student. {Gyalsup} actually means “regent” because he took over the throne of {Tsongkhapa} after {Tsongkhapa} passed. So, he was the first holder of the throne of {Tsongkhapa}. Who was {Tsongkhapa}, if you don’t know, born 1357; died 1419; wrote ten thousand pages of Buddhist commentary, on every Scripture, on every major Scripture. He, it, it’s almost impossible within one lifetime. We believe he was just taking transcription from Manjushri. We believe he was in direct contact with Manjushri, and you cannot read, {Gyalsup Je}, who was under {Tsongkhapa}; his student, [unclear] cannot read, in the monastery, we read about one paragraph a day, we debate it for about six hours. You can debate a page of normal English stuff in about ten minutes; extremely difficult, extremely deep thinker {Tsongkhapa}’s is more, it’s deeper. So, how he wrote it, we don’t even, can’t even, we don’t even imagine. Those books in the house over there are his collected works; incredible. You know, Professor Thurman who’s very [ex], I won’t say he’s [unclear]guished [laughter], he’s a distinguished scholar, in his life, he’s been able to translate one hundred pages of {Tsongkhapa}. You know, that’s about where it’s at. So, that’s {Gyalsup Je}. Very fantastic work, extremely difficult to read, we can’t read it, so we have to study [pause]

{Tsema} means, what?

[Students: [unclear].]

{Pramana}; normal, unaffected, unscrewed up perception. That would look great in a translation book [laughter]. {Go} means “a thought, the thought behind something.” You know, when my boss says, “The cow got skinny,” what’s his {gomba}? No bonuses this year, okay, he gave that lecture one year, right, [unclear] [laughter]. {Gomba} means “the thought behind something. {Gen} means, it’s {Alankara} in Sanskrit, it means “jewel”; {alankara} we were, I was responsible for translating this book, it’s Jewel of the True Thought, and he has, this scholar has written, he’s in Tibet, he’s head of the Buddhist Association in Tibet, Tibetan government, and he’s head of the {Norbukinka} Palace and he’s an incredible scholar, he wrote this book twice, it was burned the first time by the Cultural Revolution [laughs] second time it was snuck out in a laundry bag and he is a genius, and there is only one man in the twentieth century able to write commentary, on that subject, he’s a genius and his student is my teacher. I’m a student of his student, I’m his main disciple so, he’s, you’re now in that lineage, and he wrote a commentary to the whole {Tsema Nomdrel}; the first person to do it in I don’t know how long. And he, it’s incredible, it’s very easy to read. So, we’re gonna study that. We’re gonna study excerpts from that.

[John Stilwell: The Light for the Path to Freedom," is that a commentary?]

A, it's the onion theory, he's commentating on him; it's too difficult for people to read; by about seven hundred years later, so he writes a commentary, and after another seven hundred years, we need another commentary, it goes like that in Buddhism...

[J.S.: So, The Lamp of the Path...]

... every five hundred years, you need a new commentary.

[J.S.: So, The Light on the Path to Freedom is a commentary on the compendium to Correct Perception?]

Yeah, actually, there's many commentaries in between them, I didn't want to over burden you. Okay, that's the lineage of commentaries, [unclear] not read this, it's in code, it's from memorized, memorize it, it doesn't make any sense at all {[very fast Tibetan]} you can't understand it. Okay, that's a typical example, of a, of a verse in code. And then he writes, he breaks the code for you, and he breaks his code, and he breaks his code. You can't go to the original books, you have to go backwards through history and it's very beautiful. So, you're gonna get a really nice commentary that's, the book has just recently been printed in Tibetan and in fact, the second half hasn't even been printed yet, it's ready, yeah?

[Student: Michael, We often do this in class, we trace the lineage of a text back generations like this, are you saying it's because there is a degeneration of understanding or because it's more colloquial for the time?]

I think both. And we don't have time; we're not spending our lives devoted to the [unclear]. He probably sat down, he didn't have it written down, he memorized the root text, then he had an oral explanation, then he memorized that and we don't do that. [unclear, laughs]. Okay, you have to know that, all right? That's the onion skin, you need to go back. There's two, now, when kids start Buddhist Logic in the monastery, when they're thirteen; first subject you study after you learn to read and write; that have to have a text book to use, these are too tough, so two texts have come out, I'm gonna write their names, it's a different homework question, okay? [laughs] And you should know this. So, I'm gonna, yeah?

[John Stilwell: I'm sorry, I lost it on the commentaries, The, The Light on the Path to Freedom is a commentary on...]

...on the one before it.

[J. S.: Compendium...]

Yeah, [unclear].

[J.S.: ...or commentary on Correct Perception?]

No, on the commentary on it. See, you go back in history.

[J. S.: The compendium is first.]

{Geshe Waldruk} is writing on {Gyalsup Je. Gyalsup Je} is writing on {Dharmakirti. Dharmakirti} is writing on {Dignaga}.

[J. S.: Okay.]

And you should know it, they're more important than your grandparents. Your grandparents gave you a body, these people are giving you your spirit. You know, these people are giving you the knowledge that you will live by; they're more dear to you than your grandparents. You should know their names; you shouldn't just think they're some dusty old books somebody wrote; they are more kind to you than your grandparents. You know, they're, they're giving you a way out of suffering and you should at least know their names. They're like your grandparents. In the monastery, we have to memorize the name of every single lama, back to the beginning of our monastery, who, who was in charge of the debate ground. And we recite it every Tuesday night, we stop and we pray for like three hours to thank them, you know, so it's a very holy thing.

[Student: [unclear]]

Well, how about like this? You mean like that?

[Same student: [unclear] first, second, third]

This is the earliest, then the next. All right, now I'll give you, this is a different question; different point. You've got two kids books that are written so that young people can study logic in the monastery.

[Student: [unclear]]

It took me eight years to get me to the point where I could study these, and I didn't do anything else.

[Student: [unclear]]

No, we're gonna to the tough stuff. {Dura, Dura} means "collected topics." It means "collected topics." I think the next course that you do on this subject of {tsema} will be from the {Dura} and most people would have started you from the {Dura}, but I think it's important that westerners learn the arguments for future lives before we die. And we might die before the next class [laughs]. Seriously, you gotta study the most important things first. {Dura}, I'm gonna give you three subjects from the {Dura}.

Say, excuse me?

[Student: Sorry, I'm just curious, about the {Dura} what is that thing under...]

Yeah, this is [unclear], it's a good question, it's a very good question. You rarely see it, it's a special spelling thing, don't worry about it [laughs]. Say {she drup} [repeat] {she drup}, [repeat]. {She drup} is the outline of existing objects; the outline of existing things.

[Srusent: Outline as in visual outline; silhouette?]

No, outline as in this is a, b, c, this is 1, 2, 3. Now imagine this, in two pages, a complete breakdown of all existing objects; it's incredible.

[Student: In two pages.]

In two pages.

[Student: [unclear] generic categories?]

Yeah, categories of existence. It takes the {Abidharma} about five hundred pages. You know, this is, these are the two kinds of existing objects; this one breaks down into two; this one breaks into three; these three have these categories; these four have these categories, about the time you finished two pages, you've covered every object existing in the universe. And it's a beautiful subject; it's really a fantastic subject and we'll do it someday, okay. Yeah?

[Student: The first [unclear] {samsun}...]

Uh-huh.

[Same Student: You said that's how to define something, you said it...]

How to define "definition."

[Student: That's an explanation of what definition is.]

Yeah, what are the rules of defining things? Because in Buddhism, if you don't know, you, you don't know it.

[Student: What does that mean?]

Excuse me?

[Student: What is that [unclear]?]

Right, what are the rules for defining. Are we gonna study all these subjects? Not in this course, I just want you to know the literature; I want you to know the, these are, this is your family tree, you should know it. Okay, say {chi} [repeat], {chi jedrak}, [repeat] {chi jedrak} {chi jedrak} [repeat]. Hard to translate, {chi} means "a general in the sense of car," {jedrak} means "a specific in the sense of Chevrolet." Now you translate it, I don't know, "the study of generals and specifics;" the study of...

[Student: Makes and models]

[John Stilwell: Classes and sub-classes]

Classes and, I don't care what you call it, you can call it generals, I don't care. It's the study of how do you make a mental image and how do you, it's, it's like Jung, Jung's archetypes and Aristotle and; it's a fantastic subject. In fact, if you study this subject, which is like "car" and "Chevrolet," okay, if you study that subject, if you're good, if you're serious and you meditate carefully, it can lead you to a direct perception of emptiness; that particular subject could trigger what your goal is. And once you perceive emptiness directly, you, you're on your way out; you have seven lifetimes to go or whatever. That's why they call it {}. You, you are, you will not suffer more. You will see your future lives; you will know the nature of those lives; you won't have a bad future life anymore.

[Student: Wow.]



You'll have a nice future life. You will be born into the, into a kind of birth that you will always be able to have good teachers; you will always be comfortable; you will always be studying these subjects; you will never forget what emptiness is; you, it's, everything's set after that. You perceive it directly and you perceive your future lives directly.

[Student: Wow.]

And, and this can trigger it, this, if you study this carefully, it can trigger it

[Student:[Is that what we're gonna study?].

Not this course. [laughs/laughter]. Still have to prove future lives. That's why this study of Buddhist, I call it Buddhist Logic and Perception, is called the key to Madhymika. They say that you cannot understand emptiness without a good understanding of this. I always tell story of {Geshe Daldon} who was that? Who is that?

[Student: [unclear].]

Where was he?

[Student: What do you mean?]

Where is he now?

[Student: [He could be anywhere] [she laughs].]

He's dead, okay? No, her, her, when she was a kid, her first teacher, old Mongolian Geshe; great master, very wise. On his deathbed, I went to his room, he's got the {Dura} in his hands, he's studying thirteen year old logic; what she studied when she's twelve. I, said, you know, "Geshe-la, shouldn't you have some Tantric manual in you hand or something? What is this?"

"No, I want to die with this, I want this to be what I carry." This is the key to everything." It's very important. And he died two days later, that's, that's what he chose to have on his, [death], so it's something, something wonderful. Logic is not, Buddhist logic is for the purpose of achieving {Nirvana}.

[Student: [unclear].]



Well, you think about it [laughs]. Then you don't remember, [laughter]. No, not very well, you guys can do it. Okay, one more book and then you're outta [unclear]. This is another kind of book. Now, we're not talking about this anymore. [Unclear]. [Geshe-la talks more class business]. Okay, say {takpik}, [repeat], {takpik}, [repeat]. {Takpik} is "the study of formal logic; how do you make a reason." This is this, because this, okay, formal logic; what is a good reason; what makes a good reason. You're not gonna study this, okay. You have to study this before you can enter the debate ground in the monastery. When you pass this subject you're allowed to go into the debates; it's usually at age fifteen. She studied it when she was a kid; we got a grant from the [federal] government and we had about, I don't know, eight kids learn it in conjunction with the local school system, Howe and it was great. We did a [unclear] at the end of the year, [unclear] Washington, D.C.; never went because they found out she was only twelve, and [laughs/laughter], long story, but, it's the study of reasoning. You, you're not gonna do it. We're gonna go straight to what they use it for, which is to prove, what? Future lives; past lives. Okay, one more thing. last homework thing, life story and a background is in your notebook, it's from the English introduction to these books; this book was written in Tibetan, but Geshe, his life story is very inspiring, he, he was imprisoned by the Chinese, he was badly injured, his books were burned, and then how he got through it and what he's doing now, is very interesting. So that's in your reading. The other reading you have is from the last, is from the core of the onion. What's the Core of the Onion? Like if you got through this book, and then you could read {Gyalsup Je} and then you could read {Dharmakirti}, and then you could read {Dignaga}. Would there be anywhere to go from that?

[Student: [unclear].]

Huh?

[Students: The Buddha.]

The Buddha. Did the Buddha teach logic? Yes.

[Student: But did he write anything, the Buddha?]

The Buddha never wrote anything. It was written down five hundred years later. He was like Jesus, [unclear], [laughter]. He, he wrote logic and the classic, this is your second reading and you must read it and you have to memorize it, his classic statement and why you need logic is ...

[Student: Who's he, I'm sorry?]

Buddha. He said, "{GANGSAK GUI, GANGSAK GI TSU MISUNG TE, NYAMPAR GYUR TARE}" which means "the reason you need logic is that if any one person, without being able to read another person's mind perfectly, judges that person, he'll go to hell. You'll fail.

[Student: Can you repeat that again, please?]

“One person,” it’s in your reading, “judges another person, without being able to read his mind perfectly, he will fall.” When He means “fall”, He’s referring to an actual incident where somebody went to hell. And it doesn’t have to [mean] go to hell, but you can think it as collecting extremely bad karma by judging another person. Somebody in the other class asked, “Does that mean that you should just give up trying to correct other people or should we just never pay attention if a Saddam Hussein is about to kill people?” No. You must resist evil and in fact, if you took the initiation last, last weekend, that’s one of your vows. You’re now required to resist evil; protect people from harm. But, you have to be extremely careful not to judge people; you cannot judge another person if you cannot read their minds. He says [nyampar, gansak gui gangsak gi tsu misung te, nyampar gyur tare.] Unless you are a Buddha, or close to it, don’t try. You don’t know who around you is a bodhisattva; anyone in this room could be a bodhisattva, you could all be bodhisattvas, I am not. I don’t know who is a bodhisattva in this room and I, and I, and I can’t judge; I should not judge you. And {Gedrup Je} who, who was the other great student of Tsongkhapa says, “Look, just go to your room. Perfect your own knowledge. Worry about your own faults. Clean out your own mind. Clean out your own actions. Keep your own vows - which are many – and don’t worry about other people [laughs]. You know, if someone’s mugging someone, help. But, do not judge other people. Do not spend your time judging other people. And the Buddha tells a story and that’s, and that’s that’s the source of Buddhist logic. The Buddha tells that story and then goes into Buddhist logic. He begins to explain the methods for perceiving things that you can’t see with your eyeballs. And that’s where Buddhist logic comes from and that’s the ultimate source of Buddhist logic. That’s the, the purpose of Buddhist logic is to keep us out of hell, okay [laughs], and, and get us to Nirvana.

[Student: How do you reconcile with the fact that if you see something, like somebody is hurting somebody else, you don’t, acknowledge that. Isn’t that judgement, also?]

Yeah, it is a judgement that you should stop the harm, but you in a, in a case of extreme violence you can, you can think that the person is probably having some evil thoughts, but you can't even be sure about that, but I'm not talking about that. I mean, what I'm talking about mainly, is the people around you; that you know who they are, in your office or in your family, or in your relatives, and you're judging them. And you, and you have no basis. You do, cannot read their mind; they could be a bodhisattva, they could be doing something for very high reasons that we can't imagine. And don't, don't, He, the Buddha calls it {Medong}. {Medong} is special kind of barbecue pit in India [laughter], where you have burning embers [laughter] for twelve feet down and it's covered by a very innocent looking powder, you know, ash powder. So, it looks, you know, looks like no problem. It doesn't look dangerous. He calls it a {medong}. It looks like you could mess around with it and not get hurt, but if you take that step, you burn and you burn badly. You fall into a deep pit of embers; burning embers. He says, he says, "Don't touch it; stay away from it; be careful. Judging other people is very, very dangerous. You, you will hurt yourself." You know, He's adamant about it; that's where Buddhist logic started. That's the question. So, I've taken the quotation out of the Sutra. By the way, who brought, brought us the Sutra? This Atisha. Okay. Atisha quotes the Sutra. It's in the {kangyu}; the Sutra is still there. You can find the original Sutra in the {kangyu}, you can find it in the {tengur} because Atisha uses it.

[John Stilwell: You're talking about the original sutra that ...]

Yeah, Buddha...

[J. S.: ...Master Dignaga...]

... one of the one's he was commenting on; one of the one's he was using to write his book. And, and that Sutra has a short, it's about five pages long, that section, and that's what the students in the other class are going to be translating for you guys and that's the part that you're gonna have to edit and it's very exciting. When you get to the end of it by the end of this course, something very interesting will happen, and I'm saving it. So, you're gonna get it in installments. First one's coming from Eric [Colomel] and then Serge is gonna do a page and then Ernst is gonna do a page. Yeah?

[Student: Micheal, when you say, brought, that Atisha brought us the Sutra, we have all the Sutras, its just that his reference to it has made it flow though all these documents.

Yeah, he wrote a book called {Do}, {Dokun me dukpa}, he, he collected major, important [unclear] from Sutras, [unclear] a book, but it happens to be, that particular Sutra still exists, some of the other Sutras in his book don't still exist. See, he lived nine hundred years ago, we've lost those. So, you can find it in two places; you go to the {kangyu}, which is in New Jersey or you can to Atisha's work, which is in the computer, already. So, that's how it comes, no one's ever found it, that's the benefit of this [unclear].

[Student: [You have to] judge the situation.]

You have to judge the situation, in order to act with compassion and, and, and your Dharma responsibility. But, be aware and you know it, and I don't have to tell you, you, you don't know his real thoughts. You don't know what he's really thinking and when someone seems to do something harmful to you or you, you absolutely can't judge. You don't know. But, you have to admit you don't know.

[Student: But, what if someone told you? ... someone tells you?]

No. If someone hurt you, people say lots of things. The Buddha, don't, don't judge. Don't worry about it. We've got all these problems within ourselves, you've got all these things to fix.

[Same Student: Yeah, but I'm not talking terms of putting down someone, but I mean I'm talking in terms of you keeping your vows and in terms of...]

Are you talking about...

[Same Student: ...I don't want to associate with these people...]

Are you saying terms of determining...

[Same Student: Yeah.]

...decisively, that this is a bad person?

[Same Student: I'm talking...]

Are you talking in terms of deciding that he's, he has bad, certain evil thoughts. Can you decide that? Anyone. What I'm saying is obviously not, but it takes a lot of Buddhist training to figure it out, you know [laughs]. It does take more than a few minutes to figure it out, but you gotta get used to it; you gotta get used to staying away from, what? The barbecue pit. It looks innocent, it looks like, you know, you can bad mouth anybody, but it's very, the karma you collect by it is [unbelievable]. Let me see if there's anything here you didn't get. What did {Gyelp Je } say about logic? He said, {Gyalsup Je} is who?

[Student: [unclear].]

Number one disciple of Tsongkhapa; on His right hand side. He said that the kindest thing that Tsongkhapa ever did to him was to teach him logic. And before {Gyelsup Je} met Tsongkhapa...

[Student: [unclear].]

More homeworks in the back? We might be short, because ...



[Student: [unclear].]

[laughs], we'll talk about it. {Gyelsup Je} was the most famous logician in Tibet, before he met Tsongkhapa. He was already a great man before he met Tsongkhapa. He went to Tsongkhapa's lecture to embarrass Tsongkhapa and he went to a lecture to challenge Tsongkhapa, and to defeat him in public. And by the end of the lecture he was a student of Tsongkhapa [laughter]. And he prostrated himself and he became his student and, and he said the kindest thing that Tsongkhapa ever did was teach him this subject. You know, Tsongkhapa taught him all the tantras; taught him Madhymika; taught him, the biggest, kind thing that Tsongkhapa ever did for me was teach me logic. And you'll see [at some point]. Yeah?

[Student: Can I ask a big [unclear], are we gonna wrap this up?]

We're gonna wrap up; we're gonna finish now, in three minutes, fifteen minutes. Now, go ahead.

[Student: I, I, ever since you've said the first word of the class {tsema} or {pramana}...]

Yeah.

[Same Student: ...I don't think I understand what normal perceptions, aren't there millions of ways of normal perception?]

Yeah, millions, all day long.

[Same Student: [unclear] perceptions, there are just million, okay.]

Knowable objects in the universe are almost uncountable. Therefore, {tsema}'s are almost uncountable. Each, each object has to be established by a, the job of the perception, the job of the {pramana} is to say, yeah, this thing exists, I saw it.

[Student: You are seeing it]

Without being drunk, without being crazy, without being under the influence of a strong emotion. You see it. It exists, therefore it exists.

[Student: So, its whatever you think it is with your normal [mind]?]

Yeah. Now, in an ultimate sense is that correct?

[Student: Probably, no]

Touchy. Very difficult question, but that's not tonite. I think that's about it.

[Student: [unclear] spelled exactly the way it sounds?]

{Sautrantika}?

[Student: The school that we're ...]

We're studying?

[Same Student: Yeah]

Okay, you don't have to know this, but this is [for her] question.

[Student: {Sau}...]

It comes from the word Sutra. And in Sanskrit, when you strengthen a vowel, it becomes [au] so, it becomes {Sautrantika}.

[Student: So, it becomes {Sautrantika}.]

Which means a follower of Sutras; Sutrists.

[John Stilwell: I don't know if it's okay to ask this, but I don't get question number four, in the homework, you know, two, you said two types of books used in the monastery? Is it the same as...]

Number four [unclear] those are the two books I wrote and these are the [unclear][laughs]

[J. S.: So, why are they types of books, I mean, I thought that was the name of a type of book. [laughter] Are you're saying it's a type of book?]

Yeah, just give me the name of the book and...

[Student: The {Dura} is only one book, is it two books or one?]

I gave us the second book. [laughter] [Don't make me] do your homework. By the way, I have a request, if you have a question about your homework, call each other first, sometimes I don't even cover it, then I know I'll get twelve phone calls...[Geshe-la talks more class business].

[Student: So, you need logic to prove things you cannot see? Or not be judgemental?]

It's the same thing.

[Student: Everything.]

Okay, go ahead.

[Prayer: mandel]

[Prayer: dedication]

One more thing. The purpose of logic, ultimately is to perceive emptiness; karma, the fact that they exist, the fact that Nirvana exists; prove that those things exist. And, and by the end of this course, hopefully, you'll have a, you'll have a better insight I would say than any other Westerner has ever been exposed to these particular proofs. I, really, by the end of the class, totally believe that there's a future life, really, I don't think so, only on the basis of the class, but I think you'll have the tools to perceive it yourself. That, I can give you and if you work on it, you will see your future life. That's, that's great. You can do that. So, that's the goal of that. Second thing, Khen Rinpoche who's our root lama, is having a birthday on Sunday, you're all welcome to attend, it's, you know bring [potato chips] or something, nothing fancy. It's in New Jersey, I think it's starting ...

[Student: Four.]

Four o'clock. And if you've had the Vajrayogini initiation, [unclear] we'll be doing a ceremony; everyone is welcome to attend that. That's it. [Geshe-la continues with class 'business.']

# # #

940725-1.aaa

12a.txt

Course IV: Class Two, Three Levels of Reality

July 25, 1994

transcribed by: Joe Weston

[unclear]

We were studying {tsema} pramana}, which means "normal perception," and you're having {pramana's} all day long. Normal correct perceptions. Okay? And ninety-nine percent of what we have are {pramana's}. There's a few cases where you don't have {pramana's}. That's where a lady crosses the road quickly and your lights are not working too well, and you think it's a squirrel and you slam on the breaks. That's a non-{pramana}. You're at work and you don't like somebody else, and you think they're always out to get you, and something happens and you think they started it, but they didn't have anything to do with it. And you think your girlfriend's messing around because you're jealous, and... it's just because of the effect of your emotion, that it, that something which has nothing to do with what you think is going on, truly seems to be going on. And those are all non-{pramana's}. Those are all [unclear]. But ninety-nine percent of what you have are {tsema's}, not {pramana}. So, today, the first thing we're gonna talk about is why you need {pramana}, what's the use of {pramana}. And there we get into a thing called "the three levels of reality," and I'm gonna give you a chart about it.

[silence]

I'm gonna give it to you in Tibetan and in English. Okay, this is the... there's two pages, and just make sure you get both pages, cause it's kind of confusing. Here's the same chart in English, and you have to pull out...

[silence]

You don't have to write it in Tibetan, it's just, I want you to see it in your head.

Say {nyungyur} [repeat], {nyungyur} [repeat], {kogyur} [repeat], {kogyur} [repeat], {shindu kogyur} [repeat], {shindu kogyur} [repeat].

Okay, these are the three levels of reality. You got two levels of reality in your other classes. Two truths. These are not related to those directly, okay? These

are different. Why? We're in a different school. We mostly, right now, are in the Sautrantrika school and the lower Mind Only School. Don't worry about it. {Nyungyur} means those objects in the world which are evident, obvious. {Nyungyur} means those things which you can perceive directly without any problem at all. So, the classic example is colors and shapes. Colors are {nyungyur}, okay? This blue, this white, this yellow, those are all {nyungyur}. Most of the objects of your senses, all of the objects of your senses are {nyungyur}. Okay? Touches are {nyungyur}, sounds are {nyungyur}, and your own thoughts to you are {nyungyur}. You don't have a problem perceiving them. They are very obvious, evident. That's {nyungyur}. {Kogyur} means "hidden." {Kogyur}. That means "hidden."

[student: [unclear]]

"That which is." So, the whole word {Kogyur} means "that which is hidden", "things which are hidden." An example of a {kogyur} object, the classical example, is emptiness. It's a hidden object. A normal person can't perceive emptiness, except by, what?

[student: deduction?]

Deduction, reasoning. I can explain emptiness to you, and based on that explanation, within about a half an hour, you can have a {pramana} towards emptiness. Can you say you perceived emptiness? Yes. Can you say you perceived it directly? No. Is there a difference? Oh! A zillion miles difference. And that's a long story. But you can perceive emptiness intellectually, and that emptiness is {kogyur}. When you perceive something through reasoning, intellectually by thinking something out, that thing is {kogyur}. Another example of a {kogyur} object is subtle impermanence, subtle impermanence. There's two levels of impermanence. One is what we call gross impermanence, and that's where you see somebody's Cadillac hit a fire hydrant, or, you know, or you drop a glass and it breaks, that's gross impermanence. That's not {kogyur}. But when you perceive... When you meditate for a long time, and then you're able to see that things are being destroyed by the instant, that nothing lasts more an instant, that's subtle impermanence, so at some point you can perceive that. That's {kogyur}. It's very difficult to perceive. You can not perceive it with your senses. You cannot see with your eyes the subtle impermanence of you or your relationships or your family or... which are all disintegrating in front of your eyes and you can't see it. That's subtle impermanence. {Shindu kogyur}, {shindu} means what it sounds like. What



does {shindu} mean?[laughs] {Shindu kogyur} It means very, "deeply hidden." Okay? "Very, very hidden." It means "extremely hidden." {Shindu kogyur}. In Tibetan, these are ancient words, but still in modern-days Tibetan you say {shindu nine kogyure}, "he's an incredible fool." [laughter] "He's a big fool." {Shindu nine} still has the same meaning. So, deeply hidden. What object is more profound, or more inscrutable, than emptiness?

[students: Karma?]

The subtle workings of karma. You know, the very subtle mechanisms of karma are {shindu kogyur}. They're more difficult to perceive directly than emptiness is. That's where a Buddha can come... I'd like to use this tangka as an example. A Buddha can come to this tangka, and he can explain why, why this thing goes to the left, and why this purple part goes to the right, and why this is a little circle and not a square, and why there's forty-three threads in here and not forty-four, and those are all... A Buddha can explain, he can see directly everything that's behind everything around here. You know, why do, why are two guys in a car, and one dies when the car hits a bridge, and the other survives? I think it was the three Mets last year, in a motor boat? It went under a dock at night, so two of them get decapitated and one survives. And he's fine, he's pitching now, you know? So, why? You know, and they were trying to explain why, you know, "the boat rocked at the last minute." I mean the answer is karma. You know, "why does one guy survive and why two don't." This is a child's question. You know, you don't ask a question like that. Or you say, "the boat tipped, and he was on the right." But why was he of the right? Why wasn't he on the other side that didn't tip? And why didn't he get his head cut off, you know? This is, those are all... They all have a reason, they all have something behind them. And Westerners have this very interesting prejudice, you know. They say, "everything has a cause." They're scientists. They say, "everything has a cause." So, then a kid says, "well, why did one guy die in the accident and the other two didn't?" And they say, "well..." So really what we're doing is we're dividing reality into two parts. Things that we say don't have a cause, and things that we say do have a cause. And when a kid comes up and says, "why did the one guy survive" you say, "well, there's no reason, maybe the boat tipped or something." And then the kid says, "why did the boat tip?" For him, there's no end. You say, "that doesn't have a cause." So really we're not scientists. We're not rational. We say that does... We're saying that doesn't have a cause. It's irrational. It's sick. I mean, it's... it's stupid. We say everything else has a cause but not those things. It's not right.

[student: The lord works in strange ways[laughter]]

No, there is... everything must have a cause. We can't exclude some things and say they don't have a cause.

[student: But they're not Buddhists. [unclear]]

No, no. Sorry. Fourth chapter... third chapter on [unclear] I can give you. [unclear Tibetan] That's the... it starts like that. It's very famous. We'll get into that. In fact, we're gonna reach that in this class. So, those subtle workings of karma are...

[student: [unclear]]

I didn't say four years ago... are something only a Buddha can perceive. Those are {shindu kogyur}. So, you have three levels of reality. To perceive this level of reality, it's in front of your face. This level of reality, you must think. You must consider reasons. You have to think it over, you have to think it out. And to perceive this level of reality, basically you have to take someone's authority. You have to take it on authority. No matter how much you think. By thinking, I can help you... and I will, I want to... The teachings on karma are reasonable. Especially the explanation of the Mind-Only school about karma. If you learn it, it's quite plausible, you can buy it right away. If you learn it properly. But no matter what thought process you go through at your level, if you are who you seem to be, that I have no idea... because of last class, right?... you can't see it, except you can just hear the Buddha explain it, and then you can perceive it based on his explanation. And that's a tricky question, and we'll get into that. You know. What conditions have to be present for you to buy it, when some being, even Gautama Buddha, says, "this is true. You have to take my word for it." Are there any circumstances where a Buddhist can accept that? We'll get into that. But the subtle workings of karma are something that basically you can only perceive, at our level, based on, on another, on a higher beings words. On his description of something that we can't see. So, the idea is, we are very interested about the hidden objects. You see, now, you live in world where you, you believe what you see and you believe what you hear, and those things are pretty much air-tight, they are all correct, pretty much {tsema}, pretty much {pramana}. When we get into this realm, where you start using your reasoning to perceive things, that's where most of the troubles, that's where most of the conflicts in the world comes from. Because people don't follow the rules of reasoning. I mean, we are all logicians. Every moment at work you are drawing

deductions. Every morning... you know, when you're in the office, and you're working, you're constantly drawing conclusions, and most of them are true. And that's... the things you are drawing conclusions about are {kogyur}. Like I was in Bombay. There's a guy in a factory there. The production's not coming out. My boss is mad. You know, I'm trying to guess why he's not doing it: "Maybe he doesn't have the diamonds, maybe he doesn't have the workers, maybe he's got another customer." You know, and I'm doing... that's {kogyur} for me. That's hidden for me. I don't know why he's not doing it. So, I'm basing all these... I'm making speculations based on, on what I think, but I don't really know. So, in that realm, you get in trouble. But, the point is that there is a whole category of objects in your world. There are objects in the universe which are {kogyur}, which are hidden. And, first of all you have to understand that they do... you have to guess that there should be things like that. There are certain objects in the world that are {kogyur} for you, you can't see them now. There's a whole big bag of very important things that are hidden to you. Can you see them? Can you ever get some kind of way of, like a kind of wisdom where now you can see those things which you couldn't see before? That's the whole study of karma. That's why you're studying karma. You're trying to see if you can develop some sixth sense, by which you can see {kogyur's}. That's the whole idea. It's very interesting. We're trying to develop a whole new mental tool by which you can see that big group of things in the universe, which to you right now are hidden, you can't see them. Yeah?

[student: So, I need an example. Are you talking about something like spirits?]

Well, let's say emptiness. By the way, that is an example. In debating, it's one of the prime examples. [unclear] Something like that. There's a big debate. You know, "do spirits exist?" You know, "are there these spirits around us, that we can't see?" Yeah, that's {kogyur}. That's a {kogyur} object.

[student: [unclear]]

Now, is that an important thing to perceive? It's pretty important, because it will help you establish past lives, future lives, other beings. But the main objects we're trying to establish are nirvana. Is nirvana... does it exist? Does Buddhahood exist? Does a Buddha exist? Is there a method by which a normal American person, within a few years, could reach that state?

[student: That's hard work.]

No, it's a very interesting question. Those are the three questions I pose. Is there such a thing as nirvana, by which you would never suffer again? Is there such a thing as Buddhahood by which you could reach a state where you'd know every object in the universe at one moment, and could help every person that exists. And is it possible for a normal person like us, by using some standard, plain old process of a few things, reach that place. Is it possible? It's very interesting, it's very beautiful. If it is, then there's a reason to come to this class. If it's not, then there's no reason to come to this class. I mean, sometimes I go to Dharma classes and they sound like pop-psychology classes. They, you know, like, "feel good and be alright," and, you know, "work it out with your family, this will help you with your life." Not the point, you know. Those are the goals. The goals are to reach a state where you don't suffer ever again. And then secondly, where you reach a state of perfection where you can help other people. And then thirdly,... is there a normal sequence of steps, that if you do these ten things, and you're just a normal American person, you can reach places. You can actually become those things. Is it possible? Those are all {kogyur}. That's the whole idea of studying {pramana}. That's the goal of studying {pramana}, is to try to establish whether or not a normal person, by following a short list of steps, can reach a state where he has no suffering anymore, or no death. That's very interesting [laughs], okay. Alright, now I ask a question that... I thought he was gonna ask me that. Are these... in Tibet, in a debate, you debate it all the time. "Are these three mutually exclusive?" "Can anything be in more than one of these categories?" I had this debate in Ganden, and I wasn't good at it. Like with twenty monks attacking me at the same time. Yeah?...

[student: It depends on your level, right?]

Absolutely. That's the perfect answer. These are not object-dependant, they are subject-dependant. They depend on the person. To who? To whom? If I ask you, you know, "is yellow {kogyur} or {nyungyur}? Is yellow a hidden object? Is it difficult to perceive, or is it obvious? Which one is it?"

[student: It's both...]

You should ask me, "for whom?" I mean, for a blind man, it's {kogyur}. For a blind man, it's hidden. He needs deduction to perceive the yellow on this wall, and, in fact, if he's like an alien from another planet, and he's also blind, he needs... it's a {shindu kogyur}. You know, there's a children's book, [b: A Wrinkle in Time], it's a beautiful book, and they meet somebody from another

realm, and... it's a children's story, and they don't have colors in their realm. So, the children are trying to explain color to these people. And they would have to take those children's word for it. That's {shindu kogyur}. It's totally out of their experience. There's no way they can establish it, except by taking someone's word for it. So, even color, even the most obvious thing in the world, can be {shindu kogyur}, you know, "deeply hidden." But what about the subtle workings of karma? Can they ever be {nungyur}? Can they ever be obvious?

[student: A Buddha,. Sure.]

Yeah, a Buddha sees... Buddha doesn't even have deduction, deductive {pramana}. He doesn't... Everything he perceives is direct. He sees all objects directly. That's his quality. Past, present and future, all corners of the universe, simultaneously.

[student: The Buddha has no sense of deduction, or has no deduction?]

He has no need for it. He can imagine it, he can pretend... you know, he knows how to act like he's doing it, but he perceives all objects directly, at the same time. So, they're not initially exclusive, these three [unclear].

[student: So, that would be like your example of the tangka, if the Buddha looked at the tangka and saw the...]

Yeah, he just sees... it's cool. You know, he looks at the tangka, and he sees that Tom Kiley, three thousand years ago, moved his hand that way instead of that way, and that's why this thing is like that.

[student: So, in other words, to two Buddhas looking at the tangka, one would look at it and say, "oh, that square up there was a real hot date three hundred million years ago," and the other one says, "yeah, windy, too." Is it something like... to them, it's very up front. It's not hidden at all.]

Yeah, yeah, yeah, they say it's like a marble in their hand, it's like an olive in the palm of their hand. That's how...

[student: But you use the word "see."]

Yeah.

[student: But you don't mean that.]

I do. That's the verb. If we're going to have a [unclear], which I'm not gonna get into, that's , that's in the [Amisamankara, unclear] in the last chapter. We'll study that some day. But a Buddha can see the whole universe with his finger.

[student: See it.]

See.

[student: Does he have eyes, than?]

Yeah. And he can smell with his eyes.[laughter] [unclear] It's in the eighth chapter of the [Amisamankara,unclear]. And a Buddha wrote it, so [unclear].

[silence]

Okay, say {muntzum tsema} [repeat], {jepa tsema} [repeat], {muntzum tsema} [repeat], {jepa tsema} [repeat]. {Muntzum tsema} means "direct {tsema}," "direct {pramana}," "direct correct perception."

[silence]

And it's the kind of perception you need to perceive {mungyur's}. So, it connects with reality level number one, and you need direct perception to perceive obvious objects.

[student: [unclear]]

No. No relation to that. Different spelling. And a lot of people get, even Tibetans, get confused about it.

[student: You need this for number one, or number one needs this for...?]

Yeah. Perception... direct perception's job is to perceive obvious objects.

[student: How do you define, "direct?"]

Excuse me?

[student: How do you define, "direct?"]

Ah, tough question. A correct perception which does not depend on reasoning. How's that? Or, you can say that direct perception which is utilized to perceive all these objects. Those are all definitions.

[student: Does perceive...]

Obvious objects, evident objects, manifest objects. What are examples? For a person at our level, if you aren't who you seem to be, which I don't know, they would be your eye consciousness, your ear consciousness... The Heart Sutra says, "[unclear]." Your eye consciousness, your ear consciousness, your nose consciousness, your taste consciousness, and your tactile consciousness. Those are the five. Those are all {muntzum tsema}. Those are all direct perception. Those consciousnesses.

[student: Is there anything beyond them, the sense consciousnesses?]

Yeah, there's more. Your mental consciousness, your awareness of your own thoughts, is also a direct perception. You hear your own thoughts constantly. You don't have to use deduction to hear your own thoughts. Sometimes you wish you couldn't hear your own thoughts. [laughter] Like when you're trying to sleep late at night.

[student: What if your thoughts were wrong?]

Your perception of yourself having a stupid or a wrong thought, that perception is correct. There is a wrong thought going through in your mind. There does exist a wrong thought in your mind. So, the state of mind which perceives the wrong thought in your mind [isn't?] {tsema}. Because that wrong thought does exist. And it is established by that perception of it.

[student: As a wrong thought.]

Yeah. Or as a thought going on in my mind before you thought about whether it's wrong or right. It's still a thought. Now, if that, if in the moments following that, you have a judgmental thought that says, "this is a correct thought," that's not a {tsema}. That's not a {pramana}. But the original awareness of the thought is a {pramana} because there was a thought there. Whether it was right or wrong, being aware of that thought establishes the existence of that thought.

[student: So, you're saying that {tsema} is only about [unclear]]

No. I'm saying that direct {tsema} is only used for evident objects. What about {toma}, the first moments of {toma}? "The path of seeing"? That's called [unclear]. [unclear]... direct perception. "Meditative direct perception of emptiness." And that's also {nyundzum tsema}. And for that person at that moment, emptiness is a rumor. Emptiness is an evident object. He's seeing it raw, directly. So, for him at that first moment at the path of seeing, that's a direct object. That's an obvious object for him.

[student: [unclear]]

{nyangjur muntzum, nyangjur muntzum}. Like {nyangjurma, nyangkimu}. Now, to perceive the second two types of reality, the second two levels of reality, to perceive hidden reality, something like emptiness, and to perceive deeply hidden reality, something like the subtle workings of karma, we need {jepa tsema}. {Jepa tsema} means, "deductive, correct perception." Reasoning, true reasoning, correct reasoning. And you use it all day long. Did the pen hit the ground? Yeah. And that's deductive perception. And that's hidden for you. The visual part of it, not the audible part. But you did not see the thing. So, relative to your eyes, your eye consciousness, that when it hit the ground, that was hidden for you, cause it was blocked by the table, and you made a deduction. You said, "I saw it drop out of his hand. Every time I've ever seen something drop out of a somebody's hand, and I hear a 'bunk', the thing fell on the floor," you know. And that's... The trick is to understand that that... you do that all day long, and it's a normal part of your human tool box, your mental human toll box, and it works. And your current ability to do that is untrained. You've never had to sit... you know, your mother didn't sit you down and say, "look, when somebody drops a pen, even though you can't see it, you can figure out that the pen hit the ground." You know, you, you have an untrained ability. You have the ability that every normal human has to deduce something. And then some people, like Einstein, you know, they have, based on the same data, they have a much greater ability to draw a correct conclusion from that. The idea in the study of {pramana} is to figure out: how does that tool of your own mind work, and can you sharpen it? Can you study how it works, and can you then find a way to develop it into like a more muscular, you know, more, a more powerful {pramana}, a more powerful way of seeing something that you can't see, and direct it towards those black holes in your knowledge where nirvana is sitting, where Buddhahood is sitting, and where the paths of those are sitting? Is



it possible for a normal human being to consciously strengthen his own ability to reason, and, with that reasoning, perceive things which other people around him can't see? That's... you know, when you talk about the mysticism in Buddhism, blah, blah, blah, this is really the guts of it. This is where you actually learn to see those things which other people can't see around you. And that's based on... you learn {pramana}, you learn the rules of {pramana}. And then you can quite certainly come to see things which you did never expect to be able to see. And you do it quite consciously, purposely. And that's what Dharmakirti's career was all about. You know, he's tried to tell us how to do that. And you can do it. So, you have to learn the rules of {pramana}. You have to learn about {pramana}. That's what we're doing in this class, that's why we're in this class. And it won't be like some mystical thing. It might be just learning to think clearly. And that helps your life, too. I mean, half the time when you get in trouble at work it's cause you drew conclusions that were lousy, and weak, and flimsy, and you thought you knew something and you didn't know it at all. That's mostly what personal relationships, when you have a problem, a lot of it is from faulty, lazy deductions. You assume the person did something and they didn't do anything like that. But you've followed your own lousy deduction, which is not a {tsema}, not a {pramana}. So, we're gonna study that. That's one of the big things we're going to work on. I think we'll take a break here. First time, on time. Because it's a natural place. When we get back, I have a much more confusing thing. Alright, so we'll start again at five after? [cut] {kenchepa} [repeat], {temba} [repeat], {deshe kobla} [repeat], {chagtsalo} [repeat]. Very, very famous. Very, very famous. These are the opening lines of Dignaga's work. Who's Dignaga?

[students: The author of...]

The father of all Buddhist philosophy of perception. Lived, when?

[students: Four hundred...]

Four, forty A.D., something like that. And these are some of the first lines of his text, which are {tsema kundu}, which means "[unclear] of valid perception." These are his opening lines. Tibetan reads backwards, okay? The subject comes last, the verb is right before that. That's why when you meet Tibetans, they say, "store, uh, store going I am." You know? So, {chagstal} means what? Do you know what {chagstal} means?

[student: Prostrate? Bow?]

Prostrate, yeah. {Chag} means "hand," and {tsal} means "to seek, to look for something." And {chagtsal} means "to bow down." Why? Because when you bow down, you're looking for something from the hand of the lama. And that's why it's called {chagstal}. In Sanskrit it's {namas}, and it means "I bow," and still, in India, they still say {namas te}, "I bow to you." That's how you say "hi" in India. So, "I bow down to..." what? And there are five parts in this verse that you must learn. What is this verse? This is Dignaga's {chujun}. {Chujun} means when a Buddhist person writes a new book, he's supposed to, in the opening lines, bow down to some holy being or object. Like Chandakirti bows down in the opening lines to [unclear], in his Madhyamika text. And Basabandu in the abhidharmakosha bows down to the Buddha. And Maitreya, in the abhisamayalankara, bows down to the Three Knowledges. So Dignaga is bowing down... The person that he has chosen to bow down to, at the beginning of this book, is the Buddha. The Buddha, himself. So this is a short verse that's at the front of almost every Buddhist commentary, from ancient India, where they make obeisance to some holy object at the very beginning. And Buddhist books are really beautiful. I mean, there's [unclear]. If a book doesn't have four qualities, it's not even a Buddhist book. There has to be some ultimate benefit to it. There has to be some... you don't have to know this, but it disqualifies just about every Western book. [laughs] I mean, people ask if I've read the latest novel. It doesn't have [unclear]. It has to have some short-term goal, holy goal. It has to have some long-term goal. It has to have some... there has to be some relationship between that long-term goal and the book itself. And then it has to have subject matter. So those are... basically, a Buddhist book, if it doesn't have some relation to ultimate spiritual goals, it doesn't, it's not considered worthy to read. And people won't study it. And if it's faulty, if it had one faulty part in it, they would, in India, they would tie it to the tail of a dog, and chase the dog through the street. That's like custom. Yeah?

[student: Would you write the word for the dedication [unclear]]

You don't need to know this. I was just... It's very famous. Every book has one. Most of the five great books, all the five great books have one. Dharmakirti's is very, very hot. Very, very funny. And, some day I'll teach it to you. It's very interesting. This is Dignaga's, right? So, there are five important parts hidden in here, in this {chujya} that you have to know. The first is here... {tsema kyurpa}, {tsema kyurpa}, {tsema kyurpa}. What is {tsema}?

[students: many responses]

Correct perception, valid perception. Correct perception. That's {pramana}. {Kyurpa} means "became, turned into." {Kyurpa} means "turned into." And the {ra} in Tibetan, the "r" here, means "into." "Turned into {tsema}." "Turned into {tsema}." In the whole universe, there are only three kinds of changing things. One are mental things, one is physical things and one are neither, but which are changing. An example of the third would be a person, like Michael is not physical and he is not mental. He's a concept, he's an individual. "I have a mental part, I have a physical part, but I'm not those. I'm an idea. I'm an individual." So, {tsema kyurpa}... I ask you: is {tsema} mental, physical, or a person? Is {pramana} mental, physical, or...? Mental stuff, physical stuff?

[students: Mental.]

Mental. It's a state of mind. Correct perception. It's a state of mind. But he's bowing down to the person who became {tsema}. Is it possible? A person can't become mental. You can have a mental part, but you can't become a mind. You have a mind, you're not a mind. So, the point is that the word {pramana} can mean "a person who is totally correct." And in that context, that same word can be used for a being who can't make a mistake, who is totally correct. Who cannot lie. That's called {tsema kyurpa}. That's called a person who is {tsema}, a person who is {pramana}. It means he has {pramana}. It means everything he ever has, or ever thinks, is {pramana}.

[student: He sees everything...]

He never has a non-{pramana}. But we call him the {pramana}. It's just a, it's just an expression. So, the Buddha has become {tsema}. The Buddha has become totally correct. He turned into someone who was totally correct. We're gonna spend a whole class on the word "turned into." {Kyurpa}. That's your fourth class. It's very interesting. The idea that he wasn't that way from the beginning. He was a liar just like us in the beginning, okay?

[student: So, is this little phrase here redundant? Is the "r" at the end of {tsema} mean "turned into"...]

It means "into." The "r" means "into." And the {kyurpa} means "turned." It's the {de nyi} grammar case, and study it some day. {Sim tak}, which is classical Tibetan grammar is a very exciting subject. [laughter] If there was a spare couple of years, we could do it.

[student: Does that mean "Buddha?" {Tsema kyorpa}?

It's... he's... normally in a {chujya}, when you're bowing down to somebody... {chu} means "an offering of praise." So, you're saying, "Oh! The Buddha! I bow down to the Buddha, who is always good. Who turned into someone who's always good." That's the first quality of the Buddha. That's the first thing he's praising. {Tsema kyorpa}. {Drola penshapa} is number two. {Drola penshepa}. What is {Dro}?... you know,[unclear]? {Drola}? {Dro} means "to go." {Dro} means "to go." I don't want to... I'm not teaching you Tibetan, but it's just fun... {dro} means "to go," and as a noun it means "anyone who is going," which means "sentient beings." It's another word for sentient beings. {Drola} means "to sentient beings, to all these goers."

[student: You can say {kando} also.]

Yeah. {Kando} means "she who goes with..."

[student: {Tunjo}.]

Huh?

[student: {Tunjo}.]

Oh, {tundo} means "those who go bent over." {Guryanz}, which is the Sanskrit and Tibetan word for "bowing." {Dro} means "going," {la} means "to them." {Pen} means "benefit or help." {Pen} means "benefit or help." {Shepa} means "he wishes or he wants." So, I bow down to the person who turned into someone who is totally correct, and who, basically, who loves all beings in an ultimate way. He wants all beings to... he wants to benefit all beings. He's looking out for everyone. That's {drola penshepa}. That's the second quality of the Buddha. According to Dignaga. Dignaga is praising the Buddha's qualities. The third quality that Dignaga is talking about is {Thumba}. What's {Thumba}? [Recites Tibetan text]. {Thumba} means "the Teacher." Capital "T". It always refers to the Buddha. The Teacher. {Thumba}. {Deshek}. {Deshek} means {sugata}, "those who have gone to bliss." {De} means "bliss," and {shek} means "gone." And that's a synonym for "a Buddha." There's another, {deshing shekpa}, which is tathagata. They're all related. They're all the same. They all refer to the same person.

[student: So, suga is a Buddha? Sugatha is a Buddha?]

Sugatha is a Buddha. {su} means "good" and it's the "swa" in "swastika." "Swastika" is "su-astika." Goodness. [laughter] It means "goodness." {Kyab} is number five. {Kyab} means... what is {kyabsu chi}, {kyabdo}, {kyabdo}?

[student: [unclear]]

To take refuge. And {kyab} means "a refuge, a shelter, a person who protects, protector." {Kyab} means "protector." {Kyabla chagtsala}, "I bow down to." {La} means "to." "I bow down to the person who became, or who turned into, a totally correct being. I bow down to the person who has ultimate concern for all sentient beings. I bow down to the person who teaches the path to nirvana. I bow down to the person who has gone to total bliss. And I bow down to the person who can protect other beings." So, Dignaga is mentioning five qualities of the Buddha. Those five qualities, Dharmakirti writes half his book about [laughs]. Based on those two lines... I mean, basically, Dharmakirti writes a whole book, and it becomes one of the five greatest books in history, in Buddhist history. Just on those two lines. So, you can spend, in the monastery you spend five years, in the wintertime, on these two lines. Something amazing. And we're going to spend the whole class, the whole course, on this number one. {Tsema kyorpa}. So, the {tsema}, the {pramana}, that we're going to be talking about, and the one that we're interested in, is the one that refers to the person. The Buddha, who is {tsema}. The whole rest of the course is taking off from here, from this first word, {tsema kyorpa}, from this first four syllables. In other words, we're not really gonna study {pramana}. If you wanna do that, we'll have another course. That's the first chapter. We're skipping to the second chapter. Where they try to prove that the Buddha is {tsema kyorpa}. That the Buddha is {pramana}. That the Buddha is a person who cannot lie, and a person who is {tsema}. And that's a big... that takes hundreds of pages. I mean, in the root text. In the root... in the common text, [unclear], we're gonna try to prove or show or discuss this quality of the Buddha, and that will lead us to a proof of future lives. Eventually. It's very interesting. It's very, uh... and it takes you by way of proving that an omniscient being could not create the world. That's... we'll get to that in this class. That's an interesting... and, you know, there weren't any Christians around at that time to pick on. It was just, uh... there was a school at that time that believed that, so he just tried to describe how [unclear], but the main thing is to prove how you are going to perceive things that you can't see right now. I have a little... this is a little thing that, uh... the Tibetan class, some of the more advanced students in the other class are starting to try to translate stuff, and it's all things that relate to what we're doing. So, I asked them, you

know, a different person is doing a few pages each week, and then they're typing it out in English. And then what we would like you guys to do is critique it. It's very rough. It's very lousy, in fact. It's the first one they ever did. And, so, you know, read it, mark it up, and it will go to Erik [unclear], who did this one. And then Serge [unclear] did the next one. That's being typed up now. And, uh, [unclear] did the next one; he's over there typing it up now. [laughter] I don't have enough for everybody, but if you're a person who would care to help, take one.

[silence]

[cut] This is Homer's. Finished, a little early.

[students: One? [laughter] That's it? That's all there is?... two question quiz [laughter] ...[handing out paper] ...[discussing papers]... [applause]... thank you ... you're supposed to be modest... Michael, are these things that are marked in the parentheses, are they a part of the text, or is that the translator adding an exclamation point? I mean, the Erik person who translated it, is that his, or is that...?]

Oh, oh, I assume, I believe that's things he added to make it more clear, cause the original sutra is very old, and it's very difficult. It's driving them crazy, actually. [laughter] And it's not all... it's very, you know, it's not something you'd publish, but if you had some style things that you didn't like, [unclear]. Okay, who's [unclear]?

[student: Um, I just want to apologize also that I didn't have the phone list for today. It's typed up, but I didn't get a chance to print it out. So, next Thursday I will have a phone list, so you guys can call each other and study.]

[prayer: short mandala] [prayer: dedication]

One little announcement. If you, you know, we sent out an announcement asking people... anyone who is going to the last two events down in New Jersey. We sent out a letter... Was it three months ago, two months ago? Asking you to call Dieter ahead of time if you needed a place to stay. And I think, I don't know, eight people called him the night before. He was very upset. So,... And I don't know who it was, but if you're planning to go to this thing in August..

[student: But we read them our names...]

Yeah, I think this list got lost, and... so, I ask... call him directly. I'll give you his number, okay? It's Dieter, and his number is (908) 364-8719, and I think he'd be very happy if people called him this week or next week for... just go home and do it tonight or tomorrow.

# course 4

The Proof of Future Lives

GMR

Class Three

July 29, 1994

Transcriber: Karen Becker

(cut) What you're gonna get tonight is from the second chapter of Dharmakirti's work and he defines what (tse ma) is. So we're gonna we're gonna do that tonight. (cut) (repeat)(miluway rikpa) (repeat) (Sardu)(repeat) (miluway rikpy). That's the definition of (tse ma), pramana. Okay. This is the definition of correct perception. Valid perception. (Sardu) means "fresh", fresh, it's a fresh perception. We'll talk about it. (Miluwa) means "unerring". Not in error. Okay. And (rikpa) means "state of mind". (Rikpa) means "state of mind".

(student: (unclear))

(Miluwa) means un unerring, not mistaken. That's the definition of pramana. That's the definition of (tse ma). And there are five kinds of mind...states of mind, that are not (tse ma). And you you should know them, okay. It's not on your homework, but it's good to know (laughs). There went that (unclear) (laughs) okay. These are called (tse min qyi lo). (Tse min) means "non pramanas".

(student: Michael, to state that definition would be state of mind which was not made mistaken at first. )

Yeah, a fresh...you can also say a "fresh unmistaken perception". But they try to use a different word from perception to define perception... you see what I mean? So they say, a "fresh unerring state of mind". And we'll talk about that. So we're gonna give...I'm gonna give you five kinds of (tse min). (Tse min) is the opposite of (tse ma), okay. (Tse min) means (tse min) means "a non-pramana", something that's not a correct perception. You want to just go ahead? You want to just go ahead? The first one is called (lok she...lok she). (Lok) means (lok) is an interesting word...it means "ass-backwards". I can't think (laughs) (laughter) I don't know...that's the best...we



don't have a good word in English. It's except for that. It means not just wrong but diametrically wrong. You know.

(student: You don't mean flipped?)

Like wrong but not just off the mark, but opposite, you know.

(student: You mean way off or opposite a hundred and eighty degrees?)

Almost opposite, yeah. Often, usually opposite. Like (mok ta) which is "wrong view" means it's not just that you're not sure about karma, you don't believe it. You specifically don't believe it. But this (lok she)...the classical example of (lok she) is when you get very sick...if you've ever been to India and if you ever studied in Dharamsala, you probably got hepatitis from the water there, and according to Tibetan medicine, when you get hepatitis you get an excess of wind in the channels, and wind has a blue color, so you see things as blue or yellow, it's interesting. When you get certain kinds of diseases you see things that are different colors. So they say if in Tibet you've got certain diseases you look at a snow mountain and it looks yellow it looks yellow or blue to you, that's a (lok she). Okay. That's not a pramana. It's not a blue mountain.

(student: Seeing something that is not really the color)

Snow is not blue. It's it's a mistaken perception because you're drugged up or you're drunk. Remember that we said pramana couldn't be any of those things, so you're sick or you're drugged up or you're very upset, or you have a strong emotion like jealousy and and you think you see something where there's nothing there. That's all (lok she). Okay. Those are all (lok she).

(student: So (lok) is backwards?)

(Lok) means "backwards or wrong". (She) means "knowledge" or perception.

(student: That makes it wrong).

Very wrong, okay. I'll put I'll put one over here.

(student: Number two?)

Say (te-tsom) (repeat) (te-tsom) (repeat). (Te-tsom) means...it's a difficult word...the main meaning is "doubt", it's defined as a mind which is split about the object. Split into two points about the object, so and there's several kinds of (te-tsom). For example, one is (dun min gyur kyi te-tsom). That's where you say...that's where you're not sure about something and you're tending to the wrong thing, you know, if somebody says, "is the, is the world round" and you say, "well, I'm not sure, but I kind of think it's flat", that's a (dun min gyur kyi te-tsom). That's it's it's a kind of a a doubt or an uncertainty which is tending towards the wrong. The wrong view. And then (dun gyur kyi te-tsom) means a kind of doubt where you say, "well, I kind of think it's round but I'm not quite sure". And those are (te-tsoms). Those are not pramana, okay. So to have a doubt or to not be sure about something you don't you're not grasping that object clearly, directly, you're not sure about the object, so it's not a pramana. (Te-tsom) is a it's the second kind of non-pramana.

(student: So then it doesn't matter if you accurately perceive it as long as you're not sure of the perception, is that the idea?)

Yeah, right. So (dun gyur gyi te-tsom) means, you know, I think it was him that killed that lady, but I'm not sur...you know, if it turns out that he did, that will be a (dun gyur gyi te-tsom) but still you...because you're not clear it's not it's not correct yet.

(student: Would you write those two down?)

Excuse me?

(student: Would you write those two down? Those two (unclear))

Long story.

(student: It's it's you're not sure but yet you make a statement?)

No. If you do make a statement based on a (tse min), you've done a...you're not a Buddhist...I mean, Buddhists are not...it's classic that we're not allowed to say anything unless we have a (tse ma) about it. We're not supposed to.

(student: So if if you're if you're eyes are if something is bothering you, you can't see it very clearly, you don't have your glasses on, I mean that could be either one in a way right?)

Yeah, what they thought about you're seeing...nor sure what it is, that (tse min). It's a non-promena.

(student: But it couldn't be the other one also, it couldn't be (lok she) (unclear))

It's (lok she) if you say, if you can't see it clearly, (lok she) would be, there's a scare crow and you say it's a person because your eyes are not clear. But (te tsom) would say, "I'm not sure if it's a person or not", it's still not a pramana. These are all examples of...pramana can be direct or deductive, and I'm giving you five states of mind which are neither. These are five states of mind which are not pramana. Therefore, if you see something with these five you can't say that that thing what, what's the definition of existence? (Tse me rigpa). So if you don't perceive it with a pramana you can't be sure that it exists.

(student: What if you see it but you don't know what it is?)

It's a pramana towards an unknown object (laughs) (laughter) It happens.

(student: (Te tsom) is the perception of your own uncertainty?)

No, that's not a, that's a pramana.

(student: That is a pramana.)

Yeah, I'm not sure is a (tse may) statement. (Tse ma) has all these meanings...(tse ma) pramana doesn't just mean...we're gonna get into it...it doesn't just mean that state of mind. It can mean "valid" or what's a good word, there's a word in English, "reasonable". I mean it's reasonable to say "I doubt". If your perception of your doubt is a pramana. The doubt itself is unclear towards its object, so it's not a pramana.

(student: Another question I have, when we talk about inductive pramana, we translate that as deductive valid perception, yet the idea of something being deductive in English is not something we would really (unclear) the idea of perception.)

But that, yeah.

(student: (unclear) we had the idea of the immediacy of a perception, what I'm wondering is does that carry over into Buddhist logic wherein the ability to prove something logically or deductively is allied with immediate perception.)

Yeah, that's exactly it. The whole point is that by the time you finish this class you develop a sense, a sixth sense called deduction, and you trust it, because you understand the rules of deduction which takes a long time to study, years, you you develop a real ability to perceive objects which the people around you can't see, and you and that's a valid it's as good as your eyeballs, but you you've gotta learn first the rules of of deduction, the reasoning, and once you know them clearly, and then you see something with it, you can trust that it exists, that's a pramana. That's the whole purpose of studying this. Yeah.

(student: Why are you including inductive?)

I don't know the difference between inductive (laughs) and things like that.

(student: Inductive is going from particular to general and deductive is general to specific.)

The only thing here is, there's three different kinds, it's a long story...it would take you a couple years to study it, but basically based on a reason, you perceive that object. That's the definition of it.

(student: right (unclear) logical thought process)

Based on a valid on a good reason you perceive it. It's not really deduction in the in the logical sense, in the formal logic sense, yeah?

(student: So in the case where you know, these in the scriptures and such they talk about the lamas perceiving the hell realms and etc etc, is this what they mean then?)

No, there's a big debate about it in fact, you know. They say, is the Buddha just a great logician or did he really see...does he really see the three times. And the answer is he has what's called (nel jor mung sum) yogic direct perception, and in a deep state of meditation he sees directly those three, and that's...those lamas see directly these things. Okay. So that's the second kind of (tse min). (Tse min gyi lo) okay.

(student: Of which there's two types of (te tsom), things that you're not sure of that you're going the wrong way...)

One where you're tending the right way and one where you're tending the wrong way. But you don't, you know, I'm not going to ask you that, this is just interesting to know. Okay. Let's just see...does that thing come off, the one in the middle? So say, (che she) (repeat) (che she) (repeat). (Che she) is defined as (tok shin tokpay rikpa) (laughter) (laughs) and that means "the perception, the perception of something that you've already perceived." And you can call it recollection. For example, if I say look up here, okay, and then I say what did you see? You that's a (che she). Okay, that that moment later when you have a

mental image of that pen, that black...the perception of the black top is a (che she). It's a (che she). Why? It's not...that perception is not triggered by the blackness itself and you don't have a clear, direct perception of that blackness anymore, and so it's a (che she). The the blackness that you're seeing a second later in your mind is very flimsy compared to, you know, blackness that created that first consciousness of blackness, and that's called (che she) and that's not it's not a (tse ma) in this school. Okay. We're in the mind only school.

(student: Michael, are you talking about only immediately afterwards or is any (unclear) recollection?)

Any any subsequent, yeah, any recollection of the previous perception is called (che she) and that's not a (tse ma). It's not a pramana.

(student: So you say I had I had a (tse ma) but I don't have that (tse ma))

It's based on a (tse ma). It's triggered by a (tse ma). It's it's

(student: So if we wha what if somebody has seen emptiness then afterwards say they don't have a (tse ma) about it anymore?)

No longer a direct perception.

(student: Right. So (tse ma) exists only in the immediate present?)

(Sardu)

(student: fresh)

Fresh. Fresh perception.

(student: That means all(unclear))

Yeah, in this school. The higher schools

(student: (unclear))

The higher schools say, frankly, that a (che she)...it's one of the differences between the highest school and the other schools.

There's a list of differences between the schools and the higher schools believe that (che she) is a (tse ma). It's a (tse ma) towards the image of black. So that's we can accept that. But but you're in the lower school right now and you have to stay in this school 'cause you'll get confused and you won't be a good Mind Only scholar if you mix up. This is Mind Only and Sautantrika you're studying. And it's very good to master other schools because they're very useful ideas that you can use when you...supposedly when you teach people everybody has a different you know, level and when you if you know all the schools you can use the appropriate tool for that person. But if you mix them all up then you get, you know, you've been to lectures that were pretty confusing (laughs) and you have to keep them separate and you have to...to know the differences between the school is very healthy for your own meditation, 'cause sometimes a thought from a lower school pops into your mind and you say, oh that that's a pretty good idea, and it's not a bad idea, the Buddha taught that idea...it's not quite correct. I know the correct one. Yeah?

(student: So if you were doing the generation stage of a practice and you were visualizing a tantric deity, would it be a (che she)? In your mind (unclear)

(Tumo zang tumo y lam ma jepe (unclear) de yiche) Remember that? From the... what was that thing? Is it's Maitreya Buddha (unclear)

(student: one, two)

(student: (unclear))

And the Sakyas made the mistake of?

(student: Mixing them (unclear))

Mixing them together. Mentioning one (laughs) mentioning (tumo ma imba) in a unique teaching while they were teaching (unclear)

(student: This whole thing is the opposite (unclear))

It means I can't answer (laughs) it. All right. We studied that (unclear), right?

(student: (unclear))

(student: Yeah)

(Che she) So that's (che she). I'll give you another one now. So how many have we had, one...

(students: This is four.)

(Yi chu) is a...the other class came up with a good name for that...what was it, speculation, a guess.

(student: (unclear) recollection?)

No, recollection (laughs) (laughter) this is, you know, after I taught you guys that quotation of the Buddha and we went to work and I started to realize that all the assumptions I've made about most of the people there could well be very wrong. I guess you can call this "assumption" too. You see. Those are all (yi chus). I mean I don't really know that this guy's bad and I don't really know that this lady's dumb and I don't really know that, you know, I don't know any of those things, they I can say to me it looks that way based on what they've done so far, but you make big mistakes, and there's very famous...that you don't know who's a bodhisattva, and you can't think badly of a bodhisattva...it's much worse than thinking badly of another person who's not a bodhisattva. So, they say you have to be very very careful. We've learned that about some of the vows this weekend, on a different note. So I I think if you examine carefully you'll find that most of your perceptions about other people are really (yi chus), they're really speculation and they're they're not pramana. You really don't know what another person's (laughs) thinking, you know, so you have to say, to live



in this world of wishing the best for everyone and not really letting yourself think that you know that they are bad or good is very healthy, I think, maybe that would be a nice state of mind to be in. Yeah?

(student: This makes me think...)

It doesn't mean that you should condone what they do wrong, 'cause that's obviously wrong. When they hurt someone...killing is wrong. Hurting is wrong. What their motivation was you can't you don't really know. Yeah.

(student: Well, so if if you want to use the example you just used, for instance, you're thinking about somebody, and you really have, actually, no matter how sure you think you are about what they are thinking, you actually have uncertainty, right?)

Yeah.

(student: Now, if you recognize that you have uncertainty about what someone is thinking, is that a (tse ma), I mean)

That's a (tse ma). We (unclear) basically. Yeah. That's a good question. To know that you're...to know that you don't

(student: When you see something from a certain angle, the angle that you get, is it (unclear))

Knowing that you don't know is a is a very healthy kind of knowledge. It'll keep you out of trouble, according to the Buddha, okay.

(student: Not enough of that in this world.)

I'm so proud I remembered them all. (laughter). My computer broke the other night and I was like (laughter). I drew a blank on some of those...there's nothing to do about it. Say (nang la) (repeat) (ma ngepa) (repeat) (nang la) (repeat) (ma ngepa) (repeat). (Nang la) means "it appears to you but" (ma ngepa) means "you you don't ascertain it". It appears but you don't

ascertain, and what it means is you think of a good English word...I don't know if there is a good English word...but it means when a kid is absorbed by a TV show and the mother calls the child to dinner, and he doesn't respond and then the mother goes up and bams him, you know, and says (laughs) you know I called you for dinner. Didn't you hear me? And he says, you know, I was aware of something...I heard something but I can't describe to you what you said, you know, I can't repeat to you what you said. I admit that I was aware of something on another level, in the background, but I can't remember what it was you said. And that's called (nang la ma ngepa).

(student: You have to have had some awareness)

Yeah, it's but...you don't (ngepa). (Ngepa) means "to ascertain or to fix something" and (nang) means it appeared to your mind to your perceptions and you had some kind of fuzzy perception of it, but you didn't really grasp that object. I don't I don't know what you want to call that. Huh?

(student: You know something's you know something's happening but you don't know what it is.)

You don't you don't mentally

(student: That's what Bob Dylan says.)

mentally (laughter) oh, okay. He must have been before his time.

(student: When that happens in a dream state, is that the same thing?)

I I'm not sure.

(student: When you're when you're dreaming and you know somethings going on and you want to stay with it but you can't?)

Generally dreams are (lok she). If in the dream you believe the dream. If you think you're really being chased by an elephant and that's a (lok she), you know. (Nang la ma ngepa)

means your your attention is diverted by something and then you you're fuzzy, you have...aren't these all kind of fuzzy perceptions, you see. I mean, aside from (lok she) which is just plain wrong, the others are all just kind of unclear perceptions. And those are not (tse ma) And that's...so I don't know what you want to call that, so what do you (laughs)

(student: Being dimly aware.)

Yeah, like that.

(students: Distracted. Dimly aware)

It's it's the it's the perception that accompanies the distraction, yeah.

(student: So let's say you're standing there, walking down the street, and somebody's like doing something behind your back, and you don't see them, you don't have you don't hear them, there's no you know, the (unclear) tactile or sensory perception of them)

Right.

(student: Would that still fit into this category because you're missing it, you're not seeing it, it's )

Well yeah, if you if if the next moment somebody said, "did you hear the guy behind you" and you say "oh yeah, you know, I was aware of something...I I didn't really fix on it.

(student: No but I'm saying...)

(Nang la ma ngepa) is fixed.

(student: I'm saying you don't, you don't have a clue.)

No, that's not that's just a non perception. It's not a perception. So those are the five (tse mins) and if you really honestly evaluate all your perceptions during the day, I'm afraid a lot of them are fuzzy, you know, and a lot of them are (yi

chu), you know, a lot of them are...you have to admit that they are assumptions and that they could very well be wrong, and to to live in your moral world that way is very healthy I think, you know. It's very good to live in a kind of state where you're aware of your own limitations and that maybe what you're seeing is not completely true, and and I know since we had the first class that's been very helpful for me. It's it's gotten, it's made me really, allowed me to be better around other people 'cause I I can I understand I can't judge them and then a lot of times you then become more sensitive to all the mistakes you made judging people, you know. Somebody asked (unclear). Okay. So those are the five those are the five (tse mins).

(student: Would you say that that last one could be that you're just vaguely aware of (unclear)

Yeah, yeah. Right. And and the implication is that because you're fixed on something else. You know. The other example I think they give in scripture is a cat watching a mousehole, and you yell at the cat and the cat is you know, he's like, and he's, you know, if he could talk he'd say, "yeah, I heard you yell at me but I but I didn't quite catch what you said."

(student: (unclear))

Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah (laughs) (laughter) He's aware, he just doesn't wanna (laughs) admit it.

(student: Michael, isn't it also a quality that while these are happening you are unaware that they're happening and you think...)

No you have...they all involve some kind of either wrong perception or some kind of fuzzy perception.

(student: But but again, if you were having a fuzzy perception but you were aware that you were having a fuzzy perception...)

Oh that's fine. That's a (tse ma).

(student: Right)

You say, I'm...if you tell your mom, "look mom, you know, I was watching TV and I didn't see you and I apologize."

(student: I know you said something...yeah yeah, right.)

And then you're aware that you had a a (nang la ma ngepa) and that's a (tse ma).

(student: Or if you're seeing the the mountain as blue but you know it's not blue it's just because you're ill...)

The sense perception is a non (tse ma) and the mental perception of the sense perception is a (tse ma).

(student: Yeah)

And that...after you see the state called illusion, living in the world of illusion, you know, understanding the illusion is exactly that, because after you see emptiness directly for the first time, in the highest school, and then whe...actually the way it really happens, you you know you're wrong all the time after that. So you have (tse ma) (laughs) you finally get a (tse ma) according according to highest school you've never had a (tse ma). You've never have a anything but mistaken perceptions until the time you perceive emptiness directly, you know.

(student: Now what'd you say, in all these you have some perception but it's)

Right.

(student: the wrong perception.)

They're they're they're not precise. They're not clear and they're not strong and they're not (sardu miluwa), they're not fresh and they're not unerring. Okay. So that's the fresh part is important in this school. (Tse may kyebu) (repeat) (tse may kyebu) (repeat) Okay. (Tse ma) means, generally, "a a correct perception, a valid perception". And (kyebu) means "a

person". It's it's a word for person, individual. Okay. It comes from the word (gye wa) which means what? (gye wa)

(student: Virtue)

Four big sufferings, ke ga na chi.

(student: Birth?)

Birth, yeah. So (kyebu) means anyone who's been born which means a person. That's the root of the word.

(student: Yeah, but an animal is born too.)

An an animal is a (kyebu). In in Buddhism person can refer to an animal.

(student: All sentient beings?)

Individual, yeah, a being. Yeah. So (tse may kyebu) means "a person of pramana, a pramana person. Can a person be a pramana? No, okay. There's three kinds of changing objects in the universe. Mind...mental objects, physical objects, and then there's things called like conceptual objects, and and the idea of Mike is in the third category, the idea of Helen is, you know, it's a concept. Helen is not Helen's body. Helen is not Helen's mind. Helen is an idea that's imposed on her body and mind. You can't hurt Helen with a stick and Helen doesn't get angry, Helen's mind gets angry, so that's (tse may kyebu) isn't can't be, a person can't be (tse ma). A person can't be a mental state. That's like saying you are anger. Or you are jealousy. That's not...they're they're exclusive.

(student: You mean any being?)

Nobody, yeah.

(student: That was just figurative a...)

You have a you have anger, but you are not (unclear)

(student: No in the opening statement, that was just figurative, the one who (unclear))

(Tse may gye pa) Well, well that's what I'm trying to say right now. Can there be a person who's (tse ma)? Not in the sense of a (sardu miluway rikpa), not in the sense of a mind, state of mind, but the Buddha is called (tse ma). (Tsa me kye) The person of (tse ma). So in that case (tse ma) doesn't mean a mental state. It means he's the person who has that mental state and only that mental state. Okay. So what they're trying to say is a Buddha is a perfect person. A buddha is never incorrect. A Buddha is totally correct. (Tse may kyebu) means "a person who is totally correct". (Tse may) is the state of mind which is correct, and (tse may kyebu) means the person who only has those states of mind.

(student: (unclear))

And that's the whole idea, in fact, the chapter that you're studying from Dharmakirti is called (Tse ma drup de lil) which means "proving that the Buddha is (tse ma)". You know. We're trying, we're gonna attempt to prove that the Buddha is always correct. Yeah.

(student: So in terms of having...in terms of becoming enlightened or developing correct perception all the time, once one involves themselves in meditation practice has a direct perception of emptiness, can they have correct perception all the time just from that or must they develop it through logical analysis constantly of the world?)

You don't have it until you're a Buddha.

(student: I'm saying but is is perceiving emptiness directly, will that in and of itself be enough or do you have to do all the logic also...do you see what I mean?)

Well, it's one of the...is is (tong lam) is the path of seeing enough to reach Buddhahood and Nirvana? That's your question,

and I ask you, is it? (Tong lam) is which of the three five paths?

(student: (unclear))

It's number three. Number five is is a tricky thing, it's not really a path, it's the result, it's Buddhahood. So where the ques you're asking is there, if my answer were yes there wouldn't be a path number four. What is path number four?

(student: Habituation)

Habituation, where you're getting used to what you saw. So yeah you're not a (tse may kyebu) the the day after you see emptiness directly, but it helps a lot.

And then that whole (gom lam), that whole fourth path called habituation is where you use your perception of emptiness and the Four Noble Truths which happened right after that to to clear out your last mental afflictions.

(student: That's not (unclear) this logical process per se, that's just a recollection of your of your emptiness experience and reminding yourself.)

It's both ways. You either, you both go into it directly again and then you also review what you perceived. And the implications of what you perceived on your life, you know. So for example you saw that you're gonna live seven more lives. So (laughs) you know, then you you stop being so acquisitive, you know, you don't need things so much, you know you're going to die, you know you're never going to be poor again, you're always going to live in a good circumstances and you perceive all those things, so you don't have to...you're not so concerned about it.

(student: Are you saying that the seven lives would be good for sure?)

Yeah. Very nice life, you know, upper one and a half...upper half percent, which is what you're in now...



(student: (unclear) either a king or a prime minister?)

You're in that now. No, you're in the...compared to all the Ruwandans (laughs) in the world, you know, you are in the upper

(student: (unclear))

You're up in the upper...you're one in a million already, I mean, people in this room are, physically, economically you know, one in a million.

(student: So we did that good in the last lifetime?)

Yeah, very nice. (laughter) Excellent. (laughter)

(student: What was so good?) (laughter) (unclear) burn up bad karma)

What is it? Pabongka said, if you can't think of anything to rejoice about, rejoice about the fact that you were born as a human 'cause you must have done some incredible good for you to be born in the human realm. You can be proud of that.

(student: Not necessarily the last lifetime always)

Usually, most often, most often.

(student: You know that perception that you're gonna have seven more lives (unclear) how do you know that there's a direct perception that would...)

You. It's a very interesting thing that one of the side perceptions while you are...right after you come out of perceiving emptiness directly, and you see all these noble truths stuff, future lives, past lives, meet Buddhas, you know, one of the side perceptions is that you know you're not a (tse min), you know you're having a (tse ma). You know with (tse ma ) that you're having a (tse ma). And and that's just absolute, you you absolutely have that, and and it's one of the side effects of

those...the incredible effect of ultimate reality, on your mind, is that for for a good period you you have all these (tse mas) and you know you're you know you're correct. It's a nice kind of experience (laughs) you know. You can also read other peoples minds for a while after that.

(student: Cool) (laughter)

Okay, and you know it (tse ma) while you're doing it.

(student: And, but you may not be able to articulate it afterwards, right, it's not just Buddhists who (unclear) this, correct?)

Excuse me?

(student: Someone else who's done the right things in a previous life may have the experience of it.)

Not directly.

(student: No. So you have...it can only happen to a Buddhist.)

And what's a Buddhist?

(student: Aha)

(student: Somebody who knows about the the Three Noble Tru... the three ratnas and takes refuge in them.)

Yeah.

(student: Has the three ratnas.)

Yeah. I mean are they worshipping a picture of that being, maybe not.

(student: But they may be seeing one of the three

But the essence of the

(student: noble ratnas)

The essence of the Three Jewels has nothing to do with the picture of Buddha. Nothing to do with it.

(student: Right. So, someone can be worshipping a picture of Mohammed, and actually still be addressing one of the three ratnas)

Could be a Buddh, could be a Buddhist. And an abbot of a monastery could be a non-Buddhist. Yeah.

(student: I was just, when you were describing this Buddha becoming a separate, tota... perfect correct...)

Yeah, totally correct

(student: Almost, I mean it sounds, I don't know, it sounds like like when we say conscious...it's almost a (tse ma) you know, that the word "consciousness" implies correct (unclear), correct perception, so in a way it almost sounds like Buddha is consciousness, I mean that's )

Yeah, that's very very it's very relevant, yeah, he's all knowing. We're gonna study that. We're gonna get into that. But it but the idea here is if if we can prove that the Buddha is (tse ma), if we can prove that the Buddha is (miluwa), that he cannot make a booboo, that he (laughter) cannot lie, you know, if you can prove that he cannot lie, eh I or even better, if you can prove that he never speaks unless he knows perfectly that thing and he's seen that it's true, then what's the implication? You know, if you can establish that about any given person, you know, Ariel, if we could figure out that anything that Ariel says is absolutely true. She will not open her mouth unless what she comes out of it is absolutely, totally true from her personal (tse ma)

(student: And she says a lot of things.)

No, and then she comes up and says all these great things about being moral and reaching the end of your suffering and then you're, it's great, but the but first you have to establish that she can't make a mistake and that she will never say something unless she personally perceived it to be absolutely correct, you know, then then that's very interesting, if you could meet a person like that.

(student: Or if you ask a person like that, "are you Buddha?", he'd have to say yes? (laughter))

We're we're gonna talk about it (laughs) (laughter)

(student: Good one.)

We're gonna talk about it.

(student: When?)

We're gonna talk about it two classes from now.

(student: How do you not know that there...how do you not know that there saying something for a certain kind of reason?)

For what?

(student: For a certain kind of reason...for a certain kind of result. I mean maybe)

We'll talk about it. There are rules, to answer your question, and that come in the fifth class, you're only in the third class. Okay. So that's the idea of a (tse may kyebu). (unclear) Now I'm gonna do, let's see, I need this picture.

(student: Are there degrees of (tse ma) or is it just (unclear)

They're not a (tse ma kyebu), I mean, they the words (tse may kyebu) is applied to them sometimes in scripture, but but literally the person who only has (tse ma) is the Buddha. But

it's said that a Buddhist master knows enough not to ever say anything that he knows something he hasn't had a (tse ma) about. That that there...you reach a stage before you become a Buddha that you will never say something if you haven't had a (tse ma) about. It's an advertisement. (laughs) (laughter)

(student: Commercial break) (laughter)

I never asked anybody for anything in my life...in my dharma life, and I've never been asked for anything in my Dharma life. No teacher of mine has ever asked me for a dollar and I like it that way and I think that's the way it should be. No I've been studying twenty years in the monastery and no one's ever asked me for anything. A lot of teachers give have given me back things that I gave them, and I think that's the way it should be. Now, there's a certain custom in the monastery when you reach a Geshe degree which I will finish next year, it's like eighteen years study, and then you, you have to go out and beg people for something and I think it's supposed to be something for (unclear) I think it's supposed to be something for humility maybe, I don't know, the word monk in Buddhism (bhikshu) means "beggar", we're supposed to humble ourselves at the doors of people in the morning and ask for our our meal, and if they decide not to give it, we don't eat (laughs), we're not allowed to keep food, actually, so I think it has something to do that. Anyway, the gift that I I...when you become a Geshe then you you have to throw a big ceremony and you have to give a gift to the monastery. So my gift is going to be a new debate park. This is a debating park. And there's some pictures up there of our of our park now, I I don't know if you can see it very clearly but

(student: Is that one that (unclear))

Yeah. There's a park now that...we don't even have a proper park. The park is supposed to be a big open park with sto flat stones and in Tibet it had trees and it was really beautiful, and it had a big wall, and you go into there at eight o'clock and you don't come out until one a.m. or something and that whole time you are intensely studying, and it that's really the engine that drives Buddhism in Tibet, you know, it's the teaching is one thing, but

it's when the students get together for five hours straight and beat it out of each other...you can not take a book, you must have everything memorized, and you can run out of memorization in about three minutes (laughter) (laughs) and you go on for four or five hours, and it's great, it's a great system, it it's keeping Buddhism alive in my idea it's what's really keeping this knowledge flying in the monasteries, is the debate system, so I wanted to give a debating park, and we have a piece of land that we got...it's about two hundred and fifty feet square, and in Tibet there wouldn't have been this four roofs, there was no such thing in Tibet, they would spread gravel on the stones and when it got cold you just put the gravel on your lap (laughter) and you you get under the gravel like up to your waist (laughter) and that's how they kept warm, and when you reach your about your fourteenth year you're allowed to wear a cloak (laughs) (laughter) tha you before that you're supposed to tough it out, you know, and it's really cold, and and we do it outside, it's in the stars, we didn't have electricity for years and we would sometimes you couldn't see the guy you were debating, it's kind of fun (laughter) but we reached the point where we have now eight hundred and, seven hundred and seventy five monks, and our we don't have a place to debate...it's not a good one, we we're debating in the porch of our temple and when it rains everyone gets wet, you just get soaked, you have to sit there on the ground and you just get wet, and if the debate master is feeling good he lets you go home (laughter) and if he's not around (laughs) you sit there, you can leave, you know, so so we designed it that there'll be a four roofs around the corner and when the monks when it starts to rain you can move under the roof and all the Geshe candidates they take their exams here and, you know, big debate contests between the school, between different classes and stuff like that, so that's my I I I pledged to to grub money for that. (unclear), give me one of those boxes. So the idea is I came up with this idea that I I wouldn't ask anybody...it's going to cost seventy thousand dollars,

(student: Does not include cost overruns?)

Yeah, and I have a budget you can see. But we came up with this idea that I'm going to ask people that I know to keep this box in

their house and when you come home you put your spare change in it. And you

(student: (unclear) for?)

(student: Michael, if you want a better (unclear) idea to change, it it attracts too much attention to the)

Well we'll talk about it. Anyway, you put your change in there ever and if you agree to sign up for this you get a new box in the mail every (laughter) once a month (laughter) you get a new box in the mail and you then the old box has stamps on it already and it has this tape here and you just seal it and you dump it in the mail box and it has padding inside, after it's full you can't, we, she's been working on it, Marie, and we took it to the post office and showed it to them (laughter) it's pretty cool.

(student: But I mean, Michael, wouldn't the postage equal to the amount of change inside?)

(student: Yes)

No the postage is... she put a little...the postage is a buck sixty-nine, and

(student: (unclear))

Well, the goal is that you put a little more in than your change (laughs) (laughter), the goal is that you try to give two dollars a day, okay, the goal is that you try...you know you're gonna have seventy five or a dollar in change and then you throw in another (laughter) dollar bill (laughter) (laughs) and the idea is to try to hit two dollars a day and if I can get a hundred people to do that

(student: Michael, we should just bring it in when we come to class, and we would save postage (unclear))

No we will cut off the postage and re-use it if you bring it in,

but the idea is that you don't have any excuse. All you have to do is lick it and throw it in a mail box. And and that's it and Maria, there's a whole team of people, Serge Laiten is in charge of it, and Maria's helping, and that's all, it will go on for a year, it will go on for twelve months. If if people give about two dollars we'll finish and they've already started planting the mango trees

(student: Aw, that's sweet.)

The trees come up and then they link and it's good for bald marks (laughter) and it's and it smells sweet...mango trees are very they're very sweet

(student: (unclear))

(student: (unclear) for the hungry, though?)

(laughs) And that's the pitch. And I think...there's a couple of other reasons. Serge needs to do this because he's he's planning something special and I think as a center, as a group, if we build that the karma of that will mean that these classes will go for a long time, very beautiful results, good results for the people in these classes. I believe that karmically that would happen. So I believe that would be the the result we would have. And then I owe the monastery a lot...we wouldn't have any of this, if there wasn't debating there I wouldn't know anything and we'll put a plaque there with everybody's name on it (laughter), there's gonna be no it's like a brass thing and they have they make it there and so that so I ask you to do that if you can, and it's no, you know me by now, it's everything here is free and no obligation, if you can do it I'd appreciate it and if not I it's all right, and you give your name to (unclear). Right, and your address, and she'll give you a box for tonight and then start today if you can tomorrow.

(student: Would you what is the deadline?)

You when you get the new box you dump the old one



(student: No no no, when is your deadline)

I'd like to finish within a year. But they're gonna start building now, I mean, the first month I'll send

(student: Oh, so as you get money you send it in)

Yeah, and they're very good at...the monks, normally, Tibetans monks love to build stuff and pay for it later (laughter) (laughs) It's gotten many monasteries in trouble. Yeah.

(student: Is this for both colleges? Is it )

Well, there's a trick at Sera. First of all I'm from Sara Mey so it would be I I have to build it for my monastery. They have to...we don't debate together. We have we have our separate debate grounds. Now Sera Je, the other our sister college who we compete with, heard that I was doing this (laughter) (laughs) and they've already selected a piece of land and they've already started planting their trees, so what you do is you play off (laughter) this when when when we built the water the first water system there, we used to drink out of mud, literally mud, and they had no water and we went to Sera...there's a Sera Government Council, half Sera Je and half Sera Mey, and I said, you know, I'd like to raise money for water system, to drill water, and they said, "just do it for Sera Mey and then (laughter) Sera Je will go out and get the money they need on their own". They have a lot of lam...we only have one big Lama in the West, that's Geshe Tharchin, Sera Je has Lama Zopa, Geshe Sopa, Lama Yeshe, Geshe Rabten, and a and a lot of other in Australia they have about seven or eight, so they're they're they're very healthy and we're like the black sheep, we don't (laughter) (laughs) we're always broke and our monks are skinny and (laughter) you know, really, and we don't have enough, so that's they're doing okay (unclear), they're doing Lama Yeshe's centers are very generous. They just presented them with half a million dollars for their food

(student: (whistles))

So, you know, we don't have that.

(student: So we're gonna get the karma for really initiating  
(unclear) debate grounds for the first ones)

Yeah yeah yeah (laughter) they've already in fact what happened was the the ground that I chose which is up there...it's behind the Dalai Lama's residence at the monastery, is closer to Sera Je, so they said, will you trade sites with us. They had one that was very convenient for us (laughter), so it actually it's a good luck...it's a good auspicious beginning 'cause for the first time I think we cooperated (laughter) and we traded si sites, so we can see the land up there, and that's gonna be Sera Je's up there, but so I appreciate if you do it, and that's all.

(student: Whose idea was it that this monthly box thing)

I've seen them in a...when you, whenever you do your tantric retreats you'll find that you meditate a lot everything except (laughter) (laughs) what you're supposed to (laughter) (laughs) you know.

(student: So this came to you during a retreat?)

Yeah, yeah. (laughter)

(student: Michael, is there going to be an accounting of )

Yeah, you can also by the way you can get a non you'll get a tax we'll we'll count it there you don't have to worry about it, we'll count it when it hits New Jersey, it's pre it's pre-addressed, you don't have to do anything, you just dump it.

(student: But you can bring it here too.)

Or you can bring it here, and then we will give you receipts if you want us to, and we'll keep a track and then that's tax exempt, we are IRS approved and all that stuff.

(student: You know what would really be good to do would be to

chart it on the wall so people can see if (unclear) behind that.

We're going do. That's, she (unclear) right? (unclear) She ran away. She's making the chart already, and we have a hundred dollars, somebody

(student: All right, Nina)

threw in the first hundred. (clapping)

(student, Nina: (unclear) it's not my money, somebody give it to me)

(student: Well, don't steal it)

You heard about that robbery on (laughs) 28th street (laughter).(unclear) do you have the chart yet? Stilwell says it'd be a good idea to have a chart.

(student: Not one of those thermometers, is it?)

(student: No it's it's (laughter)

Just think United Way (laughter)

(student: Actual versus needed, you know)

(student: Hey that's an idea (unclear), all right, cool)

So that's all. Have some refreshments and we'll start in about five minutes.

(student: That's great. When did you actually budget this)

Well, I committed to find a sponsor and then I realized it would be nice to (unclear)-lots of students talking together in background).

(student: Michael you should have some boxes with no stamps, this way you don't have to (unclear)

(student: If I get stuck can I borrow your battery? (laughter))

(student: Yeah yeah, well I hope (unclear))

(student: But then you waste the boxes)

(student: Well I'll let you record and I'll just have to record (unclear))

(student: And that's boxes, you have to think about costs)

(student: See with these rechargeable batteries they die fast, like once you get down to three, they're good, and then they run on three for a while but then like once they go from a three like in two minutes they're gone.)

(student: Yeah, you know I recharged it once and I left it in my bag and I thought they were good and I came in here and they weren't and I don't know how long I had them in my bag. I had them recharged in five minutes and then they went unn.n.n.n.n.)

(student: yeah, died.)

(cut)

(dang) (repeat) (tamche kyenpa) (repeat) (dang) (repeat) (der drupay lam) (repeat) One more time. (Tarpa dang) (repeat) (tamche kyenpa dang) (repeat) (der drupay lam) (repeat). Okay. You know what (tarpa) is? There's a (tarpa) publications in in London, they call (Tharpa) bad spelling (laughter), freedom. Freedom. Liberation. Moksha. In Sanscrit. And it refers to Nirvana. Which the definition is (unclear Diamond) (laughs)

(student: A cessation)

Yeah

(student: which comes from the individual analysis and (unclear))

Wow.

(students: All right. (laughter and clapping))

I called her this morning and told her (laughter).

(student: (Unclear))

No that's great. Okay. They say you say the end of your mental afflictions, the end of all your anger, jealousy

(student: Permanently)

Permanently cessation...because you saw emptiness. That's (tarpa). That's (tarpa). Could you achieve it this evening?

(student: Yes)

Would you look different tomorrow (laughter) morning?

(students: No)

No (laughter). You'd stop scowling maybe when you get up (laughs) and (tamche kyenpa), (tamche) means "all, everything". By the way (dang) means "and". (dang) means "and"

(student: a n d?)

A n d. (tamche) means "everything". (Kyenpa) means "to know". So (tamche kyenpa) is the mind of a Buddha, omniscience, all knowingness. So, nirvana and the state of omniscience, Buddhahood, all knowingness. And (dang) and (der) means "to them", (der) means "to those two", to them, (drupay) means "going, for going, for traveling" and (lam) means the what?

(students: Path)

Path. Path. So if you have to read that part in Tibetan normally you start from the back, so what is it? The (lam)

(students: The path)

For (dru pa)

(student: The path for traveling)

For going to those

(student: To those two things)

So there's three things being mentioned here; one is nirvana, one is omniscience of Buddhahood and one is the path to get there. And the purpose of the whole second chapter of Dharmakirti's book, which is what you're studying if anybody ever asks you, is to try to prove that these three even exist.

(student: What would the full statement be?)

Nirvana, Buddhahood and the path for traveling to them.

(student: It's a it's a clause, it's not a sentence)

Yeah. There's no sentence. Yeah. Nirvana, omniscience and the path to get to them. Those are the three things that we want to try to establish ea...and and Kedrup Je we if you came to the Friday night class Tsongkapa's you know, one of his two great disciples, he said, frankly speaking, you and I aren't...we don't even have a (tse ma) if there is such a thing as a Buddha. You know. We are Buddhists and we are studying Buddhism to achieve Buddhahood and we cannot...Kedrup Je says you can't give me three (laughs) good arguments why Buddhism exists...Buddhists...the state of a Buddha, enlightenment, even exists. You know, you're not sure. It's a (te tsom). You have a (tse min). You you're not really sure, you know, and you're not really sure that nirvana exists or that it's possible, much less how to get to there, you know, so so really if you're a good Buddhist logician, the first thing you have to admit is that maybe (laughs) there's no such thing, you know, you're not sure that they even exist, and the and the function of this whole chapter and really the reason future lives and past lives come up is is in conjunction with try trying to prove these three, that they even are possible and that

they even exist. And that's the big job of pramana. That's why we're spending so much time on (tse ma). We want to try to get a (tse ma) about these three. Then then if you if you really had a (tse ma) that these things were possible, that they existed, then you could make some good progress, you know, if you if you had some pretty convincing evidence that such a thing as nirvana was possible, then your life would change a lot, your behavior would change a lot, you know, yeah.

(student: I didn't understand the connection (unclear))

I didn't...there was no connection made yet. I just threw it out as a as a morsel, you know, you're gonna get that later...it's a good question, you know, what connection is there between this class which is supposed to be about past and future lives, by the way that...the proof of past and future lives is found in this chapter, but it's not why he wrote the chapter...it's a side issue. But for westerners it's pretty, you know, we want to know about it, so that's what I named the course 'cause it's cute, but it's really just a side issue and it doesn't even come until the seventh class I believe. What we're trying to prove is that these three things are even possible, and that's that's gonna be the main thing. Now what kind of (tse ma)s are there? How many kinds of (tse mas)? Basically two. Basically two. What are they?

(student: Direct (unclear))

Direct and?

(students: Deductive reasoning)

You can call it deductive or reasoning is maybe better, okay. The first is defined as not depending on a reason. The second is dep is defined as depending on a reason. Based on a good reason you see something, you perceive something. Okay, That's de what we're calling deductive reasoning. And there's two

(student: (unclear))

By the way are these things...what level of reality are these three things on?

(student: The first is direct and obvious. (unclear) (laughs))

I'd say you know some of it's hidden and some of it's deeply hidden. Okay. So what kind of...of which which one of those two (tse mas) are you gonna have to rely upon?

(students: Deductive)

Deductive. There's two types of deductive...did we do that?

(student: No)

Yeah, there are three. Did we do three?

(student: No we we never talked about it (unclear))

Oh, okay, all right. Well we'll I'll mention it briefly and then we'll stop. Three kinds of deductive perception. The one you use for deep objects is is what you normally think of as reasoning...you can say reasoning. Log...you can say logical reasoning, maybe that's correct. The second one depends on belief in an authority.

(student: Believe or belief?)

Belief in an authority. Do you do you...in other words you're going to examine the person who's saying it and if you can come up with some compelling reason that he can't lie or that he won't say anything that's not true, and then he says something very deep, you you you can't perceive the the truth of it. Those are for deeply hidden things.

(student: I don't follow the structure here)

In other words if you want to perceive a hidden thing...watch this pen, (laughs) okay...did it hit the floor?



(student: Deductive reasoning.)

That's deduction. You did not see the pen hit the floor, you're that's (kok gyur) for you, that's hidden. It's not deeply hidden because you don't need my authority you don't have to believe that I'm a person who never lies, and I say, the pen hit the floor...you don't need that. It's it's not that deep (laughs) you know. (laughter) All right. If it were that deep you'd need me to say, look, did I ever lie to you (laughs) (laughter) and I I'm telling you, the pen hit the floor. You know, and I can't lie, you know, I never lie and and and you find some compelling reasons to why I can't lie and then I tell you the pen hit the floor, then that would be deep... if it were deeply hidden, something that you could never see on your own even with thinking, but it's just someone has to present it to you and then based on your deductive reasoning that he can't lie, you you take it. Yeah.

(student: I I I guess when you described it last time, last session, I thought you were saying, you know, about some (unclear) you know, we don't understand that, but if you know we trust the authority and then we read it then we see it, that, I mean is that)

Oh eventually it it all

The Proof of Future Lives  
Class 3, part 3  
Transcriber: Karen Becker

(student: I mean, is that also hidden, is that also very hidden? I mean is that also on that level? Does it have to be proven?)

Oh, that's a good question...no. It doesn't have to be.

(student: So so that's the first part of what you're saying. Logical reasoning is used for hidden things and the second part of what you're saying, how does that relate?)

It's the second part I'm saying that we for very hidden things,

deeply hidden things, you need authority, a person of authority, a (tsemay kyebu), you know, that person that can

(student: (unclear))

Yeah, you could never figure it out on your own. You need someone to come and say, that's the way it is, and then you need some deductive reasoning to prove why he can't lie. Why he would never lie.

(student: For following his reasoning about it? I mean if he)

No, then it would be deductive. You see.

(student: Oh I see)

The Buddha can teach you logic and you can perceive emptiness in this class, intellectually. That's a deductive perception at that time.

(student: So it doesn't have to do with the (unclear))

No not no. And then there's a third one which is not too important and it's not mentioned very much if you want to be complete about it...there's a kind of perception that about conventions. What is conventions mean? It means we all agree to call the moon a ball of cheese or something, okay. And you normally a convention has to have a a sort of a good reason behind it, you know, it looks like it's got holes in it like a piece of cheese. That's called convention by similarity. And then we all agree to call it...or the man in the moon. Okay. We say there's a man there. It means there's a drawing of a man. So that means just between all of us we all agree to call something something. And that's and you can perceive that that thing can reasonably be called that. That's called it...that's the third kind of deductive perception.

(student: (unclear))

(student: Similar)

In other words if I say okay Marie decided tonight...we were searching for a name for these boxes and she decided...we kind of decided to call it a "Dharma Box". Okay. So it's a Dharma Box. Now now next time I come into the class and I say, did anyone send in their Dharma Box (laughs) you know, you all know what I'm talking about. You know. Why? Because you can say, well, I remember last week we agreed to call this thing a Dharma Box. And there's no better reason than that.

(cut) So the the convention can be anything that you can imagine. That's the limitation of convention. And well it's not very important (laughs) okay. The point is, to perceive these three things you're gonna need either reasoning, logic, or you're gonna need authority and to get authority you've gotta prove that that person is is totally correct person.

(student: Which is based upon logic and reasoning?)

I'm gonna...yeah, yeah. And I'm gonna go into that. That's a big subject.

(student: So Michael, we had for deep objects, for very deep objects and for conventionally agreed upon objects?)

Excuse me?

(student: What we)

Oh. The first kind of deductive reasoning, logical reasoning, is used for objects which are hidden. The second kind of deductive reasoning which is based on authority is used for objects which are deeply hidden. The examples are emptiness and the very subtle workings of karma, okay. Emptiness is easy enough for you to figure out with logic, you can perceive emptiness directly based on logic. You can never see the deep workings of karma based on logic. You have to have a an omniscient being come to you and say, look, you know, the reason your ear is shaped like that is that a million years ago you hit somebody, you know, you just could never see it on your own with logic. The third one is

got nothing to do with deep or not deep. It's just things that we agree to call something. So you don't have worry...don't worry about the third one. Don't sweat on that one. It's the first two that you're gonna need to perceive these things, and you're very much want to. You know, if I could convince you that there is such a thing as nirvana, really, if I could really get you to a state where you could see with a (tse ma) that nirvana exists, your life would change. You know, you you come to this class because of what we call a (bak chak), karmic seed from your past life. You enjoy it or you're attracted to it...you en you kind of like it, but but you probably if you are who you seem to be which I don't know, you you probably don't have a (tse ma) about nirvana. And what really what it is, and if you came out of this class with a (tse ma) about what is nirvana and what is Buddhahood, your life would change. You know. Then your goal would be very clear to you because you would see that it's possible to reach this state where you don't have to die. And you don't have to get old and you don't have to have suffering anymore, you know, that would be...and if if you really believed that such a thing was possible your life would totally change, you know, and that that's the whole purpose of this class. We're trying to get a (tse ma) about that about that thing, and we're gonna try, we we really will try and I think at least you'll come out with a pretty strong tendency that this thing does exist and I can reach it, you know, so that's exciting. Okay. I have one more installment of the sutra...I don't wanna read it tonight but maybe next time I'll have someone get up and read it. It's a very interesting sutra. The other class is translating it. And I appreciate if you can comment on the translation.

(student: (unclear))

I made more, yeah, I will. And Anila's...you you did the word processing? She worked this up on her on her (unclear), Sarah did the translation. (unclear) This is a this sutra has very big meaning and by the end of the class when you get to the last line of the sutra you'll know why. I think that's all (unclear)

(students: Homework? )

Oh the homework. (laughter)

(student: Is this a real picture?)

(student: It is nirvana)

(student: Is this a picture (laughter) yeah, I know, but I mean is this a real, is it a real)

It's a color shot.

(student: Ah, that's neat)

And then you get a new picture every month.

(students: Wow. Different. Ahhhh.)

Yeah

(student: (unclear))

(student: Do you have any more of the translations (unclear)

Excuse me? I don't have more but maybe Anila can run some more off next week. Can you run some more off, later?

(students; (unclear))

How many how many more people wanna wanna translation.

(student: me)

Maybe like four or five more.

(student: I'll pass them on down (unclear))

I didn't ask you to type in the other class (laughter)

(students: (all talking together at once)

Kiley, you ready?

(student: Unclear))

(prayer: short mandala)

(prayer: dedication)

940801-1.aaa

15a.txt

**Course IV: The Proof of Future Lives**

**Class Four: Being of Totally Correct Perception**

**August 1, 1994**

**Transcribed by: Amber Moore**

[unclear] [clapping]

He flew all the way up from Barbados for this class, [laughter]. Say {tsema kyebu} [repeat], {tsema kyebu} [repeat]. {Kyebu} means "person". {Kyi } means "to be born" and {kyebu} means "anyone whose been born", which, which is a Tibetan word for person. {Tsema kyebu}, {tsema kyebu}. {Tsema} means what?

[student: The right perception.]

It means a "good perception", the right perception. And it's such a good perception that if you have one, you know the thing you're having it towards is real. It exists. So this is very important, {tsema}. So what do you think a {tsema kyebu} is?

[student: A person that has pramana.]

Yeah, but it's, it should mean that, but it doesn't. It means "anybody who has pramana". By the way who would that be?

[students: The Buddha.]

You don't know {tsema}? You know {tsema}?

[student: Everybody knows {tsema}.]

[student: Its very fuzzy.]

[laughs] If it's fuzzy, it's not {tsema}.

[student: Oh its not, okay it's not]

{Tsema} is, "I see a yellow wall", {tsema}. Okay, you have, you have a, ninety percent, ninety-nine point nine percent of... the other night I had a non {tsema} and I remember what it was. I was looking at a thing on the subway from a distance and it looked like a person's... a poster of a person, and then it turned out to be a banana or something, [laughter] when I got closer. That's a non {tsema}. But besides the weird times like that, you know, the rest is all {tsema}, the rest are all {tsema}. So you should be a {tsema kyebu}, but that's not what it means. [Tsema], {tsema kyebu} means a person who has only {tsema}. A person who is totally {tsema}. And in this case {tsema} doesn't mean a state of mind. It means "totally correct". A person who is totally correct.

[student: Not their perception? Are you talking about their perception?]

Right, it becomes an adjective rather than the noun for the perception. It becomes a person who is like those perceptions in that he is totally correct and every, every state of mind he has is a {tsema}. Now, who is that?

[students: The Buddha.]

Yeah, only a only an omniscient being can be a {tsema kyebu}, normally. And in Tibetan nowadays, when you say {tsema kyebu} it can also refer to a great saint because what it means is, if a, when a {tsema kyebu} says something about something, what?

[student: You know he's telling the truth.]

You know he's telling the truth, [laughs]. That's very refreshing, [laughs]. I mean, imagine a world where people didn't say anything unless they had a {tsema } to back it up. Imagine, imagine that you restricted your own words to things that you really knew. Ah.. much quieter world [laughs].

{student: What's the difference between a saint and a Buddha?}

Well the point is that, they're not totally enlightened yet , but still they are very careful not to say anything unless they have an actual {tsema } about it. That means most of what we say about people, we'd have to shut up, [laughs], because we don't really have {tsema} to judge. I mean, I found myself doing it today. If you work in a busy office, lunch time is the time that you gossip about other people. And we were gossiping about five or six people, then suddenly I realized, hey, I don't have any tsema about any of this stuff. And that's a, a non



{tsema}. So {tsema kyebu} is something like a person that cannot lie, cannot lie, if he says something, it's true.

[student: Is the Dalai Lama a {tsema} ...?]

A {tsema kyebu}? Can you judge that?

[student: No.]

Why do you think that the Dalai Lama is much different from any one else?

[student: Because he's the Dalai Lama.]

[student: Because he was chosen.]

[Laughs] Huh?

[student: Because he was chosen.]

You mean, if he wasn't chose... well, that's different.

[Student: Conventional, deductive reasoning.]

Well, we'll talk about it. We'll talk about how do you, how can you figure out that someone's a {tsema kyebu}? He's, he is said to be a {Tsema kyebu}.

[student: How, How do you, Excuse me.]

[Laughter]. If he's not [laughter], who is? No, it's a... that's actually one of the reasons of this class. How do you establish that the Dalai Lama is a {tsema kyebu} ? How, how do you know that such a thing is possible? (A), is it possible? (B), is he one? You know, we have to think about, to be able to think about we have to be able to figure out how we establish it.

[student: It seems as if ...ah... ]

By the way, we will answer that, we will.

{student: Which class? [laughter] Because I'm going away, I wanna be here, five, five more?}

Fifth class, next class.

[student: next class.]

Now, when is that next one?

[student: Next Thursday.]

Would it kill anybody if I go away for a week, or would you prefer it? Seriously.

[students: ohh.. Why would you leave?]

[student: We'd have to talk about {tsema } more.]

[student: Why would you leave?]

Kills anybody? Does it ruin anybody?

[student: If you go away between the fourteenth and the [unclear] that would be fine.]

Would you like it?

[student: Because I'm going away that week.]

[student: The last week in August.] [Laughter]

I think he's talking suddenly, maybe next week.

[student: No, next week is before the, no, the week after.]

Just for one week, just for five days.[laughter]. I can see this happening [unclear].

[student: Would you be here this Thursday for the class? Or you don't know for sure?]

I'll be, I believe I'll be here [laughter]. I'll be here, because it's too late to cancel.

Yeah? [student: It sounds like {tsema} is something to do with the truthful...]

Yeah, yeah.

[student: ... awareness of what you are perceiving. So if you looked down the subways' platform at this yellow poster, and you thought it was a picture of a person and you began to believe and put weight on that, and then you got closer and saw that it wasn't, that would have been an incorrect or untruthful relation to what you were perceiving. However, if you saw something and you said, "I see a yellow object, but I'm too far away to see clearly what it is." that would be a correct {tsema}.]

That's a {tsema}. That's a {tsema}.

[student: So in other words, if we're careful to be truthful to ourselves as much as possible, we could have {tsema} all of the time.]

Yeah, yeah. We do have {tsema} most of the time. I'd say with other people we, we, somebody asked in the other class, "What level of reality are other people's thoughts on?" And I didn't really remember it being in a scripture, but it occurred to me; it's almost like {shindu kogyur}, it's almost like it's very deep, hidden. Because I'm not sure that you could figure out someone else's thoughts even with logic, you know. I, I, think that to really know what other people are thinking, it's, it's probably almost beyond our, our capacity.

[student: So what about the [unclear] that can tell you what the person is about?]

You can, you can, reach a state of meditation, and it's in, it's all over the Abhidharma that you can read other people's minds and you can when you reach the path of seeing. I mean, before that.

[student: So...]

That's, yeah...

[student: You know, we're talking about a Buddha only has {tsemas} all the time, and therefore he cannot lie.]

Well, theoretically, you could have {tsemas} all the time and still be a liar.

[student: Right, so...]

But the fact is, he also has this internal mechanism that he will not state anything unless he's had a {tsema} about it.

[student: Right.]

Then you're covered.

[student: Well, what about the idea....]

Ah, we're gonna get there, we're gonna get there. If I don't cover it by the end of the class, ask me then.

[student: But, but, but he has...]

I know what you're gonna ask. I can read your mind, [laughter] just kidding.

[student: He could have a [tsemin] and not say anything about it.]

If he has a {tsemin}, he won't make a declaration about that thing.

[student: But he could have...]

No. No, I say a saint could have a [tsemin] or a Buddhist, people who wrote the {Tengyur}, which are not Buddhas, according to Buddhism. They had {tsemins}, had non {tsemas}. So they didn't say, "I know this, this is how it is", you're not allowed to. If you do that you're not eligible to be in the {Tengyur}, [laughs] that's a rule. You guys are gonna keep these other guys late. Okay, alright, [Laughter].

[students: Oh, no..no...]

Nah, no, go ahead, you never get to ask the question.

[student: I was vexing about how you reconcile the notion that the the Buddha who's having perfect perceptions cannot lie with the doctrine of skillful means [unclear]]

Don't worry, we're gonna get there.

[student: So, very quickly then, not only is a Buddha then a person of {tsema}, who is always having {tsema}, but they have a particular kind of {tsema} which is also a direct knowing, they couldn't have the kind of {tsema} that you have, about, "I see this yellow object." but I'm not sure that's what it is.]

We'll get to that, we'll get to that. Okay, {tsema kyebu}. Now what does the Buddha see? Now we call it his {sig yule}.

[silence]

Who is Chenrezig?

[students: An emanation.]

Avaloketishvara, why is he called Avaloketa? Ishvara means "lord". What does Avalok mean? Looking down, and looking like this, [he looks at students]. It's called "loving eyes". Avaloketishvara means "looking with loving eyes". {Chenre} means to, to look at someone like your in love with them. And then {sig} means to "look". {Sig} is the word for look. It's the honorific. What do you call the word for, for, I'm sorry, "see" in ordinary language, if your talking about your friends? What's the path of seeing?

[student: Tong Lam.]

What do you call the path of seeing? {Tong Lam}, {tong} okay? {Tong} is the non-honorific. {Sig} is the honorific. What's honorific? In Tibet, if someone's older than you, you have to use a different language. And if someone's younger than you, you kinda, use a different... or your peers, you use another language. A whole other set of words. {Yule} means object, object that the mind looks at. So {sig yule} means the object that the Buddha sees. Why don't they call it the objects that the Buddha knows?

[student: Cause it's the same thing.]

Generally you can use the word see in the sense of knowing, but that's not the sense here. What's the sense?

[student: [unclear]]

He sees everything directly, he doesn't have {jyepak tsema}. He doesn't need {dedak shin}. He doesn't need authority. He doesn't need reasoning. He sees everything directly. He sees all objects directly. There is two kinds of objects that he sees.

[silence]

{Chi nyepay che} [repeat], {chi nyepay che} [repeat]. {Chi nyepa} means "as many as there are", {{Chi nyepa} means "as many as there are". {Chi nyepa}. {Che} means what?

[students: Dharma?]

Yeah, generally {che} means Dharma, but Dharma doesn't only mean religion. It can also mean things, existing things, so he sees as many existing thing as there are. That's part of his "{sig yule}". Part of what he sees is everything that exists. Everything that ever was, everything that ever will be and everything that is now. At the same time, in one moment. He sees all of them. That's his quality. That's one of his qualities.

[student: What was the first definition of the {dedak}??]

Ah, he sees as many objects as exist.

[student: Existed? Existing?]

I like to call it the totality of object, totality of things, the totality.

[student: Didn't you say there were two kinds of objects?]

Yeah, I haven't got to the second one yet. Well, first of all he sees everything that there is, by the way, shouldn't that be everything shouldn't that be everything? How come there's two?

[student: Is that hidden or not?]

For him it's {mungyur}, you see, I always have to ask you, " for who","for whom?" That's always gotta... when you ask me that, I'll ask you, "For whom?"

Because for him it's {mungyur}, it's the same thing as colors are for us, its obvious for him.

[student:Is it past, present and future, everything that exists? Existed, exists...]

At the same time. Every thing that existed, and ever will exist, he perceives in the same instant.

[silence]

[student: Did he see, let's see, the Buddha thousand years ago did he see that there were going to be refrigerators and things like that?]

Not only that but he, ah... two and a half thousand years ago he set up his teachings, he spoke his teachings so that you could have it tonight, [laughter], you particularly, seriously. No, he has that ability, he has that belief. He sees into the future, he knows what your going to think two and a half thousand years from now, so he says something that will chain react up to you in 1994. He has that ability. Personally tailored,okay. Say {jigtawe che} [repeat], {jigtawe che} [repeat]. {Jigtawe} means as it is. As they are ... as they are. {Che} means what? Existing things, existing objects. Which is what? What is the way things are? Emptiness, they're emptiness. They're true nature. They're ultimate nature.

[student: So it's really not that there's two different objects, there's just two different..]

You're right.

[student: .. ways he has of seeing them.]

Two levels. He sees all the stuff that there is and he sees how all the stuff that their is, ultimately is.

[student: So you're saying the first is [unclear]. He sees the conventional nature?]

Yeah.

[student: For whom?] [Laughter]

[student: Hell being or not?]

[student: Excuse me?]

For whom? Well I'll talk about it . I'll talk about it right now. He's the only being who can concentrate on both of these objects at the same time. You or I, or anyone else who is not a Buddha, either we are seeing emptiness directly or we are seeing other things directly, but we cannot focus on both at the same time. When you go into to the - {someone sneezes} the direct perception...exc..., gezun.... [laughter] at the first moment of the path of seeing, you can no longer perceive anything else, you can't have any other have any other perceptions you can't even think that you're seeing emptiness, cause that's a relative truth. That's a, that's a relative object. You is a relative object, you seeing emptiness is a relative object, emptiness is an ultimate object. So you can only focus on one at a time. You can't have any... that's why they call it "{chupa dug shagpa}", water poured in water, you can't even, your not even aware that of yourself seeing emptiness at that moment. You can't, you cannot be. Because you're not a Bueddha. Only a Buddha can focus on both of them them at the same time. See, he can

focus on you, on your mind, on what your thinking and he can also focus perfectly on your emptiness, all at the same time.

[student: How do you know that the Buddha does that? I mean how do you know?]

This is the purpose of this class and the question is beautiful. Someone asked me and I appreciate it. And, and I want you to ask. How do you even know a Buddha exists? How do you know such a thing is possible? You don't. We're gonna discuss some proofs for it. Maybe the reason why we're so lazy in our practice is that, subconsciously, we haven't really figured out whether such a thing is possible. If we knew it was possible we might do harder, we might try harder. {Di tawa che}.

[student: Michael?]

Yeah.

[student: Does Buddhism have a, point of view on...if we aspire to this knowing emptiness and this awareness and stuff, what, what, how should we treat our lives? Like my job, I mean, how important is my job? Should I be...]



[Laughs]

[student: Should I be a ditch digger or should I be a CEO? What difference does that make to me as a Buddhist?]

I think that there's a couple levels answer that. One is that, one is that... one is that you should have a job. Right livelihood is that you should not grub off of other people. You should, one of the Buddhist principles is that your supposed to not bother other people.

[student: But what about the Buddhist monks? {unclear}]

[Laughter] Ah, that's the first one. The second one is that you have to die and you don't know when. We studied that. So if the time comes when you truly are ready for that you would cut down on your work, I guess. But to do it prematurely is not good, because you'll just, you'll end up going back, when you'll ready you'll know, okay. That's the second thing to say. I think the third thing to say is that work, work is a wonderful place to ... you know the place where you work, your job... the definition of nirvana is to stop your bad emotions, and if your sit in a retreat house, or a cave you, you won't get, you won't be exposed to any of the objects that can inspire those bad thoughts in you. [Laughter] But if you go to your office there's pretty ladies that a monk is not supposed to look at. There's people getting angry at you that you're not supposed to be angry at. There's your peers who are getting the position you wanted, that you're not supposed to be jealous at. There's the whole situation going on that you don't remember why it's happening, which is good for practicing your ignorance, you know, and those are all great. I, I think work is a wonderful ... you know I think you really have to...and, and then lastly, where, who are the sentient beings that you're working on? Who, who are they? Who are the sentient beings? They're the people in your office, cause you spend more time with them than anybody else. Those are the... you know, you could have bohichitta towards all sentient beings, but the only ones you're exposed to is the ones in your office [laughter]. And you can't even treat them right. No so that's the, those are the sentient beings for you. And it's very, it's very funny that we don't think that those are the representatives for you for all of allthe beings in the universe. You some how think that when you reach bodhichitta it will be toward every martian and every [unclear]. And you don't imagine that the sentient beings you have to work on... that are provided to you, are the ones in your office. And the day that you become... the day that you reach wisdom

about emptiness and therefore act properly, it'll be towards the people at your office. So I think it's, t's a great opportunity. Okay, anyway, those are all the answers. But there may come a day that you might want to work less. I don't believe that in the United States that you have to work forty hours a week to live...nicely. But, it depends on... or sixty, [laughs]. Okay, {di tawey che}, {che she}. [student sneezes] We did last weeks five states of mind that were not {tsema}, right? My question to you is that, does the Buddha have only {tsemas} or does he have, or have a {tsemin}? He's a {tsema kyebu}. He's supposed to only have correct perceptions.

[student: He perceives the conventional nature, which is us perceiving {tsemins}.

Now, what about... what is the definition of recollection?

[student: Keeping an image in your mind of something that you've seen.]

Yeah, perceiving something that you have seen before. And the definition of {tsema} is {tse me [unclear] rigpa} which means a "fresh perception". So there's this huge debate, "What about the Buddha, what about the second instant of your Buddha hood". What about your omniscience at the second instant of your Buddhahood? What's it perceiving?

[student: It's perceiving everything in the universe.]

Everything in the...it's perceiving everything in the universe. But you just saw that in the first moment of your Buddhahood. And in the next trillion years of your Buddhahood, you're gonna be perceiving the same stuff. Because it's all past, present and future, your seeing everything. So is he a non {tsema}? Is he not having fresh perceptions? He's not having old perceptions.

[student: Why wouldn't it be fresh every moment he sees it again? Even if it's the same thing, cause it's not changed, but its still fresh because he's seeing it at that moment.]

Yeah, because it's direct. And that's the answer, he does have a direct perception. Fresh direct perception each instant towards every object.

{students: The things are still changing for him too, even if he can see the future, the future is changing.]

Well, there were schools in Tibet in the old days that said a Buddha's wisdom had to be unchanging. And, and it's disproven by Dharmakirti. He said that's not true. He said, if the image is changing, then the mind that is a mirror is changing also. So the mind, even the mind of a Buddha is, changing. It doesn't change from non-omniscient to omniscient, I mean from omniscient to non-omniscient. But it does constantly, as it reflects new objects, and as object change, and even just shift from past to present. Although he sees them all, he sees, his mind is also moving. So we say that he is omniscient but he's not unchanging, his mind is not unchanging. So that was a big argument in Tibet, it, it was a big problem, for a lot of people said, there has to be stuff that the Buddha doesn't see at the first moment of his omniscience that he sees at the second moment of his omniscience. But it's not true, otherwise he's not omniscient, obviously. Yeah?

[student: I was, I wasn't clear on the recollection in the sense that are we talkin' about seeing it in your mind again or the second time you're on the subway platform and you saw that poster again. This time you know what it is.]

Mostly seeing it in your mind.

[student: In your mind.]

Re, Recalling something mentally.

[Student: Mentally, not visually...or]

Because as a direct perception, it's again triggered by a direct object. And that's fresh. Recollection is a wimpy, because the blue from five minutes ago is generating a new consciousness in your mind. And it's very wimpy. It's actually not the blue, it's, it's a lousy image of the blue in your mind that's generating the consciousness. So that consciousness is not as trustworthy, It's not as...

[student: It's not as fresh.]

What do you call fidelity? It's not...

[student: It's it's disintegrating.]

It's weak, and it's wimpy and it's getting close, it's a non {tsema} according to this school.

[student: And that's our, that's our, that's our perception, not the Buddha's.]

That's how we see things that we've seen in the past. He sees them directly.

{student: So he sees recollection directly.]

He can see you recollecting, [laughs]. But he doesn't have recollections, because...

[student: He doesn't need 'em]

Because when he sees the blue he saw ten minutes ago it's the blue of ten minutes ago directly generating a consciousness.

[student: Even if he's not looking at it?]

He's looking at everything, [laughs].

[student: How could it change then?]

As it, well you could say, "As it moves through time."

[student: Because there is no time.]

But he still recognizes our perception of time. He could, maybe his mind moves as he sees us changing our perceptions.

[student: So then, is the Buddha seeing everything in the past, in recollection?]

No, how could he?

[student: How could he have recollection? He doesn't have, there's no such thing as recollection for a Buddha.]

No he doesn't have, there's no such thing. Everything is direct for him.

[student: Can't be.]

Everything is direct for him.

[student: But if he sees the future, then things aren't unchanging.]

Say that again.

[student: If if he sees the future it's not a not changing thing, it's a given thing, for him, so it can't be, can't be a changing thing]

If it's functioning it's changing, even in the future. If it's doing something, by doing something it has to change.

[student: Is it because of the nature of time?]

But I know what you mean, I know, I see what your saying. For him it's all like frozen.

[student: Mmm, Uh huh.]

[student: But we don't know.] [Laughter]

[student: No, I mean, It seems to be this kind of, I mean how could anyone know, truly, exactly what it's like unless they were a Buddha themselves?]

We, we can't, Ah.. but we do have to attempt to prove that he's omniscient. We do have to attempt perceive the possibility of his omniscience.

[student: But to say exactly the way that he's seeing something, I mean we can say generally, but exactly the way he's seeing something.]

No , no you can't. You can't. In fact only another Buddha can. Okay.

[silence]

{ Jyepa sum} [repeat], {jyepa sum} [repeat]. The way you see direct, obvious objects is with direct, correct perception. The way you see hidden, just plain hidden objects is with reasoning, thinking. The way you see deeply hidden objects is with what?

[student: Belief.]

It's, it's like authority. The Buddha says look, the reason this thing goes to the left here, the reason it doesn't go to the right, is that you waved your arm like that ten thousand years ago [laughs]. Only the Buddha can see that kind of stuff, no matter how much we understand in a rough way that something must have caused it and we can figure out the causes roughly, but we can't actually see that it was a wave of some, of our arm thousands of years ago. By the way, it must have a cause, every thing has a cause, it's changing. And we just chose in our society to ignore those questions. Why did the left wheel of the car go flat and not the right wheel? Why did the person on the left side die, but not on the right. You know, why does this medicine work for him and not for me. Those questions we just avoid.

[student: In the west, wouldn't we go back to a series of causes also?]

No, they'll go back to who, short term causes, they'll say, well the medicine didn't work for you because your enzymes are different.

[ student: Yeah, and the enzymes are different.]

And why are the enzymes different?

[student: Yeah, and the enzymes are different because this chain....]

Yeah, and your father was such and such. And you'll say why was he my father? And they'll say you know, don't ask a silly question. But then you say oh, Mr. Scientist, is it a thing? "Yes." Does it have a cause? Well not... there's some things that, hmm..[laughter]. No, really! It's not, it's very unfair. Then when they get to a thing they can't figure out the cause, they just skip it.

[student: There's no way of knowing, they would say, why the pin broke that time.]

No they just skip it. Why was he your father? Why wasn't somebody else your father? And children ask this question and if I ask this question in my office, they'll laugh at me. You know, it's not a silly question. It's a thing, it has to have a cause. It's an object. All objects have causes. Once you get into saying this

object has a cause and this doesn't, that's voodoo. That's middle ages stuff, [laughs]. You know, but you grew up with it, so you feel comfortable with it. A hundred years from now they'll probably say we're silly, hopefully. Okay, {Chepa sum}, so what are the three? These are the three tests

[student: What is {chepa sum}??]

{Chepa} means "test". {Sum} means "three". They are the three tests for checking what someone says. When the Buddha says, "Hey, that was when you waved your arm ten thousand years ago", these are the three tests that a normal person can use to check whether or not what he says is reasonable. Did I give you his famous quotation, "{Jinbey longchu tringi gey}"? I'll write it, but you know, you don't have to memorize it, it's not on your homework. It's the most, it's one of the most important quotations in Buddhism.

[student: Do you mean checking to see if it's logically accurate?]

We're gonna talk about it. Okay?

[student: Who said this?]

I'll give you a quotation, okay?

[student: If you ask a question, speak up, 'cause they'll never pick it up on tape.]

[silence]

{Jinbey} [repeat], { longchu} [repeat], {tringi} [repeat], {gey}. {Jinbey} [repeat], {longchu} [repeat], {tringi} [repeat], {gey}. {Jinba} without that {sa} is the first perfection. What's that?

[student: Generosity.]

Giving, giving. I'm not too hot about generosity because it can also mean giving protection, it can mean giving Dharma. I like giving, but I don't, you know but I'm not gonna shoot all the people who translate it as generosity. But I think once you learn more about it giving sounds better. {Jinba} means giving, the first perfection. {Longchu} means, things that you own, what do you call it? Things in your ..

[students: Possessions.]

Possessions. {Trim} is short for {tsultrim}. Does anybody know {tsultrim}?

[students: Morality.]

Yeah, second of the perfections; Morality. Which I, you know, it is morality, but you know, morality's such an unpopular word in our culture. [laughter] I kinda like, not hurting others is the same thing.

[student: [unclear]]

Not hurting others. It's it's the same, it's absolutely the same thing, okay. {Shenu shedang shepa letopa deyang.....[unclear] nyi}. [Laughter] Definition, alright. {Trim}, {trim gyi dey}. {Dey } means, oh, {gyi} means by, B Y. {Dey} means happiness. And it's a very famous quotation of the Buddha, he said, "If you give to others, you will have possessions. If you keep your morality, you'll be happy, you'll be a happy person." And he's talking karmically, and when you talk karmically, normally it means in your next life. So what he's saying is..

[student: Say the whole thing again.]

Excuse me.

[ Student: Could you say the whole thing again?]

Ah, if you give to others you will gain possessions and if you keep your morality you will be happy, in your future life. Not only in your future life. If you follow certain Buddhist practices like this in a radical way in the higher teachings, the whole idea is that it could be in this life. But but generally speaking, next life okay. This statement can only be confirmed with which of the tree kinds of { tsemas}? Can you see the truth of this directly? Impossible . You can't even see your future life directly. Can you see it with reasoning? Do, you can but it's not gonna be a very clear perception. You have to take his word for it, it's authority, you have to depend on authority. Now, my question is, being Buddhist and being logical, the idea of accepting something on authority, it's very distasteful. We don't wanna do that, we don't like it. So therefore we have {chepa su}. If you don't wanna take something on authority without the {chepa sung}. That authority has to be checkable with the {chepa sung}. You don't just believe what the Buddha said, because the Buddha said it, it's gotta pass these



three tests also. Now I'll give you the three tests, okay.

[silence]

Say, { munsum gyi} [repeat], { minoepa} [repeat], { munsum gyi} [repeat], {minoepa} [repeat]. {Munsum} means "direct, correct perception". Its short form is {munsum tsema}. Direct correct perception. In the same way, you can see this color here. {Gyi} means by, B Y. {Gyi } means by, B Y. {Mi} means what?

[student: Not]

{Mi}, {me}, and {ma} are negatives in Tibetan. { Moepa} means, { moepa} is a very difficult word, help me with it, we couldn't do it much in the other class. It means when I thought the sign on the subway was a person from a distance, I had a perception of it as a person. But when I got closer and had that other perception, the {tsema}, of the thing as a banana or whatever, that second perception {moepa}'s the first perception. You know {moepa} means, literally it means to harm or injure. In the definition of morality that's the word that comes. Don't {moepa} other people.

[student: [unclear]]

I don't know, you think about it, I don't know how to... it means when one perception bams another perception and the first one just dissolves because it was, you know, standing on one leg anyway.

[student: Cancels?]

You could say cancels.

[student: Displaces.]

It just blows it away because the first one was wrong and the second one is correct. It's like when you're at work and you think that somebody's out for you because they did something . But then you hear out from another person that they did it because the boss told them to do it. And then suddenly, that first perception just disolves. That's {moepa}.

[student: So is {moepa} the action of displacing?]

It means, it cannot be {moepa}'d by a direct perception. And what does that mean? It means, what that person said, "If you give you shall receive" , "If you keep morality you will be happy in your future life." And you'll see people that are naturally more happy than others. That statement cannot be disproved with any direct perception that you can ever have. Period. You can't prove it's wrong with any direct perception that you've ever had, you have had, or ever will have. That's the first test, if you pass that test, it's already pretty good. It's one third good. You

can't disprove it with any direct perception that you have had or ever will have and that's natural because if it's true you can never have a {tsema} that's not true. If it's true, you can never have a {tsema} that contradicts it or that blows it away. You never will have such a {tsema}, because it's impossible.

[students: [unclear] it's true.]

Didn't say that, yet. I know, I agree, so far I haven't said anything about proving it's true. I'm just saying, you can't unprove it, you can't disprove it , so far.

[Student: Why can't something be two at one time ? You know, something is this way....]

This is a universal truth, if you ever have a {tsema} that contradicts a universal truth, it's not a universal truth, [laughs]. If you ever have a direct, correct perception that contradicts this statement, it's not true.

[student: Is this where all three have to be?]

I didn't get there yet.

[student: Or any one of the three.]

All three must be true. All three conditions that I haven't given you yet must be there.

[student: But this isn't covering things that I can know, if something happened across the street yesterday that I didn't see I ain't never gonna have a direct perception of that.]

Right, I'm gettin there, I'm gettin' there, give me time.

[silence]

Say, { jyepak gyi} [repeat],{jyepak gyi minoepa} [repeat], { jyepak gyi minoepa} [repeat]. What is { jyepak tsema}?

[student: Reasoning.]

Reasoning. Correct, foolproof reasoning, air tight reasoning, not the fuzzy reasoning we always use, okay. {Jyepak gyi}, like I'm at work today and we have a supplier in Bombay. He hasn't supplied the stuff he's supposed to supply, you know. Now, it's either because he really doesn't have the diamonds or it's because he has them and he's given them to some other company, because they're paying him more. Okay, I mean those are some of the... so if I find out that, from somebody that definitely he's not giving them to somebody else, then I can have a {jyepak} that he just doesn't have them. But, even that's not a {jyepak}. Maybe he's got them and he's hoping to give them to somebody else. You see what I mean ? {Jyepak}'s are very difficult, it's very difficult, to be a good logician it's very difficult. And then you, that's why we get in trouble with people. We do lousy {jyepaks}, actually they're not {jyepaks}. You know? If you could think of every possibility, then you could say you have a {jyepak}, he's not giving them to me, for that reason. But, it's very difficult. And, and If you get in the habit of keeping your {jye paks} straight. The people that you know in life who are successful and who are good people, are very strict about their {jyepaks} to themselves. They don't allow themselves to judge a person or a situation without all the, satisfying pure logic. Totally honest logic. Very difficult, we don't do it much. {Jyepak } means "good reasoning", solid reasoning, air tight resoning. {Minoepa} means, not what?

[student: [unclear]]

Whatever, not...what's a good word, I don't know, disproved.

[student: Displaced.]

Not contradicted by good reasoning, okay? And if this statement is true, which, as a Buddhist, theoretically, as a Buddhist you beleive it, you will never be able to have a air tight logical reason why it's not true, why it can't be true. If you're

honest to yourself as a Buddhist, if that's true you'll never have a correct, air tight, reasoned perception of anything that contradicts that, in fact, you never will. For Eric we still haven't proved anything, we've disproved something, okay? We still haven't, all we've proven is that I, I haven't seen it, I just said, well, so far we haven't proven it's wrong. Maybe we can't prove Hitler wrong, but that doesn't mean that he was right [laughter]. We've gotta be careful here, Okay.

[student: Now, what was the definition for {gyi} again?]

{Gyi} means, " by, B Y". So we can't, cannot be contradicted by a airtight reasoning.

[silence]

Say, {ngachi} [repeat], { ngachi ringyel} [repeat], {ngachi ringyel} [repeat]. {Nga} means "before". {Chi} means "after". {Ri} means what?

[students: [unclear]]

{Gyel} means, contradict itself. So what do you think it means? {Ngachi rigyel}.

[student: Not internally resistant.]

[student: Before or after.]

Not only that but...

[student: Ever before or later.]

Well, it's referring to what he said, so what do you think? It's referring to his statements, so what does a {ngachi} mean?

[student: [unclear]r]

Yeah, what he said yesterday, and what he said today, he doesn't change his story, Okay? Nothing he ever said before ever contradicts anything he said later.

[student: Different statements.]

Even different statements, yeah it doesn't have to be about the same thing. Doesn't have to be that he switches his story on the same thing. It can be that, that nothing he ever said in his whole life ever contradicts anything he said later.

[student: Try that on Bill Clinton.]

JeTsongkhapa said, and this is the last thing I'll tell you before you have your tea, because I want you to get upset about it. Je Tsongkhapa said, "When you reach a real good state in your Buddhist education, you know, when you, when you become really knowledgeable about Buddhism you will realize that there is not one statement in the {Kangyur}, not one statement in ten thousand pages of scripture, I'm sorry, one hundred thousand pages of scripture, that contradicts another statement in Buddhist scripture. You will not find it. The more you study and the deeper you study you will find that there is not one statement in Buddhist scripture that contradicts another statement in all those hundred thousand pages. Okay, take a break.

[student: Of course, initially it seems like there's lots of them.]

What's that?

[student: Of course, initially it seems like there's lots of contradictions.]

Yep. Hey, Claire, how's she doin' ?

[student: I walked into her work, I came in and she said to say hello.]

[silence] [break]

[cut] that there's not another statement in Buddhist scripture that contradicts another one, I have one for you here. {Ma} means what? Around the world.

[student: Mom?]

Mom, okay, {Ma} means Mom. {Dang } means and. {Pa}, Pop. Ma}, "mother" and {pa}, "father". {Nyi} is just a filler, because this is a verse that's found in a sutra. What's a sutra? The definition of a sutra?

[students: A scripture?]

Huh?

[student: Words spoken directly by the Buddha.]

{Sangye gyi ngar}, spoken by the Buddha. {Dujej mitog,tujog pong gye du sumbay Sangye, Sangye ngar}. Anything that the Buddha said that would remove the bad qualities of disciples. Which means when the Buddha stubbed his toe he went,uh, that's not, that's Buddhas speech but it's not a sutra, okay? Of coarse, he never stubbbed his toe. {Sayjang}, {sayjang} means something to kill, should be killed, should murder. {Shing}, "and". The Buddha said this, what is it?

[student: You should kill your father and your mother.]

[student: Wow]

You should kill your father and your mother.

[student: What is {shing} again?]

And, is a ... is the rest... there's more of this sentence. {Shing} means "and", and there's more of this quotation.

[student: Ecetera?]

Well, it's and, and then there was more. {Shing} means "and", A, N, D. It means this is only part of a longer quotation. I just found the rest of the quotation, I've never seen it before, I went downstairs during the break and asked the computer because I wanted to make sure I was spelling it right, and it says, "and destroy your country and everybody in it." [Laughs]. Okay?

[student: Hmmm]

And there's more. [Laughs], kill your father, mother, and wipe out your country and everybody in it. Obviously, we have to.....

[student: {unclear} means and.]

{student: And, A, N,D, A, N, D.]

[students:I don't know. {unclear}]

What I'm about to say about this subject is not in Dharmakirtis' book, okay? It's in Madhyumika, it's in the middle path. But I just thought that it was so appropriate here that I just stuck it in, alright? It's very famous, we spend about a year on this subject. {Trangye}, say {trangye} [repeat]. {Trang} means "figurative". Figurative, not literal. It means the Buddha said something but he didn't mean it that way. {Trang}, you can find scriptures where the Buddha said, "things have their own nature", things have a self nature. In the lower schools he said that, "things do have a self nature", things are real. And then in later schools he says, "no, their not". [laughs]. Okay. That's {trang} . One of those has to be {trangne}, {trangdun}. {Nye} means "literal". Figurative and literal. Figurative means, he didn't mean what he said. {Nye} means he did mean what he said. And we, in Buddhism spend years on this subject, because it's very important, right? How do you know when the Buddha meant what he said, and when he didn't mean what he said? Okay? Because you can get in big trouble, with a religious teacher, you know, if he says, "kill your father and your mother", and people think he was literal, you have a problem, you wouldn't have mom here. Okay. So they're three rules for, "How do you know the difference." They're the ground rules for interpreting the Buddha. How do you know when the Buddha was talking literally, and how do you know when he was just speaking figuratively. How do you know the difference? Okay. [silence]

{Gom} means thought, meaning, true thought or true intention behind what somebody says. You know, when my boss says, what did he say this afternoon? It was really funny, I don't remember [laughter]. Something like, you know, you're a really talented person. You know it means we can't send any one else in, because no one else is stupid enough to go [laughter]. I mean, that's the {gom}, okay? {Shi} means basis, so {gom shi}, {gome shi} means; what did he really have in mind? What did he really have in mind?

[student: True intent?]

Yeah, true intent, I like that, true thought or true intent. What was his true intent? {Tigey mitag kor dombay}, okay, { Gom shi}. Excuse me?

[student: Tsema gomgen]

Yeah, {tsema gomgen }, that {gom} is the same {gom}. And that means, what did the Buddha really mean when he taught {tsema}, but this is {gom shi}. What do you think the { gomshi} is in this case? He say"s kill your mother, kill your father, destroy the place where you came from.

[student: To liberate us.]

And all the people you grew up with.

[student: Be free of the past.]

Yeah, be free of attachment. In Buddhism you, in the Buddhist confession for monks, {Tibetan.....}. You first have to confess any, any disrespect to our parents before we confess disrespect to the abbot, or to our Tantric masters. It means you, must respect your parents. You know, it's more import...you know, it's listed before respecting your tantric master and the person who gave you your vows. You must respect your parents. I mean you're not allowed to, killing your father or your mother is one of the five deeds that can get you to the lowest hell, automatically. Period. There's only five; trying to hurt a Buddha, killing an arhat, splitting up the monks during the Buddhas time, which you can't even do now, and killing your father and your mother. Those, so he obviously had something else in mind when he said that, okay. That's {gom shi}, what he really had in mind.

[student: What? To be free of....]

Attachment, for your, for the place that you grew up in and things like that. I mean, don't let that hold you back from your spiritual progress. It doesn't mean that you have to reject them necessarily. But if, but if your, you know, if they keep you from being a good person or something like that, you don't.

[silence]

Say, { mula} [repeat],{nuajay} [repeat], {mula} [repeat], { nuajay} [repeat]. {Nue} means the way things really are. Reality, true,true reality, how's that? In this case. {Lopa nyentso} means the way things really are

. [student: Ultimate or conventional?]

No, just the way things really are in the sense.. we'll see, you'll see. It doesn't



mean ultimate. It doesn't mean emptiness or anything like that. I'll explain it. {Neu} and {la}, {la} means "to", T, O. {Neu}, you had before, what does it mean? "Hurt, damage, contradict". {Je} means "it does". So, listen, I'll tell you something true. This wall is red. [Laughter], okay. [cough]. {Meula neumje [unclear]}, {meula neumje}, I mean, it offends your intelligence. Come on. It contradicts what I know I mean, it contradicts what I can see right here, you know. It's wrong. It contradicts reality. It contradicts what I can see is real. Why did Michael say it was red? He wanted to explain the idea of {meula neumje} to you. That was my {gom shi} and when I call that thing red, it's {meula neumje}. It, it's not true, it offends your direct perception, you know it's not true, {meula neumje}. It's the second. By the way you're gonna get those last three I spoke about and these three mixed up, be careful not to. The three tests for checking what a person says and now these three conditions for deciding that the person is just speaking figuratively are different, and don't get them confused on your homework, I'm sorry that there is two three's coming at the same time and their kinda related and..

[student: [unclear] means what? {Meula}.]

I'm sorry, excuse me?

[student: {Meula}, what does that mean?]

{Meula} means to the real reality, to the reality, you know, fenced reality. You can see it's not red, you can see it's yellow. The true condition. {Meula Neumje} means it contradicts the true condition. You can see it's not yellow, you know very well that your parents aren't {sajang}.

[student: So what are the second three, what classification are they?]

I was afraid you were gonna say that. What are we gonna call it? The three ways to check, I guess you could call it the three rules for interpreting the Buddha.

[student: Is it always so obvious though?]

Ah, no, or else there wouldn't be four Buddhist schools, [laughter]. And each ones swearing that they're right, [laughter].

Say {goepa} [repeat], {goepa} [repeat]. {Goepa} means compelling need,

compelling need. Big purpose served.

[student: Big purpose served?]

Big purpose served.

[student: Or the compelling need.]

Either one, take your choice, [laughs]. There's a compelling need for him to say that. Why did the Buddha say to the Abhidharma disciples, "There is a self nature. Of course there's a self nature, if they didn't have a self nature, they wouldn't be there. It's itself."? Why did he say that? First of all, is it true? Is it {meula neumje}? Is it true?

[student: It looks true.]

It's not true ! They don't have a self nature. Or else the guy at work would seem nice to you, but please.

[student: But to them it would.]

[Laughs], okay. No, no, {neu} means the "real reality". It is not true, so why did he say it? He

had a {goepa}, he had a {goepa}, Okay?. He would have freaked 'em out. {Goepa} means it's a compelling need for him to say something that is not correct, and he did it all the time. And, and there are beliefs in each of the three lower schools which are wrong.

[student: And what was his compelling need?]

If he had tried to explain emptiness to those particular disciples, they either would have, normally what happens, with a, with a disciple whose, whose, intellect is not strong enough, when you explain emptiness to them, they can swing over to nihilism, nothing that matters. I can act anyway that I want. I can kill, people, I can lie, I can steal, if everything's empty, and you've seen that. You know, pick up half of the books in the Snow Lion catalogue, see what they say about emptiness, you know, and they say, "You see colours, and it liberates you,

you don't have to do anything, right." When in fact it's quite the opposite. When you see that the guy at the office is empty, you realize, you know, the ugly way he seems to you is your own projection and he's empty, and then you realize where it came from, your past bad deeds and then you'll stop doing things like that. So actually, the opposite is true. As soon as you realize that something is empty, you have to, quite soon after that realize that everything is totally up to your goodness. You must be good. So there's all these books about Buddhism, you know, teaching that in Buddhism you can do whatever you want, it's liberating, you don't have to think about anything, just put your mind into a void. You know it's wrong. And so the Buddha, to all those disciples who might fall into thinking that he said, "No such thing as emptiness."

[student: How do you know he was talking to those disciples, how do you, because this, the books were written years and years after the Buddha was dead. So how do you know that they didn't misquote him, or that this wasn't made up by the people who wrote it?]

Ah, we can establish a {goepa}. And and we can establish that there is some pressing need to do that even if, even in the present time. Even in nowadays you're not allowed to explain emptiness to people who are not ready, it's a vow.

[student: How can you reconcile with what Lama Tsongkhapa says[unclear]?]

You think about it. I think it's when you understand {treng ye} that you can accept Tsongkhapa's statement.

[student: And that says it's not that sophisticated. Its not like something you can realize after ten years of studying.]

No, I think..

[student: Because it's a catch all. Put any contradiction under that. If I say, "There was a need under a certain context to lay bait for people".]

You could, you could say that.

[student; He's talking about something much more...]

Yeah, he's talking about something much, and in fact I'll tell you that when you've finished your five year course, and when you have studied all four schools, deeply, you'll see the same thing. You'll say, "Man, this is a fantastic network. It's all, I see why he said everything. I see where everything hooks in to everything." And that's why I wanted this course to touch everything, cause if you just taught Abhidharma you wouldn't get everything. If you get, if you just taught the highest school, Lam Rim, you wouldn't get everything either. When you get the whole, they call it the sugar ball. In India they have these brown sugar balls, they usually got maggots inside, [laughter], really. But where ever you eat it from, they say it's sweet. Any contact you ever have with the Buddhist scriptures if it's well explained, you, it just blows you away. There's no part of the Buddhist scriptures that you can say are useless or meaningless or wrong or not helpful or... Every contact you have is very sweet, from the lowest school to the highest school. And I'll tell you, if you ever have any other impression, you haven't studied enough, I would say, Okay. One more short thing. Yeah.

[student: That group, we're not talkin' figurative are we ? We're talkin' about ..]

These are the rules for establishing something he said was figurative. There's a big need for him to say "kill your father, kill your mom" He wanted to shock people.

[student: The Abhidharmist thinks they have a true nature. He's saying that figuratively they have a true nature.]

Sure.

{student: They didn't know that he was meaning figuratively.]

No, by definition, they often don't know, or they don't find out 'till later.

[student: So what's the difference between saying something figuratively with the people when you know they don't know that your talking figuratively and not telling the truth.]

[Laughter]

It's a debate in the monastery.

[student: I know, fifth year, fourth class.]

[Unclear Tibetan] The Buddha, the Buddhas, it doesn't come through in English. The Buddhas speak lie, but lie, the Buddhas speak lie, but the Buddha don't lie, or something. The Buddha can describe lying, but the Buddha doesn't lie. But in Tibetan it sounds cool. It's, Buddha don't lie, Buddha lie, I mean, nevermind, [laughter].

[student: Is this figurative but not literal, or both?]

Well it's very beautiful, I didn't want to tell you this, but since you asked. In the highest, even the division between what is figurative and what is literal is also an object the Buddha simplifying for people. So the lower schools don't even agree to what the higher schools think is literal and figurative. The rules, even in the lower school are different. And in the highest school, Madhumika Prasanghika, any scripture which does not mention emptiness directly is figurative, it's not the whole truth. Even a book about morality, if it doesn't mention emptiness in the same breath, is, is not, it's figurative. It's beautiful, that's a very beautiful thing.

[student: So all schools recognize {trangye}??]

[student: Before you go into that.]

Is the, is the air conditioning too cold?

[student: Could I ask a question before you go into that?]

Yeah.

[student: You gave us the three rules, so how would you apply those, could you give us an example of, you could, you know you get these sticky [unclear]]

Well, {bani mani sa jay}, so first off all, what did he have in mind when he said, "Kill your mother, kill your father" ?

[student: How do you know?]

Well first of all {meula neumjay}, it offends everything that makes sense to you, I mean, you know that you shouldn't kill your mother or your father. Something wrong with the statement, then you try to figure out what he had in mind behind it. Oh, he meant, don't be attached. Well why did he say that ? Why

didn't he just say, don't be attached? Why did he say, "Kill your father and mother." ? He wants to shock you. He wants you to remember what he said. You will never forget that quotation. I'll tell you that, in your life, I don't believe you, any of you will forget it in your life. If I got up here and said, "Don't hate your mom and dad, oh I'm sorry, don't have attachment.", you'll forget that in about a week. It has a value, it has shock value.

[student: So all three of those things should be there to say that it's figurative.]

They have to be present, all three have to be present, even deciding that is a tough job, and you know that. But at least you know that Buddhism talks about the rules and I like that, I really like that. We have rules, and the books on that are really long . And we have some over there, we did some on the computer, for Sera Je. Tsongkhapa wrote a two hundred and ten page book about it, and most students in the monastery try to memorize that, and you get an award if you memorize it. It's such an important subject. Okay, {tsema drepa} [repeat], you have this already, the one who turned correct. That was in that quotation, you have to ignore that. Okay the one who became correct, the one who turned correct. The last thing we're going to do tonight, it's only one minute. Is ah, why did Dignaga say that? Why didn't he call the Buddha the one who is correct? Why did he use the word turned?

[student: Because he turned..]

[student: Because he developed the process.]

[student: Because he wasn't always.]

All good answers. There's a negative need for him to say that and there's a positive thing. I mean, there's a negative thing he's saying, and there's a positive thing he's saying. We call, {yong chokyi goepa} and {nam chokyi goepa}. There's, there's something he's trying to get you to realize didn't happen, and there's something he's trying to get you to realize did happen. What's the thing he 's trying to get you to realize didn't happen?

[students: He wasn't like that from the beginning.]

He wasn't like that from the beginning . He was not like that from the beginning. The Buddha was not perfect from the beginning, in fact he was just like you and me, in fact, he did some terrible things.

[students: Really?]

[student: He did?]

The first sixteen volumes of the {Kangyur}, which are the books on vinaya, monks vows. They're not long stories about keep this vow, keep that vow, keep that vow. They are stories of the Buddha describing his, many stories of him describing his past bad deeds. It's like Rinpoche saying what a bad kid he was, if you ever read that book. I mean, the Buddha's describing horrible things, and then at the end of the story he usually says, by the way, that was me, you know. [laughs]

[student: In his previous lives.]

Yeah, he was just like us, he's a little bit ahead of us, but we'll end up the same, won't we? I mean, that's the point of class. He was just as bad as anyone ever was. So he was not, the negative statement, he never was, he was not perfect from the beginning. Positive statement?

[student: The cessation involved.]

He became, he did something to get that way. He did something to get that way. He followed some kind of method. He followed some kind of path. Those are the two implications of that statement. And, and the whole second chapter of Dharmakirtis book is gonna be just about these four syllables. Somebody wrote a whole book about this, { Sema kyerpa}. Became, turned correct. Alright, Carly.

[student: No homework?]

Oh, Tom asked me to, Tom's gonna, has invited anybody who's interested in having like a discussion group about the vows, you know that Rinpoche taught, last weekend, which are bodhisattva vows and secret vows. He'd like to start, maybe start a group like that to start to talk about them sometimes and stuff like that, and stuff like that. So if anyones interested you know.

[student: Also to discuss the practice that the people got in the last initiation and

looking forward to the initiation to come . If people are interested in forming a discussion group or study group about what that entails, I'd be more than happy to be of help.]

I know that Serge and them are doing that, it's really good, they spend, I think they get together on Saturday nights. It's really good for you. If you wanna, are you ready?

[Prayer: Short mandala] [Prayer: Dedication]

So we will have a class on Thursday. Then there's a good chance we'll take a week. We'll have a week off. I'm gonna try to have Saturday night and a Saturday morning.... [cut]



**The Proof of Future Lives**  
**Class 5**  
**Transcribed by Karen Becker**

(cut) you see, I don't much like, that's why I don't like that translation.

(student: Because (unclear) means permanent and unchanging.)

When we say permanent, we mean eternal. And and when Buddhism says permanent it usually means changing or unchanging, so I prefer the terms "changing" and "unchanging". Because like is the (shunyata) of this wall permanent?

(students: No. Yes)

Is it eternal?

(student: No)

It's not. When the wall's destroyed it's emptiness we will go out of being, okay, so therefore you can have an emptiness that lasts only a millisecond. That is (takpa) but it's not...in in my book it's not permanent, that's why I don't like the the translation "permanent", I had a trouble with it twenty years ago when I started studying, I I I it was strange to me.

(student: But the emptiness of it is still there even if it's not there.)

No, it's absolutely not there.

(student: It's dependent.)

'Cause there's nothing to be empty.

(students: (unclear) But it's it's become dirt or it's become something else hasn't it?)

Emptiness has to be emptiness has to, emptiness is a

characteristic of an object. If the object is not there  
emptiness (unclear)

(student: But the other (unclear) has the object truly  
disappeared?)

Oh yeah, when you destroy the wall, the emptiness of the wall is  
gone.

(student: Well the wall, but the element of the wall)

But then the elements of the wall have their emptiness.

(student: Oh so)

But the wall is gone.

(student: But if you)

When you die your emptiness

(student: But isn't the emptiness of the wall the fact that it  
does change?)

(student: No, huh uh)

Please. (unclear Tibetan) What about space? Doesn't have  
emptiness? No.

(student: well,)

(student: So what is the emptiness in that the wall get broken  
down, it's the it's the emptiness of the components of the wall?)

There's nothing that doesn't (unclear)

(student: components of the wall)

The emptiness goes out of existence. The emptiness of the wall  
no longer exists. When the wall is destroyed there is no

emptiness of the wall.

(student: So how do you refer to that which is left?)

That's why I don't like the word "permanent". Because that's obviously not permanent, but it's not not...so that's why I have trouble with that word. In the case of death meditation when it's called (chi wa mi takpa), your impermanence, that's okay, that's a good translation. But in general, in Buddhist philosophy, I have trouble with that with that...doesn't quite do it for me. So I like to call them "unchanging" and "changing", okay. (Takpa) means "changing" and (mi takpa) means "unchanging". The the wall...the emptiness of the wall will never change. In so far, so far so long as it exists it's quality never changes a nit, a wit, (laughs) anyway, never changes at all. It it goes out of existence and comes into existence but it but while it exists it never changes, that's the idea. It has no cause. Nothing produces it. Nothing can affect it. Therefore it's it's unchanging. Yeah.

(student: I just want to clarify that (takpa) is "unchanging")

Right.

(student: (Mi takpa) is changing.)

And even in Tibetan they admit that they put the (mi) on the wrong one. Okay. It's it's reversed. This one is negative. This one happens to be positive.

(student: Oh gee)

It's just the mis it's just a a a quirk of Tibetan language that that had to have the negative. The concept is positive. This concept is negative.

(student: That explains the leaning towards "permanent" and "impermanent", not permanent.)

Right right. 'Cause it it sounds a little bit easier, but but

you can see now why it's technically wrong. The emptiness of the wall is not permanent but it is unchanging. And that's that's the point.

(student: You can say "changeless")

The the mind is changing but eternal, and that's that's something else.

(student: Teachers say "permanent" and then use "changing" and "unchanging" to qualify it (unclear))

Oh yeah, in English you have to say that. But but in Tibetan you could have used "permanent" for this (takpa) then you can't...this never changes, there's no such thing.

(student: Can you say "permanent and changing" and also "permanent and not changing"?)

In English you can, but you can't say (takpa) and changing and (takpa) and unchanging. (Takpa) means "unchanging". Unproduced. Unborn. Undestroyable.

(student: So what happens (unclear))

(student: So that's mind. Mind is (takpa))

No it's (mi takpa).

(student: But but you just said that it's it's continuous continuous.)

It's a (unclear) but it's changing, that's all.

(student: I'm sorry, I'm getting confused (laughs)(takpa) is changing or (mi takpa) is changing? (laughter))

By the way, functioning thing, anything which does something is a synonym for (mi takpa). Anything which is produced is a synonym for (mi takpa). Anything which can be destroyed is a synonym for

(mi takpa). Anything which is produced and destroyed by the instant is a synonym for (mi takpa). But but you'll study that some other day. There's a whole book about it.

(student: So then there's two kinds of emptiness? There's permanent emptiness and impermanent emptiness? The emptiness of a wall being impermanent emptiness and the emptiness of your mind is permanent?)

The emptiness of your mind...the emptiness of your mind is eternal.

(student: So there's two different kinds of emptinesses.)

In fact that's your Buddha nature, since you brought it up. And I'm not, it's not the class, you know, it's not the subject, it's not even the school, but (laughter) but the emptiness of your mind, since it will be around when you become a Buddha, is your Buddha nature. And and what those other people all say is Buddha nature is completely wrong. It's not that you are Buddha inside and you didn't uncover it, or something like that.

(student: So that was my question, that when the wall breaks down the emptiness is no longer there because it's a wall whereas when a person dies the emptiness is still there because it's a person or animal or anything whatever.)

Right when it...the continuum, the emptiness of the continuum of the mind never it's never never goes out of existence.

(student: Permanent)

(student: But you can still call it the emptiness, I was just thinking maybe you're thinking of it as mind instead of emptiness, so it is still the emptiness of the mind continued whereas the emptiness )

What is the emptiness of the mind? The emptiness of the mind is the fact that the mind does not have any nature of it's own. No nature of it's own. Not even of being mind of it's own.

(student: So what is mind?)

(Sel chen rik pa) (laughter) (unclear) That which is that which is aware and...that which is clear and aware.

(student: It's what?)

Clear and aware. Aware and knowing.

(student: So is that like consciousness?)

Same definition, it's the same.

(student: In talking about the emptiness of the wall and the wall being destroyed and not changing)

When the wall is destroyed there is no longer any fact that the wall has no nature. Yeah.

(student: Maybe a way to think of it is in terms of it's dependent origination because it's a wall dependent upon our conceiving of it and labeling it as a wall, so it gets broken down and we no longer conceive of it and label it as a wall, therefore it can no longer be a wall.)

There no heap of parts to be labeled wall (unclear), that's one thing.

(student: Therefore we now perceive and label it "rubble" and it has the emptiness of rubble because it's dependent upon our perceiving it that way.)

Yeah. That's true.

(student: I have a little, a question with a little step back. And it might be a little bit blasphemous, I don't, is

(students: Let's (unclear)

(student: Would it be better for us to learn this in English...would it be, would it be clearer to learn this in English so not to have the confusion of (takpa) (mi takpa)?)

Maybe in this particular case. But in general it's good to put a seed

(student: I mean ultimately?)

A seed in your mind. It's good to have a (bak chak). It's good to have a (bak chak)...it's good for you to hear the Tibetan. Why do they always put Sanscrit at the beginning of a Tibetan book? I mean in in the (Kangyur) and (Tengyur), they always put the Sanscrit in, nobody knows what it means, they they they religiously put the Sanscrit. One reason is that it's a holy...I mean the first Dalai Lama in his commentary of the (b:Abhidharma...Abhidharmakosha) says it's because when you become a Buddha you will speak Sanscrit. I mean it...there's a reason to put stuff in that you don't think of. It's it's just putting imprint in your consciousness and it will come out later. Tonight we're gonna discuss the idea of a of omniscience, what is the nature of omniscience. Omniscience is a state of mind, a kind of mental state, and it's it's obviously tied in to (tse ma) because omniscience is (tse ma), or pramana, or correct perception towards everything. And only a Buddha has that. That's why he's a person of total accuracy. (Tsemay kyebu). So we have to discuss what is omniscience. And the reason it's coming up here and the reason I'm talking about it is there is a school in ancient India called the Charvaka and they said that there isn't such a thing as omniscience, they agreed to that, but they said an omniscient being can only be the creator of the world. He said omniscience always comes along with being creator of the world. You can't be omniscient without being the creator of the world. They said those two qualities had to come together.

(student: And they used the same word, I mean it's directly translatable to "omniscience"?)

Yeah.

(student: As opposed to omnipotence?)

Yeah, exactly the same word as the Buddhists used.

(student: Same definition?)

Same def same definition, knowing all things in all times.

(unclear) But they said that that being who knew all things and who must have made the world is also (tak pa), which is what?

(student; Unchanging.)

Unchanging. He never changes, okay. From him flow all things. He knows the smallest sparrows pain. He made this world. And he's (tak pa), unchanging, he's...which means he's always been that way, he's always been omniscient, okay, so he's he's qualities are like that. They they they, you know if you (laughs) are sitting in Tibet and trying to grasp this idea it's a little bit weird, you know, they say, okay there's this guy who made the world and he also knows all things and those two qualities always come together and he never changes. So Tibetans, you know, said, actually it was Dharmakirti he said, well let's examine this idea. Let's examine if such a thing is possible. So where do you put mind in these two? Mind. Mind is changing all the time. Mind is changing by the instant. It's changing by the instant.

(student: This came up last week when we were talking about the Buddha's omniscience and if the Buddha knows all things from all three times, then isn't there a sense in which (unclear) this unchanging way that he essentially can not change, it's like a container...of all objects).

The Buddhists the Buddhist schools in...there were schools in Tibet that thought that. There were schools in Tibet that argued that the Buddha must be...that his omniscience must be (takpa).

(student: It's so. But he)



No. (laughs) It's (mi takpa), it's changing and I'll tell you why, I'll tell you Dharmakirti's argument. Okay. And when Dharmakirti gets, when when Geshe Yeshe Wangchub gets through presenting Dharmakirti's idea he says, and that should be enough for all these Tibetans who think that the omniscience of a Buddha is unchanging. If you don't believe Dharmakirti, what can I do? (laughter) 'Cause Dharmakirti is answering that question. Dharmakirti is ab...I'm about to explain Dharmakirti's explanation of why the even the Buddha's mind has to be changing, okay. And the fact is that the mind has something like five qualities, and one of them is called (nam pa), okay. (Nam pa) means "when you look at an object, your mind takes on that aspect." When you look at blue, your mind gets a little blue (laughs) okay. What do I mean? It means like a mirror, gets a little blue. If you put a blue object in front of a mirror, it's not like it stains the mirror and there's blue in the mirror forever, you know, for ever after, but there is some kind of blueness reflecting in the mirror. The object, some quality of the object exists in the mirror at that time. The mirror is mirroring that blueness. The mirror has some blueness in it. For the time that the blue is in front of the mirror. And then when you take the blue away from the mirror what happens? The blueness goes away. It's not like it, it's not like a computer burn...what do you call it...burning? Burnout?

(student: Burned in screen on a computer?)

It's not like that. It doesn't...there's no shadow stays there and the mind is the same. Whenever you put an object in front of the mind the mind is like a mirror, the mind is like a piece of glass, and when you put the blueness behind the glass then the glass takes on some quality of blue. And when you remove the blue, the mind loses that quality.

(student: It seems to me for there some self existent blueness that's, you know, (unclear) before the mind. (laughter)

Why self existent?

(student: Well, where's the blueness coming from? It's just presented itself to the mind.)

We'll study the Mind Only school's presentation some day, and they say that the seed which creates the blue and the seed which creates the mind seeing the blue are the same. There's a karmic seed that's triggering both events.

(student: So the seed is already within the mind?)

Yeah.

(student: So what this mind is taking on whatever the seed for (unclear)?)

The mind is...the fact that the mind changes to blue when the blue is presented to the mind and the fact that the blue was presented to the mind are all coming from the same karmic seed. And that's a beautiful thing to admire, but it's not the..and we'll go over (laughs)

(student: Yeah, I'm getting confused because you keep jumping from one school to the other and I'm I'm getting really confused, I mean)

I know. So not to not to confuse. When you when an object appears before the mind, one of the qualities of the mind is that it reflects that object, it it becomes it takes on the image of that object and you know that, you know, you have some...it's not that color leaks into the mind but it's in the way that color is reflected in a mirror. Somehow the mind is is soaked with that object. Somehow that that object is imaged in the mind and when you take the object away it goes away. That image in your mind goes away. That's called (nam pa) N a m p a. It's one of the five qualities of the mind. And yo and I can't and by the way there are schools in Tibet that think if you figure out how (nam pa) works you've perceived emptiness and they spend many years meditating on the mind and how it takes on the form of the object. They call that meditating on the...they think that's meditating on the ultimate nature of the mind. So wha...and it's

wrong. That's not the ultimate nature. It's just the normal nature of the mind, no big deal, you can see it pretty easily, but what I'm saying is that it takes some practice to, you know, just cook it, your mind is like a mirror, what's presented in front of the mind somehow reflects in the mind, and that's called (nam pa). The mind takes on that aspect. Now if the object is changing, what happens to the mind?

(student: changes)

It changes. It's like a mirror. When you when you move the object out of the mirror it's... the object is moving across the mirror and the reflection in the mirror is changing. Part of the mirror is changing. What I'm trying to say is if if a mind, if a state of mind focuses on something which is changing then the mind itself must?

(student: Change)

(student: But could couldn't it be something like a river, a river is continually changing but it's continually the river?)

Yeah, the mind is just like that. The mind is eternal, but not unchanging. It's always changing.

(student: But the but the vessel is not changing, the ingredients are changing.)

Yeah, and that is what it is for the vessel to change.

(student: Huh?)

(student: What's in the vessel is changing, the vessel is not changing.)

The mirror, is the mirror changing?

(student: The mirror is always a mirror, just re is is reflecting)

So the mirror is changing.

(student: But it's always a mirror.)

Yeah, and the mind is always a mind. (laughs) The fact that it's a mind doesn't change. The mind is changing. The fact that it's a mind doesn't change. (Sam sam mi yimba) that's a famous debate for kids in the monastery, you know, fifteen year olds in the monastery spend hours in these...you know, they love the action (laughs) they don't really think much about what they're doing, they say, you know, they debate about whether the fact that the mind is a mind is permanent or not...is unchanging or not. That's unchanging. The mind will always be the mind. Or the fact that the mind is named the mind is always unchanging. But but the what the mind itself is changing in the way the mirror is changing. If you perceive what? If you are looking at what? A changing thing. If you're focused on a changing thing, then your mind is your sensation is changing. We call it a changing, the (unclear) are changing, thoughts are changing, I mean

(student: When you when you perceive emptiness it is not changing?)

Ah, now that's my next point. Could everybody get the first point? (laughs)

(student: To go and put it up a step since the Buddha is seeing everything, the past, present and future, at every moment it's the same set that you're seeing)

But it's, but those objects are changing.

(student: Not moment to moment. Because it's the same set you're seeing from moment to moment.)

Does he perceive the flow of time?

(students: No)

(student: That that that's a ver, that's a very interesting point because it show the way that we tend to ascribe static ontology to things even if we say, okay, if I have a whole history of of something of it's life to birth, if I can see it at each moment it still must have some kind of substance that that that subsists, but it's actually that it it has nothing like that so that even if you can see the totality of it's moments, those slices of time themselves are always in the midst of change, there's really nothing to hold on to.

(student: except mind)

You can say that. You can say that. You can say that. But anyway the objects, if the objects of changing the mind are such, even the Buddha's mind, how does the Buddha see change?

(student: I gue I guess my point is is that because he's perceived everything...)

Yeah, and is perceiving everything all the time

(student: And is perceiving everything, his perception hasn't changed.)

His perception doesn't change but yet, but does he see change?

(student: He does see change.)

(unclear) then his mind changes (laughs) right. Think about it. Just cook it. Okay. This is Dharmakirti, not Michael Roach, okay, and the verse is in your reading and the commentary is in your reading. And and be aware that some Buddhist schools in Tibet, later, thought just that. They thought omniscience was not wisdom, they thought it did never that it never changed, but every book in India, every Buddhist book says the mind changes, the mind is a changing object.

(student: Why would they say "not wisdom"? What do they mean by "wisdom", if if not)

They think they I guess what they mean is they can't accept that

omniscience is a state of wisdom. Because if they do they'd have to accept that it's changing.

(student: Why does wisdom have to be changing?)

I don't know, but they they they avoid that, they don't want to say wisdom, that that omniscience is wisdom. Maybe because it's a mental function. Maybe they accept that mental functions change but the main mind doesn't change. Maybe therefore, they have to argue that omniscience isn't is not a mental function but is the main consciousness. All right. Now what about...if what I said is true, and just cook it, you don't have to accept it, if what I said is true, then what about a mind perceiving an a a unchanging object...is the mind then unchanging?

(student: What kind of object could the mind perceive that was unchanging?)

Emptiness, or space.

(student: So how, okay, so let's say em emptiness)

Or the fact that there's no no elephant in this room.

(student: But if an elephant comes in the room (unclear) changing.)

It's just it goes out of existence (laughs) okay. No. The the lack of an elephant in this room does not change from moment to moment. Until an elephant comes in. So let's say until five o'clock no elephant comes in. During that time, the lack of an elephant never changes it's quality in the slightest, it it just does not, it's quality doesn't shift in the slightest, it's always exactly purely lack of elephant. It doesn't get less or more lack of elephant. That's what changing means. So

(student: So, that's what (unclear) means?)

(student: But that's a background perception right?)

(student in background: Unchanging, unchanging)

(student: That would be...if you're sitting in this room observ...you don't sit here until an elephant shows up you don't sit here and the only thing that you can see is that there's no elephant here.)

No, but whenever you focus on that object, you're focus focusing on an unchanging object. It never gets more or less elephantless. It's just elephantless.

(student: Like a measurement.)

(student: But your convictions would change, I mean at first)

Well then no that's different, that's totally different, that's changing. That's different.

(student: Glad it's not here (laughter))

(student: So then there's a there's an infinite)

Glad it's not here (laughter)

(student: Will we have to know the inner qualities of the mind in order to answer that question, 'cause)

Ahh, they would confuse and it's a long subject. So that's all. Now. What is the argument? Why why does Dharmakirti say a mind is omniscience is changing? Just get that one. Why?

(student: 'Cause things are always changing.)

'Cause it's focusing on a thing that's changing. It's a it he's saying the mirror is changing if in front of the mirror there's something going like that. If if something is moving in front of the mirror the mirror is changing too. That's his argument. Therefore omniscience is?

(students: Changing.)

Changing. Because omniscience focuses on what?

(student: Things that are changing. Everything.)

Everything. (unclear), by the way, this covers all existing objects. Every existing object has to be one of the other here.

(student: So omniscience is nothing?)

No. It has a (nam pa), okay. Omniscience is...what is, omniscient...think of omniscience as a big mirror...what's reflecting in the mirror?

(students: Everything)

Every single object in the universe that ever was, will or

(student: And is)

Is, yeah (laughs), And their, and each of those objects emptiness.

(student: Oh emptiness)

It's seeing all of those things, okay. It's ref...all those things are reflecting in the mirror, as long as there's anything moving, the mirror is mov is changing. Omniscience is changing. There therefore because omniscience sees all stuff, and because changing things are some one of those stuffs, then the omniscience is changing. That's Dharmakirti's argument. Now the non Buddhists come and say, well what about when the mind focuses on something unchanging. According to you, then the that mind at that time should be unchanging, right? Dharmakirti says, "no not necessarily". He says, it doesn't, in other words...the reverse is not necessarily true. If you focus on something unchanging, the mirror is changing. I'm sorry. If you focus on something changing, the mirror is changing.

(student: Why?)



But...just because you focus on something unchanging doesn't mean the mirror is unchanging.

(student: Why?)

And he says because because the mind engages in the object and then withdraws from the object. The mind is always

(student: Well the mind (unclear) always changing)

Like a fly, it's on the object for a while and then it goes away.

(student: The omniscient mind or the ordinary mind?)

That's a tough one (laughter) (laughs) This is the argument. He doesn't mention that point. He says, he says, is the mind focused on the ob...is the mind like a...we call it (bang mong nar shing), we say a person who can't sit in his seat is called a fly in Tibet. You know, he can't he he comes to the object and then he goes to the another one and then he comes back to the object, this is the nature of our minds, anyway, and there that's called (rik val), it means "the mind is changing because sometimes it's engaged and sometimes it's not engaged, and that's changing.

(student: Yeah, isn't that really the only change? I mean there's no)

When he's focusing on em on something unchanging, that seems to be, I mean that's Dharmakirti's argument for saying that even then the mind is changing.

(student: So then prior to omniscience the mind is always changing.)

(student: No but he's saying that omniscience is changing.)

He would say even omniscience is change.

(student: But what is the direct)

Because omniscience sees

(student: Right right. I'm just making the distinction about the before period.)

(student: But we with the nine stages of meditation when you reach the final stage of shamata, I thought by definition )

One pointed (unclear)...one pointed

(student: Right. I thought you mind..by definition your mind doesn't wander so you're not withdrawing and engaging)

Well I'll say this, and and that's why you're let's say you're meditating on your thoughts, or or we need something unchanging, right...let's say emptiness, is emptiness of four o'clock the same as emptiness at four-o-one?

(students: Yeah, yeah, maybe, (laughter) No.)

(student: When you're when you're when you're meditating on emptiness you're meditating on a generality, on a concept really, aren't you?)

Not when it's (unclear) but anyway

(student: Because it's not)

So I those are his two arguments. I'll go over them. He says omniscience must be changing because omniscience sees all things and changing things are part of all things. So if the object is going weh-weh-weh-weh-weh and that the perception of it must somehow reflecting weh-weh-weh. Yeah?

(student: But is there really an object that's going weh-weh-weh or is it merely a perception of an object that's going weh-weh-weh?)

(student: Unclear)

In this school the object is (unclear)

(student: Okay)

Now, why doesn't then why, then Tim's question, why then if something if the mind focuses on an unchanging object don't you call the mind unchanging. Well because it's it's touching the object and then it's engaging and then it's disengaging, and that's changing. That's his argument.

(student: So the direct perception of emptiness is?)

Is a state of mind and all mind is changing. I can give you another argument why the mind is changing, the mind is

(student: Well, but wait a minute. Isn't mind changing because it's consciousness from moment to moment?)

That's another reason. But this is not his argument here. He's he's basing his argument on the nature of the object. But in fact since mind has to be caused, of course it's changing all the time. Why? The energy that shoves it into our present time is always...it's a reaction in...anything that pushes something gets less as time goes on. The energy that keeps it going changes.

(student: But but Geshe Yeshe Wangchuk's the text that we read for last week said the second mind of omniscience is not the cause of (unclear) it's not, it doesn't focus on it's object by the power of the person of omniscience so)

It's not, it's a

(student: That's right.)

Let's say this. It's direct cause is the is the omniscience of the moment before and always will be and must be. It's it's material cause, the stuff that turns into omniscience in the second moment has to be the omniscience of the first moment.

(student: But it's not triggered by)

What's what's what's what's giving it the content, what's creating the the content, is not the is not the omniscience of the first moment. You have to distinguish between...there's five types of causes. The stuff that turns into the mind of the second moment. The stuff that turns into omniscience of the second moment is is always the omniscience of the first moment. It's always...that's why he he's has a mind stream, he still has a mind stream.

(student: But is it)

Has to be.

(student: But you're, then you're but)

There has to be some stuff to turn into omniscience.

(student: But then what does it mean to (unclear)?)

The, it's not the memory of the objects of the first moment which is triggering the the awareness, the consciousness. It's it's the very objects themselves.

(student: Because they're always (unclear))

Yeah. It's not like he's he looks at the blue and he turns away and he says, oh yeah, I remember what all things were like. He sees them again pure, fresh

(student: So the Buddha has no memory?)

No, he doesn't have the mental functions of memory. He doesn't even have (je pak tse ma), he doesn't have deduction.

(student: And he doesn't have clairvoyance either.)

Except in so far as he can read someone's mind. You know, he can perceive your deductions so he knows deduction exists.

(student: Right)

He doesn't he doesn't require the state of deduction because everything for him is evident.

(student: So being without any memory. Any any mental function of memory or or clairvoyance.)

Yeah. Why not clairvoyance?

(student: Well, what's the difference between clairvoyance and just seeing it directly?)

Well you could...we do call it clairvoyance but we call it the Buddha's clairvoyance. We call it (sang gye gyi chen), there's a word for it, five eyes, first chapter (b: Abhisamankara). Yeah.

(student: Okay, this is something that can't for me (unclear) changing the homework, the Buddha, once he's enlightened, presumable because he sees everything also sees his own (tse mas) and (tse mins))

Yeah, right.

(student: prior to enlightenment.)

Oh, and that's why he wrote the Kangyur, that's why he spoke the Kangyur.

(student: Right.)

The Kangyur is sixteen volumes of it are the Buddha tell you all the bad things he did to people (laughs)

(student: But so there is this kind of...but that's not, it's not really a self co...I mean, would you call that self consciousness?)

It's not aperception. It's not aperception in the classic sense of that word.

(student: Okay, so it's not inter)

Where the mind perceives itself.

(student: Interverted, right.)

It's not that.

(student: And the other thing is you sounded that you were making a distinction of about moments of consciousness of from the first moment of omniscience to the next.)

Yeah.

(student: But you're acting as though it's beginning at omniscience, but doesn't it begin with...it's not...it's beginningless, because it's isn't it begun long before omniscience?)

The mind stream the mind stream is beginningless.

(student: Right)

Omniscience there's a there's a moment that it begins to be a quality of that mind stream.

(student: Right, but it doesn't com...does it completely transform that, so that...do you know what I'm saying? Is it a complete break (unclear).

Yeah. Yeah. No. No. It's still...no. That's why we talked about the Buddha nature. Okay. (Sang gye su gye rung). It's the definition of Buddha nature, (san gye gyi rik). Anything that turns into the Buddha.

(student: Is it...)

One more and then we gotta go on 'cause I'm I'm gonna

(student: Okay)

'Cause I feel bad if you (unclear)

(student: Are there any other metaphors for the mind other than mirror 'cause mirror is way off, I mean it's )

Well,they say "glass". Glass.

(student: But but it'd be glass that has an on-off switch. When a when a when a mirror's)

Never...never empty, never has no object.

(student: When it's perceiving emptiness...)

That that's a definite object. That's a very important object. See that...then you've got a wrong idea of emptiness and you should have been in the first class (laughs).

(student: Yeah, that's right.)

The mind never turns off. We wish. Right?

(student: All minds have Buddha mind where)

Mind is like a like a fly, mind is never without an object. There is a state called (le du she mey (unclear) ting nge dzin), you know, mindless, there is a very deep state of meditation which is called "non...non mind" or something, but it's not it's not really. Okay. So those are his two arguments for...and I present them for you and I and I'll maybe I'll just leave it like that, you know. I I

(student: Are there two arguments? There were two in there?)

Excuse me?

(student: Did you just say those were just two arguments?)

(student: Yeah, one and two)

This happens to be the first two questions on the homework, okay (laughs). Why why does why does Dharmakirti think that omniscience has to be changing? Why?

(student: Because it's focus is always changing.)

It's focusing on a changing thing. Why is it focus on a changing thing?

(students: Because it's)

It focuses on everything and everything has a lot of changing things, in fact unchanging things are quite rare. The the quantities are much less. You should talk. (hand clap)(unclear) it doesn't have even have emptiness? Yeah, I guess so. Okay. (b: Abhidharma) says there is. Okay. Then then he says then somebody says, well Dharmakirti, I guess mind is unchanging too because mind focuses on unchanging things. And he says, well not necessarily so. Why?

(student: Because the mind engaged in a different thing.)

Yeah, he's steps back from that argument about content of the mind, you know, well that's for unchanging, that's for changing stuff. Unchanging stuff, because the mind focuses on it and then goes away and then comes back again, well then it's changing. The mind is changing.

(student: Yeah, but if you're omniscience you are seeing everything all the time.)

Maybe in the second moment it's maybe it doesn't get into (unclear) Buddha. (laughter) (laughs) Okay. All right. Now, now he he he asks... I gotta write another one.

(cut)

(repeat) (sowapo) (repeat) (jikten) (repeat) (sowapo) (repeat)



(Jik ten)...it's a beautiful word in Tibetan...it's the name for the world, it's the word for the world, the dirty world. Our world, our suffering world. It's not a synonym for samsara, but it's the name in Tibetan for the place, the world. (Jik) means "destructable" (ten) means "basis", and you know, it just means world. (Sowapo) means "maker", maker of the world, creator, and this school, the Chandrakas, they said that there was this person...and other schools in Hinduism said there was a force that created the world, and that force, that primal cause and that (jikten sowapo) what they call Ish Ishvara, okay, or Indra, is unchanging. He's unchanging but he creates the world. He's been forever and then at some point he creates the world.

Yeah?

(student: Michael, who believes this? Is this the Hindu or)

The Chakrabaka. It's a school which was prevalent in India in six hundred eighty.

(student: Unclear...force)

No, the being. They were the believers in that being. And then the (sam kya) believed in a in this force. But I tell you something very serious...you know, this subject is not just religious debate, you know, it's not just an interesting question, you know what I mean? You have in your guts and I have in my guts some gut feeling that well, what your parents said was true, you actually entertain the thought, you actually seriously consider the thought that there's a being who makes the world, and that there is an outside force who is either cares about us or doesn't care about us, who's watching us, who's somehow involved with our lives, and and you in your guts you have a little bit of that left, differing degrees, I would I would guess, you know, but but you probably...you know you can't pick up a magazine or a newspaper or you can't read a novel or it's always there, there's always this idea of a being who made the world and who has some influence on your life. And if and if you think about these arguments carefully, that's just a totally wrong idea. That's just illogical. It just doesn't

(unclear) it's it's it's just false, it's just non-existent.

And so so why why pick on people's beliefs, you know, it's kind of nice to think there's someone there. Because you have to find out what really made the world. That that's the point. It's not to pick on so on, you know, whatever tradition you grew up with and I grew up with. It's it's that we were inculcated, not...well didn't grow in us when we were born, it was taught to us, and it and if it's wrong, and if there's a different place where the world came from and where our our experiences come from and where our suffering comes from, then this is a very bad idea. This is very harmful to us. It blocks us. It obstructs our our our getting out of suffering. And and insofar as you entertain this idea, then you you have a very dangerous block to to getting out of suffering. So, it's not just a useless debate, you know, and you have to think about it. It matters where the world came from and it matters who made the car accidents and the cancer and and these nice sunsets and the flowers, it it really does matter, if you want to get out of suffering. It's a very it's a very vital important question. It's not just, you know, they're wrong, we're right, you know, like that. That doesn't help anybody.

(student: (unclear))

Ah. I've been waiting for someone to ask that, okay, anyway, we gotta, first we gotta show how one, we will show one small problem with the idea that an unchanging being could create the world. Okay. She asked a very good question. Did he make it in seven days. If you think about it, why shouldn't this creator, if his nature is never to change, why does he take history to make the world, why does he take millions of years to make the world? Why can't he do it in seven days? Why did the world develop...why does the world go on...why does it take so long for...why does time go on? Why does our life last for fifty, sixty seventy years, why? He can (finger snap) he can make it all and and wipe it all out in a minute, why not? You know, why why is he restrained to years? Yeah?

(student: I thought we established that time was not a factor in this realm that we're discussing. There is no time.)

Well, if he's unchanging, and he's all powerful, then why go through time? Why not destroy? Create every being and every experience and every moment in history in the same moment and then just be done with it. Why do things go on? Why do things have to change? Why do why does Lincoln have to come and before that Washington and after that Roosevelt, why? Why can't he just do everything at one moment and get it over with? He's not a he's not restrained by time. He's (tak pa). He can do it if he wants. Why why do things go on?

(student: It's such a (laughs) (laughter))

But there's no logical reason. If he's totally powerful and he can create all things and all...and he can create all moments of all things at the same time, so just do it, you know, why stretch it out, why have (unclear)

(student: Maybe he did. Maybe we just perceive it that way.)

(student: I don't know, yeah, exactly.)

Why do you (unclear) Well, now you, we call, you know, a rabbit's horn, you know, and maybe it's twenve inches and maybe it's fourteen inches high, I don't know, you know. We say in the de monastery, okay, let's debate whether the rabbit's horn is twenve inches or fourteen inches. Doesn't exist. Okay. That's...(rimpa shin) means "in in stages", (rimpa shin) means "in stages". The world according to your own perceptions occurs in steps, in stages.

(student: (Rimpa) is stages?)

That's where the word (lam rim) comes from (unclear) (Rim) means "a step", (shin) means "in", okay. (Rimpa shin) means "in stages". That's the Buddhist proof why a an unchanging being didn't create the world. Because things are happening in steps and things must happen in steps, you create the causes, you you you nurture a thing, you cultivate a thing and then over a period of time the thing grows and that's the way things work. And anything else is (me nye je), we had it last week, anything

else is an insult to your perceptions. You can see that's the way things work. You know, you have to do your work at work, you have to open the bank account, you have to get the materials ready, you have to hire the staff and then after a few months you can produce something but it just doesn't happen like that. Things things are caused. Yeah.

(student: Could you also say that this was an unchanging being the act of creating something would need to change)

It that in itself is a contradiction, total contradiction. Anything anything which expends energy to do something is changing, must be changing.

(student: It's a I mean isn't, I mean there's some people I I I guess that say "primal cause", you know, that that God was a (unclear) they say that that in other words he started the ball rolling and then he said, okay, take it.)

I I you know, to a to a to a pure to a Buddhist who never heard about this primitive idea, he'd say you know, you're just grabbing at straws, you know, what what're you talking about, you know. Why why if he's om om omnipotent, I almost...by the way, the Buddha is what? He's omniscient, but he sure isn't omnipotent. If he was omnipotent, what?

(students: No suffering.)

No cancer. Come on, you know. No aids, you know. No pain. He he what is he, a sadist? (laughs) You know. (unclear)

(student: But uh)

Does he want to test you? Okay, test me and finish the test within one second.

(student: An unchanging thing can (unclear) to that changing thing, is that it?)

Impossible.

(student: So why couldn't you say this is a changing...)

You have to expend energy to do something. You have to move to change. You have to move to make something.

(student: So why couldn't you say this being was a permanent changing omnipotent being, what would that would)

Oh they didn't say that. We're not fighting somebody who said that.

(student: But what if they did (laughter)?)

(student: But the but the implication is when they say)

(laughs) We'd have to think about it. Oh by the way there's there's hundreds of pages, I mean, they they go through the Hindu schools, but these is the one that to me was most interesting, because I grew up...when I was in the monastery debating it, I realized I was the best debator to defend this position (laughs) and then I realized that's my problem, you know. Yeah?

(student: Well, the Judeo-Christian ideal is that God is jealous he gets wrathful some, they claim he's changing, he's he's omnipotent but he changes, they never claimed he doesn't change because he's always responding and teaching us and loving us, so)

Yeah, right. I'd say so.

(student: They never said he doesn't change.)

Right. Right. But they say he he was God for all time, which brings me to the next argument. (laughs) In others words, I'll give you Dharmakirti's now...then I'll finish and we'll take a break. Dharmakirti's argument against that, okay. Now he has to say, he'll say to you, okay, you've changed now. Now you say your God changes. Now you say your God goes through moods, and sometimes he does stuff and sometimes he doesn't does stuff, so he changes, but you're saying that his quality was Godness forev

forever. He never was not God and then he did something to become God. He's always been God. And then Dharmakirti says that in itself is a wrong idea. He says that's not possible. He says you have to go through...there has to be some cause to make you omniscient.

(student: Omniscient or omnipotent or both?)

(student: Well, how can we accept that the mind stream has no beginning )

Excuse me?

(student: Exactly)

(student: Where is where is the cause for the mind stream?)

We'll talk about it. We're gonna get there in the seventh class. (laughter) okay. But but they but this is Dharmakirti he says, and and you know to us it sounds not very good argument. But I'll present it to you and you think about it. He says, a being who has been perfect for all time, a being who has been omniscient and omnipotent for all time has never suffered the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune, he almost says it that way, you know, I mean he's never had anything bad happen to him, and he's never had anything good happen to him, in a previous version of himself which was suffering. He never had it. He's never been through that. Th and then Dharmakirti says, therefore he can not be omniscient.

(student: Why?)

Cook it. (laughs) Okay. He could not have applied the antidote to suffering and therefore become omniscient.

(student: Say it again.)

A person's who's been Mr. Know-it-all forever (laughter) never had a time when he became Mr. Know-it-all because he never suffered, and because he never suffered he never practiced the

practices that allow you to stop suffering. What's the main one?

(students: Direct (unclear))

Direct perception of emptiness. He never went through that. He never did that. He never was he never was a wimp long ago and had bad things happen to him and then taught learned learned the way, learned the path, meditated on emptiness directly and with that powerful powerful antidote stopped his suffering. He never did that. Therefore he's not omniscient and he doesn't exist.

(student; May I say this is kind of a totology.)

It is a totology. It is a totology.

(student: I mean so how can that be a how can how can we be persuaded by that)

Cook it. All I say is cook it. Some of these things are so are so out of our ex...what he's say is that...what is he saying when he says that. He can only be it can only be a good argument if it's true that everybody in the world know that, come on, to become omniscient you must go through suffering and you must perceive emptiness directly, right. I mean, if that, if we all knew that

(student: If we're gonna use that as a basis, then yeah)

Yeah. If if I already died. So for him somehow it's a priority. That's all. That's all I can say.

(student: Yeah but, you you you don't have to burn yourself to know that fire burns.)

Right (laughs) Okay. That's his arguments. So I give you his argument. And I just say cook it. After when we get back we'll talk about where Buddhists think the world came and then by the way, it's not like you don't believe me right now so you'll never believe me. As you learn more it will feed this. It will feed it more and more and it will support it more and more and then

one day you'll say, oh that's where the world came from, this is where my world came from. You must understand that to practice the higher teachings, the the secret teachings. The whole idea of the secret teachings depends on understanding where the world comes from. If you practice the secret teachings without understanding these points it's useless.

(student: Omniscience is (unclear), omnipotent meaning did suffering, (unclear))

Yeah. Well then he has an omniscience forever and

(student: Why why can't you suffer as much as an omnipotent being (unclear))

If he's omnipotent and he's sticking pins in his arm, I don't know why he'd want to do it, but (laughs)

(cut)

(repeat) (lang ja) (repeat) (dor ja) (repeat) (dor ja) (repeat)  
(lang ja lang ja) means "things you should take up", things you should take up, meaning things you should practice, things you should follow. That's (lang ja). Things you should take up.  
(Dor ja) means "things you should give up". Things you should get rid of.

(student: Which one?)

(student: (Dor ja))

(Dor ja). (Dor ja) means "things you should get rid of". Things you should abandon. If you knew this if you knew where this line was, your life would be very good, you know, we we we're got it mixed up, some some of the things that we should reject like pain, money, attention of other people, hope for lasting love in this life, you know, things which are impossible, we we are struggling to get those things. Those are not (lang jas). Those are (dor jas). Things to get rid of. And then the (lang jas) which are you know, sacrificing ourselves to help other people,



you know, putting other people before us, all those things, we they're in our (dor ja) part, but they should be (lang jas) (laughs) you know. The re...we don't know (lang ja) and (dor ja) very well. We we we don't know it, we we we heard it but we don't really believe it, we didn't buy into it. There's only one being who knows these conditions perfectly.

(student: Buddha)

And that's a Buddha. Okay. He knows it perfectly. And that, Dharmakirti says, is why he's omniscient.

(student: Is he saying (unclear))

Dharmakirti has this long verse which is in your reading and he says, it ain't omniscience to know every rock at the bottom of the Pacific Ocean. It's not omniscience to know every bug crawling on every plant in the planet. He says, omniscience, what really makes the Buddha omniscient is that he knows perfectly what we should be... giving up and what we should be doing. And he's the only being, and that that qualifies him as omniscient, and he and he says, if you think omniscience means some being who knows perfectly what's what we should be giving up and what we should be taking up, and think about it.

(student: Right. So so then, according to Dharmakirti, the the highest quality of omniscience, or the main thing of omniscience or the most important thing of omniscience is this.)

This is what qualifies you as omniscient. If you knew this perfectly you'd be omniscient. He doesn't care if you can see everything in the world, and he has this beautiful line which is very famous in (so chok jar gyu tem pa shok) which means, if you think knowing everything or being able to see, you know, the atoms of some object, and and basically that science's what, that's what science is offering, right, they're offering you the the ability eventually to see every object. He says, so big deal. It doesn't help you. It doesn't help you at all. That's not omniscience. That's not that's not the point. So he says,

if you do you think that's the omniscience, then go study with a eagles. 'Cause if if you've ever been in India it's it's incredible, they have lot of eagles around our monastery and both, what do you call them, vultures and and they fly you can barely see them, they're up above, I guess they would be a mile high or a mile and a half high or something, you can barely...you see them go up in a funnel and then they disappear, you know they're up there, and suddenly they swoop down you know, like three four thousand feet and catch a mouse, you know, they got some kind of weird ability to see. You know, so in in Bud in India in six hundred a.d. this was an example of some creature who could see unbelievable detail so he says, if you think that's omniscience, then go study with birds.

(student: (unclear) does an omniscient person know all I mean I know that's not)

Yeah, he does also know all things. But that's not the main reason, that's not really the important reason. That's not the important part of being omniscient.

(student: Is this important because it's tied to seeing the subtle aspects of pramana basically)

It helps.

(student: It leads to happiness)

It helps. But basically it's important because that's what helps us. That that's our interest in the Buddha. Otherwise, the Buddha's not interesting. So okay. Somebody can see everything. Who cares. You know, if he can't get me out of this lousy life, where everything I get is I lose and I can't get all the things I want anyway, then I don't care. I don't care if there's some guy who can see everything, you know, I I don't care about Steven Hockens wrote a book about the nature of the big bang, it just doesn't affect me. (laughs)

(student: So this is really the culmination...)

Huh?

(student: So seeing these two things is the culmination of seeing subtle pramana, this this (unclear))

Na na na na not directly related like that. It helps. Of course he he had to know that 'cause he knows this perfectly, that's true. So

(student: But Michael, isn't the...it seems to me this is something you'd have to accomplish as a prerequisite to developing omniscience.)

Yeah, if you if you were omniscient, by the way you would also know this. That's not the

(student: No no no no. (unclear) not saying.)

(student: No, it's it's part of the process, you know it better and better and better and better and finally you know it all.)

Oh Oh you've gotta know this very well to become omniscient. Yeah, you do. But you don't know it perfectly until the day you become omniscient.

This is by the way called the pure side of existence, and this is called...I'll write it.

(student: The pure side of?)

Existence.

(students: existence.)

Everything in the universe comes into one of those two things. And we don't know, we we got it messed up. Shantideva says, you know, we chase after the things that hurt us and we run away (laughs) from the things that would help make us happy (laughs).

(student: (unclear) try to give up the things that hurt you it hurts. (laughter)

Seems to hurt. 'Cause that's your side of the...by the way if you do it with understanding it's quite pleasant. You know, keeping your vows is a pleasure. You know. Acting right is a pleasure. You know. Helping others people...I mean once you get into it's a real pleasure. There's no problem with it at all. It's it's like, you know, you think eating chocolate all day is happiness, and then when you stop it (laughter) (laughs) it feels really great. You know. Anyway, the pure side and the afflicted side. What does affliction mean...mental affliction? I call it bad thoughts. Sanscrit "kleisha". Tibetan (nyo mo). And affliction means...the klish, the the word comes from a sanscrit root that means to bother you and and your mental, your six main afflictions bother you, jealousy, anger, hatred, desire, these things bother you. They they upset your mind. They afflict you. They irritate you all day long. If you didn't have them it'd be quite pleasant. That's the afflicted side. Afflicted side means things directly involved with those, or the products of those thoughts, which are what? New York City. The karma...New York City's created by these things, affliction, by mental affliction.

(student: Could you list the) (laughter)

Your body and your mind, you body and your mind were created by them.

(student: Our experience of New York City is created by them)

Your body and your mind are also (dor ja) (unclear). Your present state of your mind and your body are...they came from mental afflictions. They were produced by mental affliction. And until you see emptiness you'll continue this and you'll continue to have all those emotions that you have all day, bad emotions (unclear)

(student: You were saying what the six were, the six)

I was afraid somebody's gonna ask me that. Pride,

(student: Anger)

Anger

(student: The six of what?)

The six main bad thoughts.

(student: Jealousy)

You got em all?

(students; (unclear))

Ignorance is in there too by the way.

(student: Oh, ignorance, then I have seven.)

Okay, I've gotta move or else these ladies'll run away on me.

(student: Unclear)

Those are the only six.

(student: Which we didn't really mention.)

If you want to do all of them we've gotta go until nine thirty.

(students: Okay. Just to remember them?)

(unclear) eighty four thousand bad acts. Say (duk kun) (repeat)  
One and two, okay. (Duk) is the first noble truth. I'm teaching  
you the shortest way to say it. (Duk nel den pa) Sometimes in the  
monastery we say (duk kun) (Duk) is what? The first noble truth  
is what?

(students: Suffering. The truth of suffering.)

Buddha said, all changing things are suffering. A little tricky.

(laughter) Most of our life is suffering. (duk nel den pa) Why

is it a noble truth?

(student: Because it leads to)

Because it's a bad translation of arya truths. What's an arya truths?

(student: What you see right before, by analys, by individual analysis before you perceive shunata)

Right after.

(student: After.)

Right after you see it. Right after you see emptiness directly and become thereby an arya, which has nothing to do with a race of people that attack (unclear) in one thousand b.c., (laughter) (laughs) you become an arya. And then and then when you come out of that state you perceive these four conditions totally, directly, and you see you know that everything in your life is suffering. Until that you're not...it doesn't really...you don't see it directly. Okay, that's (duk). (Kun) is what? Second arya truth.

(student: The cause of suffering.)

Yeah. The source of suffering. Where does it come from. (Kun) stands for (kun jung den pa). The source of suffering. Which is mainly your bad thoughts which are caused by ignorance. Okay. Why? The blank at work (laughs) okay, you know, work is where it's at, you know, where is your world, you know. Where else are you gonna learn all this stuff. Think of the bad guy at work when you react to him with ignorance, not realizing that he's empty and that he's a projection of your former past deeds

(student: He seemed very nice to me) (laughter) (laughs)

He's very nice, actually. That that's not the boss that I always talk about. (laughter) That's not the big boss. That's not the big boss. (laughter) He's actually quite nice.

(student: And he's nice too, the big boss, most of)

(Duk kun). So (kun) means (kun jung den pa) which means "the source of your suffering." And and that's that whole mechanism that we keep talking about at work, you know, when you respond badly, that's (kun jung den pa). It's source. It's creating more of the same. You gotta meet him again. That's (kun)...that's exactly (kun jung den pa). You're not gonna find some philosophical (kun jung den pa) somewhere else. That that's it, and and if and as long as you have a bad day at work (laughs) still then you didn't make it, okay. (laughs) (unclear)

(student: Sorry. My mind is going in and out. You said (duk) is suffering?)

Excuse me?

(student: (Duk) is suffering?)

(Duk) is suffering which is the first noble truth and (kun) is the source. There's two ways to remember them that I'm (unclear) okay.

(student; Michael the two words together mean something, I mean (duk kun) means something.)

It's a it's a way in in monastic debate to say the first two noble truths in a very easy way. We just say

(cut)

(duk kun)

(student: Okay so nothing says that there's two)

(unclear) okay? And you don't want to learn all that, (unclear) (duk kun) Suffering and the source of suffering. (Gok) means what?

(student: Cessation)

Yeah, (gok me denpa) means stopping it, finishing it, ending it. Cessa...what they call cessation. Stopping it. Stopping suffering. That's (gok). (Gok) means "stopping suffering". And and it really is and you can really get it, and and that's the whole point and I I hope we do it before we die (laughs) you know, I hope we do it before we all get old and these classes stop. You know. I we that's our goal. We have to do it. You can do it. You can really do it. And it's quite pleasant (laughter) (laughs) okay. (Lam) (repeat) (lam) means "path". Path is is exactly...what's the main thing of path, understanding the emptiness of that object. And then responding to it with compassion and love. So the Buddha knows this this condition perfectly. And the last point of tonight, the homework question says, why is the Buddha unerring? Why is the Buddha never, why is he unerring, why is he (miluway), why is he perfectly correct, why does he never make a mistake. How can you know it? On what basis can you say that the Buddha is is correct when he describes these four? When he says, here's your condition, you're you're messed... you're in trouble (laughs), you're getting old minute by minute, if you're pretty you're getting ugly, if you're smart you're gonna be senile, it must happen. Anything you have you will lose. You'll lose you body, your face and your name. Forget about your kids and your friends and your money. You lose ever...you lose your identity. Why and and why why should we believe him? This is a very important. Why should we take it?

(student: Well we see that that's true. Everybody dies)

That's the nice, okay that's the real nice (unclear). We see this one. Out of everything he said, out of everything the Buddha says, and by the way, this is one of the only proofs for believing the Buddha, there's is one of the only good reasons you should be a Buddhist. It's one of the only good reasons why you should ever practice or go to a class, because he's the only being...I I know in my experience and maybe I don't know about you, who describes this condition perfectly. You know. Out of those four there's only one that I can perceive now. But he hit it on the nail. I love his description of suffering, you know, I



mean, that's what attracted me to Buddhism. It's so perfect. Nobody ever said anything like that in my experience, you know. People are saying, if things not right, you know, some things are okay, (laughs) you know, what they're saying, you're kind of saying it kind of desperately, you know. (laughter) Yeah, I just his description of the problem attracted me, this this absolutely true, that the seed of the destruction of a thing starts as it begins and my and my condition is unhappiness, and even those things which I dearly want to go right, collapse, you know. Why? What's causing it? I mean, what's what's going on, and does everybody suffer, you know. Can can somebody collect a certain amount of money or can somebody reach a certain level of income or can somebody reach a certain level of balancing their life that everything's all right and there's actually happy people in the world (laughs). No not really. It's true. You you kinda wish they were and you kinda think that if you had a little more exercise or (laughter) (unclear) you know you gotta think if if I could just shift this over here (continuing laughter) and increase this, I really would be happy. But that's not the case. It doesn't work. It never will. There is no balance like that. There's no such thing.

(student: Michael? Doesn't that point to the fact that we really don't even see clearly the first one. We see the first one but ultimately)

All I'm saying's that and and I love it, I heard Kedrup Je I read it in Kedrup Je, why believe the Buddha? Because he describes that condition perfectly. Okay. And then does that mean everything that he said about stopping it is true? No. Does it mean I can take him as the closest thing to authority in my life that I've found? Yes. It...that's all. That, it's, the rest is kind of an assumption. You know, you you're taking his word for the rest because he described the problem so well. That's it, that's all, that's why he's supposed to be (unclear). And that's the only way you'll ever see it. And for me that's a quite nice. For me it's enough. And I don't actually have no choice. (laughs) No one else even described the problem, so one guy describes the problem, okay, I I...there's really nobody else, you know, that's the (unclear), okay, that's I I'm gonna write

one little quotation from the (b: Abhidharmakosha). You guys have been dying to study (b: Abhidharma) I know.

(student: Michael, this is not the explanation of, the Buddhist explanation of)

What?

(student: Cosmology. This is not the Buddhists' explanation of where the world comes from or are you)

This is the Buddhist explanation accepted by all schools.

(student: So it's any what you're gonna...right)

(student: You've got a lot of help)

You're asking where the where the world came from and I'm gonna tell you about that.

(student: Okay)

(cut)

not on your homework and it's not on your quiz, it is in your future lives (laughter) (laughs) and it's a great it's a great quotation from the fourth chapter of the (b: Abhidharmakosha). And it's really it's really beautiful. (Le le) these are two different words that are spelled the same and sound the same. The first one means "karma" (Le) means "karma". The second (le) means "from". From. (Jikten) you had before. It means "the world", or this planet. (Natsok) means "all the various ones; all the various ones". And (kye) means "come".

(student: Come?)

Come. So what's that sentence mean?

(student: All the worlds come from karma)

Yeah. All the planets of the universe come from karma. All these many planets that beings live on, according to Buddhism, many many planets with inhabited by beings like us, all of those planets come from karma. This planet came from karma. (Le le jikten natsok kye), say (le le) good luck (repeat) (jikten) (repeat) (natsok kye) (repeat). (De ni) means "that" meaning that karma, that karma, (sempa, sempa) means "when the mind moves, anytime the mind moves, any time the mind goes like this...look (laughs) that's (sempa). Movement of the mind. Shifting of the mind. What do you call...there's a good word in English.

(student: unclear) (laughter)

Yeah. Just like that.

(student: Vascillation)

It just means any time it just...shifts, why is movement of the mind (sempa), it's not the word (sem) by the way, it doesn't mean mind. It's (sempa), it's a different function of the mind. And any time the mind moves. (Dang) means "and" (de je) means "what it makes you do". (De je) means "what it makes you do". Or say. And that comes in the next line. The definition of karma is is any time the mind moves. And anything inspired by that movement of the mind.

(student: Any...any time the mind moves?)

Any time the mind shifts, that's karma. That's (le).

(student: Is karma. And that creates the world.)

Yup.

(student: Whose mind?)

(laughs) Yours. No, your own. That's a good question. You you created this world...you created your world. We happen to in this room we have all done a karma together in the past that we

are all experiencing the same room right now.

(student: But but but is that Mind Only...I mean, that sounds so close to)

No it's accepted by all schools.

(student: But then is there a universe out there, there, I mean is there a universe out there)

No.

(student: except from mind?)

(unclear) of your perception.

(student: Is there a mind out there separate from...beings?)

The Buddha if you want to say that, but no, that's all. Every mind is a long spaghetti noodle and goes back with no beginning goes on for no end, and they're all separate.

(student: There's no universal mind.)

They can be together, they can be near each other but they can never mix.

(student: So all these many many minds create many many worlds?)

At the at the...all the, well no.

(student: Well, then it's not one world.)

Yeah. All the beings in this world have collected a similar karma to live in this world and the people in Tijuana who live five minutes from the people in San Diego, you know, have collected a different karma. They live in the same land, the same water, the same air and they're very poor, and then five minutes across an imaginary line everyone's extremely comfortable, and that's (unclear) but they've all created a

karma to perceive the world.

(student: Michael, just one thing. Are the are the number of those continuous minds finite)

Yeah.

(student: or infinite. They're finite. It wi it will never change. How's that.

(students: That's not an answer.)

(student: Do they not address that or is a big or is it a big (unclear)

Big problem, big problem.

(student: Okay)

Sentient beings are countless.

(student: Right)

There will be a day when the last sentient beings becomes a Buddha. (laughs) Okay.

(student: (unclear) can you be more than one sentient being at a time?)

Excuse me?

(student: Can you be more than one sentient being at a time?)

No no.

(student: No?)

Never. Never. That's an absolute principal. You cannot collect karma for someone else, you cannot experience someone else's karma.

(student: Oh no, can I, my mind be an insect, in hell and here at the same time?)

No, no.

(student: Can minds split in half?)

You can perceive hell in this realm if you have certain aids, not aids (unclear)

(student: And our mind will always stay as one mind continuum...it will never grow)

Yeah it never makes it...all the people who have ever become Buddhas are different beings.

(student: Can you say that whole statement?)

The various worlds of the universe come from karma. Karma is the movement of the mind and what it inspires us to say or do...do or say.

(student: unclear)

Excuse me?

(student: (unclear))

Karma is any movement of the mind and what that inspires us to do or say. And it's accepted by all schools but not every school understands how our emptiness ties into this, how perceptions tie into this, and you must study those, otherwise karma is not very easy to swallow. When you study that in detail you'll be able to buy it quite easily. And that's that's'll be...maybe that's a good subject for our next class.

(student: So this is merely a concept of as you think so becomes your reality (unclear) not in the sense that they consider it)

But there's always a time lag between (unclear). We don't believe in "causelessness". If you are good now, if you are moral now, I'm a sorry to say it won't help you right now. (laughter) (laughs) And that's the problem that people have. King Buyana, King Buya, King Buyadyana, you know, he became an arhat and he

(student: Who also became an arhat?)

(students all together: (unclear))

The principal of the higher teaching is such, the secret teachings is that you (unclear) very very very (unclear)

(cut)

(student: Michael? (unclear))

It will, it it can improve but but where people give up religion is when they get disasters after being with a person for a while. And Buddhism doesn't promise you that. Buddhism says you've got certain causes in your actions and motions, you can remove them through proper purification, but don't expect not to have major problems in your lives. That's not the way it works. (laughs) Sorry. (laughs) But that's it's cause and effect. You don't get the effect at the same time as the cause, it's impossible. It will improve...you life will improve because (unclear), you know accidents happen to you, disasters happen to you...your mental state can improve constantly. You state of happiness can grow constantly. That's that's something you can control. But you can't control the events that happen to you, and and, you know, Dalai Lama gets chased out of Tibet. (unclear) Okay.

(student: The Dalai Lama is (unclear) at the same time, how can we do that and still have this course be what it was tonight?)

(student: It was in our homework.)

(students: Is having class...oh homework, yeah. Twenty)  
(laughter)

The idea of Go...if you say that God is the principle of karma and if you behave as if God were the principle of karma, and I mean a good Christian does, and a good Jew does,

(student: I'm going to bed)

I mean a good Christian is is behaving exactly...he thinks he's doing it in the presence of God, we think we're doing it in the presence of the principle of karma. I'm not sure they act much differently. But I think in the end you must

(student: The principle of karma (unclear))

in the end it's an obstacle if you don't understand that everything comes exactly from your actions. I think it's a huge obstacle, that that might actually prevent you from reaching your goal, if you don't truly believe that every bad thing that happens to you is directly related to something you've done. And that if you do any bad reactions to any bad...if you're just irritated slightly, you're gonna have a bad reaction. Much less fight with a person, or yell or get angry or get red, you know, anything less than equanimity is dangerous for you and harmful to you, you know, and and will have bad results, must have bad results. I think when you really understand that...what it forces you to be is is happy (laughs) you know, it it forces you to be happy in the in the face of bad circumstances and bad people, and that's...even if Buddhism is wrong, that's still a great feeling, try it, you know, it's very interesting.

(laughter) And that's not why you do it. You don't do it to be calm or...you do it to get out of suffering. But by the way, it's also the nicest thing to do, and by the way it's the most pleasant thing to do. And it's the best thing for the situation (unclear), you know, if you're just happy, the person's screwing you and you're happy, you know, that's a great...you can do it, as you study more, you can...if you have somebody literally trying to mess you up at work, you're just not gonna allow them to ruin your happiness (unclear)

(student: (unclear))



No it's not even talking about his reaction. You're just happy.  
Fact you're always happy. So

(student: A...as distinguished between somebody who's just plain  
crazy (laughter) who's happy when (unclear) (laughter), I mean  
there's a big difference, right?) It's not the sa...) (laughter)

(prayer: short mandala)

(prayer: dedication)

**The Asian Classics Institute**

**Course IV: The Proof of Future Lives**

**Class Six: The Four Reasonings of the Forward Order**

**Geshe Michael Roach**

**Transcribed by: Angie Overy**

[student] Yeah. [student]

Yeah, nobody, different people asked me. I mean, that question wasn't very clear. And we went over a couple of reasons why, a couple of problems with the idea of an omnipotent, omniscient omnipotent being, okay. And, and the main one is that he could not have created his own mind.

[student]

Yeah, because it has to be caused so he could not have been, a person who is, there's just a problem with a person who's omniscient creating the world because he would have had to create his omniscience also, because his omniscience is part of the world

[student]

Excuse me?

[student]

That's another problem. I mean, he would have, if he's, if he's the creator of the world and if he knows everything, knowing everything is one of the things he would have had to create. If he created all things, he would have had to create his own omniscience, which is a problem.

[student]

It wasn't very clear. It was in the reading but you have to, you have to get it out of the reading. But, basically, that he would have had to create his own omniscience and that's ... . And, he would have had to be omniscient before that because the creator would have had to be omniscient. So that's, that's a problem. It's like saying, they say it's like a man riding on his own shoulders or a knife cutting itself. And you just got to think about it, okay. [laughs] I mean, it's a problem with an omniscient being creating the world because he, he had, his omniscience, he's part of the world also. And his omniscience is part of the world and he would have had to create his own mind and to create his own

mind he would have had to be omniscient. But he wasn't omniscient yet because he didn't create himself yet. He didn't create his omniscience yet. If you say the creator has to be omniscient, then who made the omniscience?

[student]

Yeah, must be caused. It's a state of mind. I mean it's so obviously crazy that, that you miss it because you grew up in this culture and you think it makes sense. Anyway, he would have had to have made his own mind because his own mind is one of the things in the world.

[student]

Say again.

[student]

The mind, we say, it's beginning-less. We say it didn't have a creator.

[student]

You can say what?

[student]

Yeah, sure. Any, any [student]. Then who made, then, who made the world? The world is beginning-less.

[student]

We studied in the Three Principle Paths that dependence has a lot of meanings and we, we learned that the lowest meaning of dependence, which is that everything has a cause, is insufficient because it doesn't cover changing things.

[student]

Unchanging things. So, by the way, I'm very buzzed out. I was on a plane all night last night. [laughs] But, yeah, the lowest interpretation of what interdependence means is, is not accepted by the highest schools because, it doesn't cover unchanging things. The lowest interpretation of dependence is that all things depend on their causes. And the higher schools say that's not sufficient because it doesn't cover unchanging things.

[student]

Yeah, they kind of fall in the middle but they, we didn't talk about what they believe.

[student]

Yeah.

[student]

So, they're dependent. But that's, we didn't cover that and that's not part of this.

[student]

Yeah. Yeah, of dependent interdependence?

[student]

Oh, depending. We're not, that's not [student]. Yeah. That's not dependent origination. It's not, we didn't talk about that yet. They do describe depending

on those things but that's not [student]. We're going to talk about it now. By the way, we've got to move tonight or else you'll be here to very late. [laughs] So it's a long one tonight.

Say, {luk-jung} [repeat], {luk-dok} [repeat]; {luk-jung} [repeat] {luk-dok} [repeat]. Okay. {luk-jung} means forward order of something and {lung dok} means the reverse order of something. And I'll give you the classic example. The classic example is not in your homework, it's not in your reading. I'm just giving you an example of what these two words mean. You know the Wheel of Life and it has those twelve links; twelve links of where suffering comes from, where this world comes from, where samsara comes from. What's the first link?

Kylie had a couple of years of this; {.. marigpa}. What's the first link?

[student]

Yeah. Ignorance, the two blind men, right? And if you have ignorance, what does it make you do? If you're at work and you have ignorance about the guy who attacks you, what will you do?

[student]

Yeah, you'll attack him back. And that's the second link, which is, karma.

[student]

{.. du je kyi le}. What's {pungpa}?

[student]

Then you start, then you start all the, all the causes of birth and things like that. You start into the different heaps that are caused by [unclear] okay. But that's, that's forward progression. That's, like, what causes. When you get up to nine, ten, eleven – what are those? Do you remember? {gurpa lenpa, jukpa sipa ...}.

When you get up to the last four links, for example, these are just examples of forward progressions. When you get up into { chupa si, gurpa lenpa} at the moment of death you, you grasp to something. {chupa sipa} means you create, your karma ripens because of your grasping. This is all at the moment of death. And then, {juk chipa}, the eleventh link is birth and then the twelfth link is aging and death. So those are {luk-jung}. Those are, that's how the wheel gets, you know, wheel of fortune, gets spun, okay. And that means forward order, okay: what, what triggers what. So what do you think reverse order is?

[student]

Excuse me?

[student]

Yeah. It's like you start with death and you say, if I want to shut off death what do I have to shut off? Birth. If I want to shut off birth what do I have to shut off? Ripe karma at, at, at death. If I want to shut off that what do I have to shut off? I have to shut off the grasping that triggers that ripe karma. And then you go backwards. If I want to cut off the second link which is fresh karma, created

karma, what do I have to shut off?

[students]

The first one which is, ignorance. That's {luk-dok}. That's reverse order. So that's just gives you an idea of a forward order and reverse order. What we're doing it, what is the use of {luk-jung} and {luk-dok} in this chapter of the Pramanavartikka is {tsema gyurpa}. What is {tsema gyurpa}?

[students]

Yeah, becoming.

[students]

Excuse me?

[student]

Say, {tunpa}[repeat] {chuchen}[repeat], {tunpa} [repeat] {chuchen} [repeat]. This is the form of a debate. This is the form of logic. When you're making a debate you always say [claps hands] {chuchen}. You take a [claps hands] {chuchen} means take this example. {chuchen} means take this example. What's {tunpa}? Is anybody saying the grace before they eat? {Tunpa lama sangye } {tsema}[repeat] {gyurte} [repeat]; {tsema} [repeat] {gyurte} [repeat]. What's {tsema}?

[students]

Correct perception. {Tsema gyur} means he turned into and then, and then in this case it doesn't mean the perception, right. It means a totally correct person. He turned into totally correct. Sound familiar? Where's it come from?

[student]

Yeah, the five qualities that Dignaga was talking about. Who's Dignaga?

[students]

He's the grandfather of all Buddhist logic. Who's the father of all Buddhist logic?

[students]

Dharmakirti.. So this is the person that Dharmakirti was getting his logic from, okay. He said that the Teacher turned totally correct, why?

Say, {kyodpa}[repeat] {yinpai chir}[repeat]; {kyodpa yinpai chir} [repeat]. So in a debate you say, {tunpa chuchen}. Say, {tunpa chuchen} [repeat], {tunpa chuchen} [repeat], {tunpa chuchen}[claps hands] [repeat]; {tsema gyute}[repeat], {tsema gyurte}[repeat], {kyodpa yinpai chir} [repeat] {kyodpa yinpai chir} [repeat] [unclear]. That's how you debate. [laughter]

What is {kyopa}? What's {kyabdro} mean?

[students]

{Kyabdro} is taking Refuge. {Kyopa} means refuge, protector. {Kyobpa yinpai chir}; {kyobpa} means protector, {yin} means what? Is. And {chir} means because. So, it means because He is the Protector. Sound familiar? Where's the Protector come from?

[student]

Huh?

[student]

The same verse; from Dignaga's verse. You're getting a pattern here. He's taking one part of the verse to prove another part of the verse.

[student]

Take the Teacher, consider the Teacher; he became totally correct; because he's the Protector. Does that make sense? [laughs] I mean, we're trying to link all those qualities to each other and we're trying to see some kind of what? Forward progression, how one causes the next, but it seems like he's pushing it. What use is it, how can you say, oh he's totally correct because he's a Protector?

[student]

Yeah, I mean, definitely it wouldn't seem to be this way. What makes somebody a Protector? That's, that's the key here. What did we say last time was the way to prove that the Buddha was correct, at our stage, at our level? Assuming you are who you seem to be.

[student]

Yeah, the fact that he described suffering perfectly. Which makes you think that he might be correct about the Four [student] about the Four Noble Truths because that's the first one. And, if he teaches people the Four Noble Truths what has he done for us?

[student]

He's protecting us. That's the only way he can protect us. You know, we talk about refuge or protection blah, blah, blah, the only way he can help you, the only way he can effect you, is to teach you the Four Noble Truths. It's the only way he can do anything for you. And they say, that's why they say the Buddha's speech is his highest activity. His mental activity and his physical activity are not considered as high as his speech. And the only way Buddha can do anything for you is to teach you the Four Noble Truths. And that's protecting you. So, now does it make sense?

Take the teacher; he became totally correct. Prove it. Oh, because he protects people by teaching them the Four Noble Truths. And, because he teaches the first noble truth we know he's totally correct. That's the, that's the key here. That's how you jump from 'protector' to 'totally correct'. How does he protect? He teaches the Four Noble Truths. What's the first noble truth? Suffering. What proves to us that he's correct? He teaches suffering.

[student]

He describes the problems better than anyone, in fact, because he describes it correctly. Everybody got it? Okay. Want to go over it again? He's totally correct because he's a protector and a protector teaches people the Four Noble

Truths: what to give up and what to take up. And we know he's correct because he teaches the first noble truth. And that's all. You have to go, you have to make those jumps. Protector means a person who teaches the first noble truth and therefore we believe him and therefore he must be correct.

[student]

Yeah, yeah, it's the only thing anyone can do to help you. To tell you what to do with the guy at work. That gets you out of suffering. That gets you out. If you react properly to the guy at work you're out.

[student]

Because you can't confirm the other three with your direct experience yet; you can judge him on his description of the first noble truth. But, frankly, you're not sure about the other three. You don't know if suffering can ever end. You've never heard of a, you don't believe there's a person who's not going to die or get old, do you? Do you really believe it? Did you ever meet such a person? No. Then do you believe there's, that ... Do you believe that not reacting badly to the guy at work could someday lead you to not dying and not getting old? You don't really see the connection. And, do you really believe that your past perceptions created the world that you see now? It's hard to confirm. Over time you'll see it with logic or you'll see it with training. You'll hear it enough times and you'll think it over and it will seem correct to you, but right now, no. The only thing you confirm that he, the only thing that you can confirm that he said is that you are suffering in the way he described. And his description of suffering is much more subtle than say the Christian description of suffering or something like that. We don't say a beautiful sunset is a nice thing. We don't say a beautiful, a good meal is a nice thing 'cos they are tied up with suffering. They always end in suffering. Suffering is part of them. Suffering is their necessary conclusions. And that's, they're not happy.

{kyodpa yinpay chir}; this is the first of the four reasonings of the forward order, okay, and that's the name of your reason. This is the first of the four reasonings of the forward order. And I'll write four reasons. [cut]

[student]

Yeah. I'll tell you what forward order means in this case, okay. It's a very good question and, you know, I was unclear on it a long time.

{rikpa} means reasoning. Reasoning. This is a {rikpa} and, and you'll learn it. I mean, you will get good at {rikpas} by the time five years are done. Debating is constant {rikpas}, okay. So {rikpa} means reasoning; {shi} means four. Four. In Dharmakirti's book the four reasonings for the forward order are to prove where, where the Buddha came from. To prove how you can become a Buddha. That's what forward order means in his book [unclear].

[student]

The forward order, in this case, refers to where does a Buddha come from.

[student]

We've only got the first one. When you get all four you'll see it. What is reverse order, in this case, means how can you prove, how can you, how can we know that such a thing exists. And we're not going to get into that tonight. That's a whole other subject. That takes a whole other year in the monastery. What we're doing in this six weeks takes a year in the monastery. The four reasonings of the forward order, which is where does a Buddha come from, takes about a year. The four reasonings of the reverse order, which means how do you know he exists, how can you prove it, they take another year. We're not going to do that. So, we're doing {rikpa shi}. This is number one. This whole thing is number one. That's the first {rikpa}. That's the first reasoning. What did we prove? We proved he was?

[student]

Totally correct. Why? Because, he's the Protector, in that verse. Meaning, he teaches the Four Noble Truths. Meaning, he teaches the first so well [student] that he must be {tsema gyurte}. He must be correct.

[student]

Take for example. I mean it's [claps hands], you know, what are we going to argue about? Ah, how about let's take the Teacher. That's {tunpa churchen}.

What do we have to prove next? Let's move this one. Let's move this one up to here.

[student]

Let's prove that he's a {kyodpa}. And then it goes like that, you see, it goes through each of those five things.

Say, {tunpa}[repeat] [students], {tunpa}[repeat], {chuchen}[repeat], {tunpa}[repeat] {chuchen}[repeat] {kyoppa yinte}[repeat], you guys are sleepy as me. [laughs]

{kyoppa yinte}[repeat] {kyoppa yinte} [repeat] {drima pangpay chir}[repeat] {drima pangpay chir}[repeat]. Take what?

[students]

The Teacher. He is a [students] protector, okay. Got it? Take the Teacher; he's a Protector. Why? {drima pangpay chir}; {drima} means stink, bad smell. It's the 'ma' in [unclear] and {pangpa} means to eliminate. It means all bad qualities. {Drima}, in this case, means bad qualities. {pangpa} means got rid of, okay.

So, take the Buddha, he's a Protector because what?

[students]

He has eliminated all undesirable qualities, literally, 'all stinks' [student] in himself. Absolutely. If it was in us we wouldn't be here. [laughs] And, no one can do it for someone else. This is a, this is a secret code for one of the five



words in that original verse by Dignaga. Which one do you think it refers to?

[student]

Yeah. Nice. Okay. Who went to Bliss. This is referring to the, the 'who went to bliss' in the verse. The One who went to Bliss. That's a word for a Buddha. So we're getting, each of those five parts of that very first statement that we had is coming from. He's totally correct because he's a protector. He's a protector because he went to bliss. What does 'went to bliss mean'? Got rid of all your bad qualities and realised all things. Mainly, got rid of your bad qualities. That's what makes you a protector. If you're not that you're not such a, you can't protect all beings. You don't have the qualities. You don't have the ability.

[student]

And realised all things. That's what {sangye} means. That's what Buddha means: eliminated all bad qualities and realised all objects.

[student]

You can't protect people until you, you don't have the ability; you have to have three things to protect people. { .....} and partly you have to, you have to understand their, you have to be able to see perfectly everything about them.

[student]

What is it?

[student]

It's called {tokpa phuntsok} and we don't get it. It comes in the reverse order so we're not going to talk about it. We're concentrating. What does {sangye} mean? What does the word {sangye} mean?

[students]

Huh?

[student]

What does it mean? What's the Sanskrit word for {sangye}? Buddha. [laughs]

Okay. Buddha. So you have the word Buddha.

Now, the Tibetans chose to use the word {sangye}. What does the {sang} mean?

What is the {gye} part? There's two words to that. There's two parts to that word,

{sangye}.

[student]

Excuse me?

[student]

That's close. {sang} can mean to clear away something in the way that you clear away your sleep when you wake up. If you have a fresh, if you wake up. I mean, let's say after the coffee, okay. [laughs] The only way it happens. That's {sang}. {Sang} means to, like, clear away cobwebs. It's a word that means to clear away something. And that refers to the Buddha eliminating his bad qualities. And then

{gye} what do you think it means? {Gye} means to wide and {gye} means he covers all objects. His knowledge, that refers to his omniscience. So, generally, the Buddha has two qualities. The definition of a Buddha has two qualities: he's eliminated all bad qualities and he, and he, he has spread his knowledge to all objects. That's {sang- gye}, Buddha. And this is referring to the first quality: got rid of all his bad, everything negative. Which is what? What's the negative side of existence?

[students]

Huh?

[student]

Yeah. Afflicted side, which means what? Two things: two noble truths.

[student]

Suffering and what causes it. By the way, noble truths is a very, I don't know if we talked about it but, truth kind of means, you know, everything is suffering and suffering has a cause. But in the real meaning of the Four Noble Truths is everything is suffering refers to all suffering things. It's not really a truth it's a reality. It's that thing. Most people never grasp that. It's not really a truth in the sense of 'all men walk on legs'. It's not like that. It refers to all men. The first noble truth refers to all suffering things. It doesn't mean the fact that all things are suffering. The word 'truth' in the Four Noble Truths means that very object, that very reality. It doesn't mean, oh this is this. We are the noble truth of suffering. You are the noble truth of suffering. This wall is the noble truth of suffering, New York is the noble truth of suffering. [student]

They should have maybe translated it as the reality. It's a difficult word. The word doesn't refer to the fact that blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. It refers to that very object. You are the truth of suffering and you are the truth of the cause of suffering. As well as you have a bad thought in your heart you are the truth of the cause of suffering. You are both of those truths. So, [student]. Two results and two causes. [student]. Two results and two causes, in fact, there's two ways of presenting it but we didn't, we'll get [unclear].

Okay. So, he's gotten rid of his bad qualities, which means, suffering and the cause of suffering in his heart, okay. Therefore, he's a {kyoppa}. Therefore, he's a protector.

[student]

Ah, good point. That's a good point. That's actually true [student] but he hasn't .. -

I'll make this simple for you, okay. If you read the Tibetan, in the reading, there's an adverb here {sepa}, which means, totally. Totally. And in that case 'bad qualities' would refer to the inability to perceive all objects and that an arhat doesn't have. He hasn't got rid of the lousy quality that he can't see all objects in

the universe. And it's a good question and if you were in a debate ground you probably would have got somebody. Okay. Now what do we got to prove?  
[student]

We're not dealing with that now. That's dealt with, it is part of going through the list but it's dealt with in the reverse order, which we're not going to get into yet. So don't worry about it.

[student]

What do we have to prove now?

[student]

Yeah. Now we have to move this one up to here. We have to prove that he got rid of his bad qualities.

[student]

Yeah. That was number two of the four reasons.

[student]

This one?

[student]

These?

[student]

Yeah. It's always the same because that's the colon.

[student]

Because [student]

Say, {tunpa}[repeat] {chuchen}[repeat] {drima}[repeat] {pangte}[repeat] {tunpa}[repeat] {yinpai chir}[repeat]. I'm going to add something. {tong nyi kyi}[repeat] {tunpa yinpai chir}[repeat]; {tong nyi kyi}[repeat] {tunpa yinpai chir}[repeat].

So why, why should the Buddha be, why should the Buddha have eliminated all his bad qualities? What caused it? Now, we've used up a lot of Dignaga's statement. We've used up what so far for reasons? We used up, what was the first one? [student] What was the first reason? Oh, 'cos he was a Protector. We used up Protector. Then what?

[students]

Protector because he went to bliss. Now, actually, you're saying he went to bliss because of what? What's the only way to get to bliss?

[students]

No. Teacher. Now, what, doesn't make sense. [unclear] very logical and she hears something she doesn't like [laughs] – should do that. At this point you should say well what's that got to do with that. What you're saying is that he went to bliss or he got rid of all his bad qualities because he's a Teacher. But what's really the only thing that can get rid of your bad qualities? There's, by the way, if you have a bad quality, in Nagarjuna, in the Friendly Letter, Letter to the

King, he spends half the book describing how to overcome your bad qualities. And, and, and he's speaking to a monk also. He's speaking to monks and he says, he gets to a part about how to get rid of desire for ladies and he gets into a lot of reasons. He says, first of all, when you look at a lady try to imagine that junk coming out of all the holes in her body, you know. Out of her eyes is coming junk, out of her ears is coming wax, out of her nose is coming snot, out of her mouth is coming [laughs] spit and out of the other holes is coming worse stuff. He says try to think of that. And then he says you can also if she's your own age try to think of her as your sister; if she's older than you think of her as your mother; if she's younger than you try to think of her as your daughter and maybe you won't get desire. And then he says but it won't really work. [laughs] He says it's only, this is like Shantideva's first eight chapters. I mean, they, those, those are tricks that don't ultimately work. It's only one thing that really works. And what's that?

[students]

Yeah, seeing her emptiness. Seeing the emptiness of [unclear]. It's the only thing that really works. So, the rest of the book what does he talk about? Emptiness. And when we submitted that book to the publishers they asked us to take out the first half and just [unclear] print the second half as emptiness is cool and morality's not so interesting. [laughs] It was a very famous publisher. I won't say, okay, But, yeah, emptiness, okay. So, because he's the Teacher of what? {Tongnyi}; emptiness. That's the clue here. Again you need a clue. It's not evident. Just because he's a Teacher wouldn't prove that he got rid of all his bad qualities.

[student]

Teacher has to involve emptiness. He teaches emptiness. Student]

Take the Teacher, he's got, he went to bliss or he got rid of all his bad qualities because he's a teacher of emptiness. He went to bliss because he teaches emptiness. And then, the implication is the only way you could ever get to bliss is to perceive emptiness directly. That's the implication there.

[student]

Right, but he's a {tsema gyurpa}. He doesn't teach anything if he hasn't seen it. He doesn't say anything if he hasn't known it. That's a real important point and I'll state it again. {tsema}, totally correct person means you don't say something if you don't know it. He won't say anything unless he's personally perceived it directly in some way with correct, he's confirmed it. He won't say anything unless he's confirmed it with his own perception. That's a lot of what {tsema gyurpa} means. And we don't do that and I've noticed that about myself [laughs], you know. In a lot of what I say, I mean, it's like talk a lot at work I realised that a lot of it is not, and my boss is very good at saying, well are you

sure about that? I'll say, yeah, yeah. And he'll say, but what about that? And I'll say, well that's correct [laughs] you know. He's very good at getting it out of you in about ten seconds that you really don't know that. That's, that's part of {tsema gyurpa}. So he teaches emptiness. Emptiness is how he got rid of his bad qualities. How many reasonings have we got?

[student]

We finished three. Now what's the last one? We've got to prove what?

[students]

What?

That he teaches, that he's a Teacher. {Tunpa}[repeat] {chuchen}[repeat] {tong nyi kyi}[repeat] {tunpa}[repeat] {yin te}[repeat] {tuk je chenpo}[repeat] {yupay chir}[repeat]; {tuk je chenpo}[repeat] {yupay chir}[repeat]. {tuk je, tuk je} means karuna, means compassion; {tuk je} means compassion. {tuk je chenpo} means what? What's {chenpo} mean? Great compassion. This is maha- karuna, okay, very famous word. Great compassion; maha-karuna, {tuk je chenpo}. {Yupay chir}; {yupa} means what? Do you know? He has, he possesses, {yipay chir} – because he possesses. So, he's a Teacher because he possesses what? Great compassion.

What part of that verse do you think this refers to? Helps all beings. Now we've covered that one: helps all beings. So, how many? Let's count them up. What are the four? What are the four reasons that we've had so far? By the way, the reasons are named by their, by the last part. The four reasons, the four reasonings are named by the last part, by the thing that you give as the reason. What was the first reason that we gave?

[student]

What?

[student]

Because he's a protector; so, the first one is called the 'reasoning of the protector'.

What proved you as a Protector?

[students]

Huh?

[students]

What was the second reason?

[students]

Gone to Bliss. Okay. Gone to Bliss in the sense of he wiped out all his bad qualities. 'Gone to Bliss', don't forget it's a word for Buddhahood. What proves he went to bliss? How do you get to bliss?

[student]

Yeah, you have to know emptiness. So we say Teacher. What made him the Teacher?

[students]

Great compassion, which was what?

[student]

Helps all beings.

[student]

That's it, yeah.

[student]

It does doesn't it. [laughs] I hate to admit it. [laughs] I hate to admit it. By the way, these are very, very famous. I mean, people spend a whole year in the monastery studying these. They are not written down anywhere in any of the great books. They're always referred to. The whole book is designed around the four reasonings but they are never written down. By oral tradition they have never been written down. I got Rinpoche to write them down. You've got them in your, in your hand now.

[students]

But it's a great mystery, you know. I said to Rinpoche, do you know that these aren't written down anywhere? I checked in the computer. We've put in thousands of pages of books. They're not in the computer. He says, you're right. They're nowhere. So he pulls out these papers he wrote out in nineteen sixty-one, for him self, and it has them all written out, you see. I had the same problem, you know, thirty-three years ago. And he pulls out this tattered piece of paper and says, here you can write it down. You can copy it. So I had this same problem. It's very interesting. Yeah?

[student]

Yeah. If you, if you don't understand the link ask me. You have to understand the link.

[student]

Wait.

[student]

Weren't there five parts? How come there are only four reasons? What's the fifth part of that statement? It was on your first homework or your second homework. Take your second homework. What's the fifth part of the statement?

[student]

Turned correct.

[student]

Good. Good question. What, anybody know? How does saying he's Protector prove that he's totally correct? We'll go, we'll go in {luk-dok}. We'll go in reverse order. How do you know he's totally correct? Why do you have any faith at all in the Buddha? To be serious, why are you? You have a subconscious attraction

to Buddhism, everybody here, nothing logical, nothing reasonable. But what's the closest thing you have to reasons [student] [unclear] to be attracted to Buddhism?

[student]

Your personal confirmation of suffering and that's the first noble truth. So that's why we say he's Protector in that he shows the four noble truths. If he shows the four noble truths he shows the first noble truth. If he shows the first noble truth he must be correct. That's all. It's a good question. It's a good question and you wouldn't know that if you hadn't had the last two classes. It builds up to this.

[student]

Right. [student] Yeah. [student] Well that's a little [student]. Yeah. [students] [laugher]

But that's not how you prove it. That's not how you know it, otherwise, you'd be, that's reverse. That's not good reasoning. You can't say I believe him 'cos he's right, because he's always right.

You can't say I believe him because he wouldn't have said it if he wasn't correct. I believe he's correct because he wouldn't have said it if he wasn't correct.

[student] [unclear] be a liar, you don't know. [laughs] He could not know what he's talking about. Not so much a liar but just not know what he's talking about. So those are the five statements of Dignaga's statement. Why did we get into that you don't know yet. Okay. We're building up to something. What's the Course supposed to be?

[students]

The proof of past and future lives. We didn't get to it yet, you know. Why are we wandering around in who created the world and these five things that Dignaga said? We don't have any connection yet to past and future lives. It will come. There's a reason but those are the reasonings right now. Those are the four reasonings of the forward order. This led to that. This led to that. This led to that. And that led to that. That's pretty forward, okay. I did it backwards.

[student]

When you write it down it doesn't but you're trying to prove how he's starting.

[student]

Starts here. Great compassion is the key to everything. Great compassion is the, is the primal cause. We don't believe there was some god that's the primal cause. We believe that great compassion is the primal cause. We believe that great compassion starts everything.

[student: primal cause of what?]

Of Buddhahood. Everything starts from great compassion and we're going to explain that next.

[student]

Yeah. Yeah. In reality it starts from that. Why? You can't have bodhicitta without great compassion and we'll talk about that but great compassion is not bodhicitta, by the way. It's one of the causes of bodhicitta. We'll get into that.

Remember those seven causes, six cause for bodhicitta? We had it in the first course. Ah, yay [unclear]. Okay, have a break and then when we come back.

Have you asked me, nobody asked me okay. You don't care to teach unless you have compassion. That's one reason. They say, {... den}. Buddha has to have three qualities. He has to know everything and he has to have the power to help us but if he doesn't have love he won't care. I mean, you could imagine a being that knew everything and had the power to teach you but didn't feel like it.

[student]

Yeah, of course, yeah. Chain of causes are what are called forward order. That's the forward order and all that's hidden in Dignaga's statement. Dignaga's statement is very profound and you study it for like ten years in the monastery that, those two lines.

[student]

Yeah and that's a long story. That's a long story. Can you perceive emptiness without great compassion? Probably not. Do Hinayana people experience great compassion? We'll talk about it.

[student]

{...}, {...} means power, ability and {den} means has.

[student]

We'll talk about it. Yeah, it seems like it could but I think Dignaga wants to point out what's the primary cause. He got down to the primary cause now. Chandrakirti, he comes a few hundred years later, agrees. And in his book, he opens his book, which is the basic book on emptiness, by bowing down to great compassion because that's the primal cause. That's the first cause. They call it the first cause in Buddhism. That's a fresh idea.

[student]

Be the first cause? They say this one helps cause wisdom and bodhicitta. Okay have a drink. We'll talk about it when we come back.

{tuk je che} [repeat]; {tuk je} means compassion.

[student]

This is a long 'u'.

[student]

Huh?

[student]

Oh, whether the 'ga' in Tibetan is a 'g' or a 'k' is a big battle between millions of people. It's a ridiculous battle because it's between a 'g' and a 'k' you'll never



decide. You don't have that in English so I like 'k' because to me it sounds closer to a 'k' but it doesn't really matter. It depends on your ear. It is not either a 'k' or a 'g'. Depending on which course is ahead one is the guinea pig and I'm still figuring out what to say or [unclear] and we have it in the other course. There's actually six things but these are the two that I'm going to talk about.

{nying je} means compassion and {jampa} means love. And, there's lots of translations but, I'll give you the basic meaning of them and I think you'll agree those are probably correct. Basic meaning of {nying je} as a general word in Tibetan, compassion, means to want to get someone out of suffering. To remove someone from suffering, that's {nying je}.

[student]

As opposed to {jampa}. We'll get to {tuk je} later. So, what do you think {jampa} is? Love. What is love? If {nying je} wants to take them out of suffering [students]. Yeah, {jampa} wants to put them into happiness. It's like a child, you know, if he's sick you want him to get better. That's {nying je}. And {jampa} is where you want, you get him presents.

[student]

Excuse me?

[student]

Oh yeah. Yeah. They're both a wish or desire, a nice one.

[student]

Love. {Jampa}, which is to give them something good; to put them into some kind of good condition. {Nying je} just gets them out of trouble; {jampa} wants to get them into something good. It's the difference between compassion and love. And you see loving-compassion, loving-kindness, mercy [unclear]. It's a difficult word. To give you a sense of the Tibetan colloquial, okay, what it, I mean, {nying je} means what you do when you see somebody in trouble, you know. You see somebody in the street, he's all dirty and poor and he's got [unclear] {nying je}. {Nying je} means, you know, I want to pity, in modern Tibetan. {jampa} means, {jampa min dhu} means they don't get along with each other; {jamp kyi dhu} means they get along with each other, they like each other. So those are the modern senses of those words but the classical philosophical sense is wants to get them out of trouble and wants to give them something good.

[student]

These are two of the six steps for developing bodhicitta but that's not the point tonight. That's not .. . I'll give you the point right now, okay. They happen to be that.

[cut] [repeat] {chenpo}[repeat], {nying je chenpo}[repeat], {tuk je chenpo}[repeat], {tuk je chenpo}[repeat], {tuk je chenpo}[repeat]. {Nying je chenpo}

means great compassion, okay. What does the word compassion in Tibetan come from? What does {nying} mean? Do you know? What's {sherab nyingpo}? Heart Sutra. {Nying} means heart; heart or essence. Heart. {Je} is the {je} in {dorje}. What's {je} in {dorje} mean? Lord of stones is a diamond. So, {je} means lord. Lord. So what's {nying je}? [student] Lord of heart, heart, lord heart, highest state of your heart. It's a nice word. It's a beautiful word, {nying je}. But when we talk about the Buddha's heart we don't use the word {nying} because {nying} is a common word. When we speak about the parts of a higher person, like your Lama or the Dalai Lama, there's a whole separate language in Tibetan. You have to use a whole different everything has a different word. This is my {lakpa}, it's the Dalai Lama's {cha}. This is my {go}, this is the Dalai Lama's {...}. This is my {lu}, this is the Dalai lama's {ku}. You know you have to use these high words. So {tuk} is the higher word for {nying je}, okay. {Tuk} is the higher word for mind or heart, holy, holy heart or perfected heart. It refers to a Buddha's heart.

[student]

Excuse me?

[student]

Yeah. Maha-karuna. So what do you think is the difference between these two compassions? They're both words for great compassion. This one means great compassion and this means great compassion.

[student]

Yeah, one is a non-Buddha's and one is a Buddha's, okay. {Nying je chenpo}, great compassion, not enlightened big compassion, is that. It's the great compassion of a person who is not a Buddha. And then, {tuk je chenpo}, or you should say, I should, you can have {tuk je chenpo} before you're a Buddha actually. [laughter] Let's say Mahayana and Hinayana. Like, bodhisattva great compassion and non-bodhisattva compassion. Anyway, there's difference between these two compassions. One is higher and one is lower. They're both great compassion. What makes them different? There's two viewpoints here. One is the Abhidharma which is a lower school. It gives eight differences and I'm not going to go into them okay, 'cos she has to leave by nine. No. But I'll go into the difference in the higher schools. Separate. Get, let me see, are these separated [unclear].

{Drel} means be separated from, {drel}; {du} means want. So, what does {drel-du} mean? [laughs] Ah, yeah, want to see others separated from suffering, want to see them get out of suffering. That's called {drel-du}. That's one kind of great compassion and even Hinayana people can have that. They would like to see people get out of suffering. [student] Yeah. [student] Yeah. I mean a lot of people think there's no such thing as bodhisattvas or that bodhisattvas are not

described in the Hinayana literature. They are. And all the stages of compassion are described. The Abhidharma describes bodhisattvas.

So, {drel-du} means wants to see them get out of suffering, other beings. {Kyob-du} means what? What's {kyob}? We had it before. Protector. Want to protect them, you want to be the one to help them. Those are the two flavours. Those are the two like thirty-one flavours. Those are the two flavours of great compassion. Those are the two versions. One just wants to see, the first one, just wants to see them get out of suffering. The second one says I'll be the one to protect them. I'll be the one to get them out of suffering. Yeah but isn't that the sixth step of bodhicitta, the {drelwa? And isn't compassion earlier than that? And someone in the other class guessed it right off. This form of great compassion, the kind that wants to help them is the sixth step. It is that taking great, taking personal responsibility. And those of you who didn't study that it doesn't mean much to you, but this kind is only had by people on the bodhisattva track - Mahayana people - that actually take personal responsibility to help those people. I don't care if nobody, {hlaksam}, which is the personal responsibility means. And it's a very nice attitude. It's very good for you. It's I don't care if no one helps me, you know. If I think it's valuable I'll do it myself and I won't be effected by whether the other people help me or not. If they help me fine; if they don't help me I'll still do it myself. If they start to help me and then poop out I'll still do it myself because I think it's important. And, even if they attack me for it I'll still do it 'cos I understand that it's important. That's {hlaksam} and that's all tied up [unclear]. Yeah?

[student]

There's three kinds of compassion taught by Chandrakirti, not Dharmakirti, and that's a very long story and you'll study that. But, basically, the third kind is where it sees sentient beings as empty and wants to help. It's called, {mikme tseway terchin; mikme, mikme nying je} and we, it doesn't come in this book. It doesn't come in this context. He's talking about, there's another book on great compassion and it divides great compassion into three types: one is focussing on the sentient being, one is focussing on their emptiness as an empty person. That's a different [unclear]. Why are we talking about great compassion?

[student]

It's the fourth reason. And remember we said it was the original cause. Everything starts from there. You get great compassion, which turns you into a Teacher; because you're a Teacher you get rid of your bad qualities; when you've got rid of your bad qualities you're a Protector; because you're a Protector you're totally correct. That's how we got here. Now the last thing tonight and I can finish almost before nine, not quite. [students] Yeah, yeah, yeah - if I can go backwards.

How long does it take to gain great compassion? Oh, by the way, in the Abhidharma the difference between great compassion and, you know, this great compassion and the other great compassion: it's focussed on all beings, it's had by a Buddha who actually has the ability to protect all beings, like that. In the Abhidharma there's a whole, there's eight different qualities, which I'm not going to go into.

How many lives does it take to get that? I should, bad question. How long does it take to get it? How long does it take to get the great compassion of a Buddha?

[students] [laughter]

Millions.

[students]

Millions. Yeah, you could say three countless, you could say, you could say thirty to the sixtieth power aeons. [laughs]

[students]

You meet a teacher, he explains it to you, you understand it's value, you know. You go through those steps. But, anyway, according to us it takes millions and millions of years. I mean, it takes, it has taken you millions of years to get to this class.

[student]

No. I never said that. [laughs] [laughter]

[student]

Ah, I didn't say that. There are some secret teachings about it, which are secret, and if you see emptiness, directly, it's very common that you would have about seven lives to go. And when you see emptiness, directly, you will know that. You will see the seven lives.

[student]

You can't go to hell after a certain part of the second Path. It's called {jor lam sopa}. It's impossible for you to take a lower birth after a certain stage of perceiving emptiness intellectually. You can't go to hell realms, which would be a nice goal, right? Okay. So, many lifetimes.

Now, this is where another non-Buddhist school comes up, called the {...}, Chravakas, Chravakas, and they say there's no such thing as past lives. They are a Hindu school that was, you know, active during Dharmakirti's time apparently, fifth century say. And they said there's no such thing as past and future lives, therefore, you can't develop compassion over many lives. Therefore, this omniscient being called Buddha you're talking about doesn't even exist. So, Dharmakirti gets interested in what?

[student]

he has to show them what? That there's past and future lives. And that's how, now in the sixth class, we finally get to the subject of past and future lives,

alright. How did it go? Chandrakirti, Dharmakirti starts talking about the idea of pramana, {tsema}, correct perception. Then he says there's one being that has only correct perception, that's a Buddha. And then he goes about showing the steps by which he becomes a person of correct perception, which is those four reasonings. The last reasoning involves becoming compassionate. Then he says it has to happen over many lifetimes. And then he hits the Chravakas who say there's no such thing as future lives and there's no such thing as past lives and it's obvious because when the body falls down and stops, the brain stops and there's no more mind. And, obviously, when the parents get together and they have this, they conceive a child, the brain must start then because that's when the kid starts moving in the mommy's tummy. So life, life and the mind starts at conception of after that and at death any fool can see the body flops around for a while and then stops breathing and the mind stops. So their big argument for proving that the mind stops and that there is no future or past lives is what?

[student]

That the mind depends on the body, the mind is linked to the body: when the body stops the mind stops. And they say you can see it. And it's a pretty good argument. It looks like that. So, then, Dharmakirti has his work cut out for him. Now, the reading that you didn't get tonight, that you're going to get at the retreat, gives you three reasons why they, three, three ways they think that dependence occurs.

Three ways in which they say the mind depends on the body. That's also on your homework which you're not going to get tonight 'cos my printer broke so I don't know how we do this. You don't have a class for another week and a half so I'd like to, I'll print it tomorrow in New Jersey and I'll leave it here. You don't have a class a week from tonight.

[students]

Right. [students] I don't, I don't even have all the questions [unclear] [laughs]

[students]

They'll be here as of Thursday morning and I'm sorry just as I it broke and I [unclear]

[student]

Yeah, definitely, I'll print them in New Jersey. So anybody who's going to the retreat I'll have it on the weekend. Anyone who's not going to the retreat could pick it up here after Thursday.

[student]

No but I could also leave some in here and a lot of people have keys .....[further comments on getting homework]

So that's all. There's three, there's three relationships, there's three ways they say in which the mind depends on the body and it's up to Dharmakirti to prove

what?

[student]

He's got to somehow prove that the relationship is not what they think it is.

That's it. Kylie.

[prayer: mandala]

[prayer: dedication]

TYPING ONE OF CLASS SEVEN

940914-1.aaa

17a.txt

transcribed by: Andrea McCullough

ACI 4, Class 7

The Four Reasonings of the Forward Order

[prayer: short mandala] [prayer: refuge] [prayer: refuge] [prayer: refuge]

[student: unclear]

There's three, three versions, and in fact it's explained in the commentary of Pabonka to [unclear] [cut] where you would be here, and uh [student: could you spell that?] Yeah, you see it's spelled many different ways. In fact I have a handout now that I think of it. This one's just two pages long, nope. [Fran Dayan: Do you want me to save these handouts for next Wednesday?] Yeah if you could. That's four pages. Kyedrup Je is generally known for his tantric commentaries, and the other great student of Tsongkapa's, Gyaltsab Je, and he's known for his logic commentaries, but both of them wrote about logic and both of them wrote about tantra so we're gonna study Kyedrup Je's presentation. And Kyedrup Je's presentation about past and future lives hinges on what we call nyerlengyigyu. Say {nyerlengyigyu} [repeat] {nyerlengyigyu} [repeat] {nyerlengyigyu} [repeat], as opposed to {kyen}, say {kyen} [repeat] {kyen} [repeat] {kyen} [repeat]. All right. {Gyu} means "cause," {gyu} means "cause," and {kyen} means "condition," or "secondary factor." And in Buddhism it's very important, a lot of books like abhidharma talks about it and other books. What do you think is the...well let me, let me finish...{nyerlen} {nyerlen} means, I call it "material cause." Okay? {Nyerlen} means "material" [John Stilwell: would that be like "primary"?] Well I'll give you an example and you tell me. It's a very difficult word, but it's not a difficult idea. When you plant a tree, when you plant, what are those trees out, Oak trees, where I live? [student: yeah]. When you plant a ac... what is it? [students: acorn] It's an acorn? Yeah, okay, so the, the acorn is the {nyerlengyigyu} for an oak tree. Why? Because it's the stuff that turns into the tree. It's the thing... in Tibetan they say "flop over." It's the thing that goes "da-da-da-da-da" and then flops into a tree. It's called {unclear}. It literally mean, you know, it, it goes through it's life cycle, the acorn, and then at one point it transforms into the tree. It's the stuff that turns into the tree, and by turning into the tree itself... disappear. So you imagine that moment when the acorn is

sprouting and it's become a small tree. So the acorn, the s... the acorn is the material that turns into the tree, that's why I call it "material cause." There's a lot of other meanings of material cause in western philosophy, I don't know what they are. But when I say material cause, I mean the stuff that turns into the result. [student: a seed? Unclear] Well, like in the case of a pot, a clay pot, what's the stuff that turns into the pot, what's the {nyerlengyigyu}? [student: clay.] The clay. Okay. In the case of a ceramic pot the {nyerlengyigyu} is the clay, okay, and like that. What are the {kyen's}, what are the other conditions that are around when, when an oak tree grows? [Fran Dayan: you mean water, sun]. Yeah, water, sun, fertilizer, earth. They don't directly turn into the tree, I mean, there, you can find some of the nutrients that were in the soil turn, are in the tree, but they are not the main thing that flops over into the tree. There's always some similarity between the {nyerlengyigyu} and its result. There's always some thing in common, some characteristics in common between the {nyerlengyigyu} and its result. That's why you don't plant tomato seeds to get oak trees. There's something about an acorn that is some kind of similar stuff to the oak tree, and that's the, that's another quality of a {nyerlengyigyu}. There's some similarity, there is some kind of corresponding stuff between an acorn and an oak tree, and that's the rule of all {nyerlengyigyu's}. There's always some similarity, and we accept that when we go out into a field. If we didn't believe in {nyerlengyigyu's} you would go out in a field and water and throw fertilizer and wait, without planting a seed. And if we had a wrong idea about {nyerlengyigyu's} we would go out and plant tomato seeds and wait for oranges to come up, and you wait for a long time. It doesn't work that way. There must be some similarity between the {nyerlengyigyu} and its result. That's the nature of a {nyerlengyigyu} [student: you need both though in order to...] You must have both. The thing won't grow without both, but the main one which is important is the {nyerlengyigyu}. We say {gyu tong na drebu dokpay kyab} It's that unique cause which if it's missing or if you destroyed it, the result, what, could never come up. Forget it. I mean without enough sunlight maybe the tree would grow but it'd be wimpy. You know, without sufficient water it might be skinny, without nutrients in the air it would be like the corn in my monastery, you know. But without the acorn forget it. If you, if you damage the acorn or you remove the acorn there cannot be an oak tree. That's a {nyerlengyigyu}. [student: so how would you translate {kyen}?] {Kyen} I sometimes translate as "factor" or "condition" or "secondary factor," and all those other things are {kyen's}. The water, the sunlight, the nutrients in the earth, those are all {kyen's}. [student: if you were to translate it as "primary cause" and "secondary cause"?] Everyone translates them in different ways, but you know what they are now, okay. I, I would say, I like "cause" and "factor" because you say, you know, "it



was a factor but it wasn't the main cause." You know, it was a factor in the accident but it wasn't the real cause. So like that. Now we want to find out the {nyerlengyigy} for a very specific object, and that is the mind at the first moment of conception, or wherever, whenever you believe the first moment of mind occurs. According to Buddhism it's the, it's the moment that the egg and the sperm meet, there is a, mind begins, consciousness begins. We want to find the {nyerlengyigy} for that. Our goal tonight is to establish the {nyerlengyigy} for that, for that first moment of consciousness. You can't remember it. You know you had it, okay. I don't care whether you think it happened at that first moment of conception, or whether you think it happened later on, you know, after a month or after two months, but you have to agree, and you can agree that there was a first moment of your mind in this life, that there was a first moment of consciousness in this life. What was, what was the content of that first moment of consciousness? Definitely very primitive. You know, you were aware of heat. It was an awareness of heat, or an awareness of wetness or or awareness of motion of the mother or something like that, but you can assume, although you can't remember, that you did have a first moment of consciousness in this life, and I don't think there's any western scientist that would disagree. We accept that the mind is a stream, and that it had a beginning moment, and and there must have been. So you, put your mind, focus your mind on that moment tonight, you know, get that clear in your mind. There was a first moment in this life of consciousness, of awareness, something, some kind of very basic primitive thought, not even a thought, an awareness. Probably it was a sense awareness of warmth or wetness, probably it was tactile I would guess, you know it wasn't like a smell or hearing or something like that. It was some kind of very primitive first consciousness in the, in the spaghetti noodle of your mind that has come up to now. Do western people accept the idea of a stream of consciousness? Of course. You send your children to first grade because you, you believe that by the fourth grade they collect knowledge, that knowledge is collected somewhere. And there has to be a connection between the mind in the first grade and the mind in the fourth grade, or you wouldn't send your children to school. You you you wouldn't have grades, you wouldn't have second, third, fourth grade because there'd be no reason if there wasn't a mind stream, so we accept the mind stream. You know, you don't go to the school and say to the teacher, "I don't like the stuff you're putting in my kid's mind stream right now," you know, but, but actually that's what you mean when you go and complain about what they're teaching your kid. It's the idea of a mind stream, you're accepting the mind stream. So we're talking about the first moment of that mind stream in this life. What was the {nyerlengyigy} for that? Not talking {kyen's}, not interested in {kyen's}, okay. Not talking about the water and the earth and

the sunlight, the other factors, the secondary conditions that were going on. We want to know the stuff that flip flopped into mind, into the first moment of consciousness. [student: unclear] Excuse me? [student: unclear] No westerner can answer that, no westerner can say that, I mean according to our western... [student: I'm surprised how many westerners believe in reincarnation these days, not in quite the same way as Buddhists...] Oh, but not, but people who do, and even Tibetan Buddhists, and I'd say ninety-nine percent of Tibetan Buddhists, have no idea why it's correct. It happens to be correct, but they have no r, no, they have no logical reason for it. They just, their mommy told them that and they believe them. I was in Russia, and, and somebody said, "religion is like language

- you just do whatever your parents did." [laughs] You know, she says, there's a lady and she's very eloquent, she said, you know, "I speak Russian because my parents spoke Russian. If my parents had spoke English, I'd be speaking English, and, and our religion is the same." It's whatever they, whatever they did, you do, and there's no better reason than that. And even Tibetan Buddhists who happen to believe, believing in the right thing have no idea why, in most cases, seems like. So Kyedrup Je does a thing, it's called a proof by elimination, okay. He's going to go through all the possible things that that first moment of consciousness could have come from, and he's going to eliminate them one by one. So to do that you have to have this big outline of all the things that exist, and he does, and it's not so big... You've had this before in another class I think, but we'll go through it again. Say, {sheja} [repeat] {sheja} [repeat]. What does {she} mean? What's the {she} in {ye-she} for example? [student: {sherab}] [student: consciousness] "To know," okay, and {ja} means "something you can know, knowable thing." {sheja} means "knowable thing." The newspaper, the magazine that His Holiness's office puts out every month in Dharhamsala is called {Sheja}. It means "stuff to know, news, knowable object." {sheja} It's the synonym for all knowable things. Anything that can be known. Why do you think it's a synonym for all existing things? [student: unclear] Is it true that all things that exist are know by someone? [student: The Buddha]. The Buddha, okay, according to us. Therefore existence and the thing which is known are equal because there is a being in the universe who knows everything {sheja}. Two kinds of {sheja's}

[silence]

Say {takpa}[repeat] {mitakpa} [repeat] {takpa} [repeat] {mitakpa} [repeat] {Takpa} means "unchanging" and {mitakpa} means "changing." {Takpa} means "unchanging" and {mitakpa} means "changing." Don't get confused by the

negative in the Tibetan, the {mi}, don't get confused by it. It's a long story and if we had all night I could tell you. [student: Isn't {mitakpa} impermanence?] Excuse me? [student: Isn't {mitakpa} impermanence?] Yeah, I don't like that word. I mean I don't like that translation. I think it's wrong and I'll, you wanna know why? [laughs]. Just briefly why I don't use that word. This wall, this wall is {takpa} or {mitakpa}? [students: {mitakpa}] Excuse me? [students: {mitakpa}] It's {Mitakpa}, it's a changing thing. It's impermanent, if you will. What about the emptiness of the wall? What is the emptiness of the wall according to the highest school? The fact that it's not anything else than my naming an image in my mind, that negative thing. Don't write that down. It's not the point of tonight's class. But when, and that's {takpa} or {mitakpa}? [students: {mitakpa}] {Takpa} It's unchanging. The emptiness of the wall is unchanging. The emptiness of the wall is unchanging. [student: but it's not permanent.] Coming, coming. It never changes in its quality. Its, its nature never changes the least tiny bit. This wall is an ob, as long as this wall is ever here, it will always be nothing more than my naming a mental image. Therefore its, its emptiness is {takpa}. Now when I destroy the wall is there still an emptiness of the wall? [student: no]. No. The basis of the emptiness is gone. Therefore that emptiness is no longer there. That emptiness is, is still fine. That's why I don't use, like the word permanent. The emptiness of the wall is not permanent, in my opinion, 'cause when the wall is destroyed the emptiness goes away, but it is unchanging. It never changes in its quality. As long as it exists, it's constant. It's always the same thing. It's never more or less empty. So that's why I don't use that word. In the Lam Rim when you're talking about death and they use the word {mitakpa} "impermanence" is fine. That's, that's correct. Anyway, and by the way, you'll, you'll understand that one day in deep meditation. You'll have a direct perception of this distinction, and that's not a perception of emptiness, but it's a very deep thing that can only happen to you in meditation, and, and you'll see the subtle meaning of, of "impermanence." [student: what's that?] Changingness. Anyway, now we ask, could that, by the way, is the mind, we're assuming the mind has to have a cause. Is that correct? I mean is that much correct? Is it true that the first moment of consciousness has to have a cause? Could it be causeless? [student: yeah but I asked once what the difference, what things were uncaused, and you said you weren't going to talk about it right now. Can you... ]. Oh, I can tell you. Space, empty space, and emptiness, and it's a long, its quality never [student: But emptiness I understand. What about space?]. No, space is easy, its quality never changes. Space is not the void outside, and space is not the place between these two walls. It's a wrong explanation, and you'll hear people say that in Dharma teachings. It's incorrect, and, and it's taught in the first chapter of the Abhidharmakosha. Space is the

place where this pen is, and when I take the pen out of the space, does anything happen to the space? Does it ever change? When I fill the space does it ever change? It never changes, its quality. It doesn't become more or less spacy, okay. It never changes its quality. That's why space is, is one of the things, one of the few things in the universe which is unchanging, and uncaused. Long story. We'll get in, we'll do it some day when we do... [student: space seems inadequate] [laughs] I think you gotta say empty space, you know, it's a long story. There are, in the Abhidharmakosha some non-Buddhist and even some Buddhist commentaries try to present wrong ideas of space, for example, that it's the black stuff out there that the planets are resting in, and that's wrong, and then you see more sophisticated people say it's the place between the two walls, and that's wrong. So it's, it's a little bit tricky. Anyway, not tonight's subject. {takpa, mitakpa} So, so first of all can we agree that the mind at the moment of conception, or whenever you believe it started, does it have to have a cause? It has to have a cause. [student: emptiness is not space] Well, I think the main reason you could say is that it's, what, what were the arguments we already had? Why did omniscience have to have a cause? Why did omniscience have to be changing? Do you remember? Because it was focusing on a changing object, and therefore it was always changing in its quality, and also because anything which is variable has to have a cause. [student: why?] I'll say it again. Anything that's variable has to have a cause, because something is making it, as the cause loses its power, the thing changes. So anything changing, therefore anything changing has to have a cause. I'll say it again. Anything that changes has to have a cause. There's energy behind it, and that energy is fluctuating, and as long as the thing that's throwing it into existence is fluctuating, that thing is changing, and the thing is getting less or more or here or there or farther or closer or bigger or smaller. It's fluctuating. [student: unclear] We didn't prove that yet. No, but each moment of mind has to have a cause, because the mind is changing. For example, I, I just changed your mind, okay [laughs]. This, this object stimulates certain kinds of visual consciousnesses in you, and as I remove the object and present the object your visual consciousness fluctuates, it changes, and mind is, that's the nature of mind. It's not unchanging. If it were unchanging there'd be no Buddhahood 'cause you could never get rid of your {nyomo's}, your bad thoughts. You might as well give up, you know. It is changing. It fluctuates and you experience that even as I speak, it's fluctuating by the instant. Anything that fluctuates has a cause. So, assuming that you agree, by the way, everything I say tonight you won't agree to, and I don't expect you to accept everything I say tonight, but it starts the process of your doubting the bias you were given when you were a child, which happens to be wrong, and which is a great obstacle to your achieving Buddhahood. So as this course goes on, if it ever does [laughter]

you will, at least it will put a few cracks in your belief, or you'll start thinking, "where did that first moment of mind come from," and and and as you get more exposed to these arguments, which you won't accept the first night or the second night, you will start to doubt the position that you have now which is only because of your birth. It's that Russian language thing, you know. It's only because of where you grew up that you believe that, okay, and as you start to doubt it your behavior should change because if we're talking billions of years of future, or rather than twenty years left at best, things change, you know, like, I'd like to clean out my mind. If I'm going to be stuck with this mind for millions of years then let me clean it out, you know. Then it becomes a different priority, and you'll start to experience that. It will become, hopefully this class, I mean hopefully these arguments will start to have that effect on you, okay. If I'm going to be around indefinitely, rather than just for the next twenty years and then get some kind of a, what do you call it, there's a Greek word for mindlessness, I don't know, "lethy," or something, I don't know. You know, if you could reach a place after death, subconsciously every one in this room believes that they're gonna die and at that moment the mind just kind of goes away and you won't have to be around anymore, and whatever bad time you're having now will end, but if it were the other way and, and if anxieties you have in your mind now, and whatever indecisions and whatever torments by desire or doubt or anger you have in your mind now are gonna go on indefinitely if you don't do something about them now, that changes the, that changes things, you know. Then it's in your interest to clean up your mind now, because if I've gotta have this kind of mind forever, that's quite unpleasant [laughs], you know. So, is that cause, {nyerlengyigyu}, of the first moment of consciousness, put your mind back on the first moment of this life, of your consciousness. Is the, can the cause be {takpa}? Can that cause be {takpa}? Can that cause be something unchanging? No. We had it when we discussed the creator. When the creator creates he has to change. The creator five minutes after he created the universe and the creator five minutes before he created the universe are different guys. He had to expend some energy. He has to be different, okay. The cause cannot be unchanging. By delivering the baby the mother changes. By delivering the result, the oak tree sprout, the, the acorn changes. It must change. The thing we're looking for, which is, what? What are we looking for tonight? [student: {nyerlengyigyu}] {Nyerlengyigyu}, the thing that flopped over into the first moment of consciousness in this life cannot be {takpa}. We can eliminate that one. [student: Michael, is there actually a point at which the cause ceases and the next... ] Big debate, big debate in the monastery. Huge fights. When you really put your mind on it, when you try to imagine the moment that the cause stopped being the cause and became the result, that's actually one practice for

recognizing emptiness. You can't. It's inconceivable. Something, that concept, if you really put your mind on it, can lead you to the perception of emptiness, because it's impossible, it's an impossibility. We live on it, we believe in it, you know, but, but if you try to imagine it, if you try to conceive of it, you can't, and, and it can lead you to a perception of emptiness. It is one method of perceiving emptiness. Long story. [student: So you're saying it's an artificial distinction on some level? That has some sweeping ramifications, karmically, it certainly does. Laughter] Yeah, it does, it really does.

[silence]

Basically, and I say basically, when I say basically, it means there's an exception, like a logician has to say that, but basically {mitakpa}, there are two kinds of {mitakpa's}. Say, {bempo} [repeat] {shepa} [repeat] {bempo} [repeat] {shepa} [repeat]. Okay. I'm gonna change this one, I mean it's not the one, this is a synonym but I wanna put a different word in. Say {bempo} [repeat] {rikpa} [repeat]. Same thing, same thing. {Shepa} and {rikpa} are synonyms, but I prefer this one because he used it. {Bempo} means "matter, physical matter." Its definition in Tibetan is {tuldu drupa}, that which is composed of atoms, it's composite matter, physical matter, {bempo}. And {rikpa} means, do you know {rikpa}? I think some, some Dharma, some Dharma group uses it as a name. [student: Sogyal Rinpoche?] Yeah, {rikpa} literally means just "mind" as opposed to {bempo} which is, what? "Matter." Mind and matter. Okay, we have the word in English, mind and matter. {bempo} is matter, {rikpa} is mind. Basically, and there are a few exceptions, all changing things are either mind or matter. [John Stilwell: So when you refer to energy, would that be an exception, is it more subtle?] There are certain kinds of, "John Stilwell" is an exception. He's a changing thing which is neither mind nor matter. [John Stilwell: a combination?] He's a, he's a concept, actually, so I'm not going to get into it, but basically mind or matter, basically mind or matter. We're gonna look at matter first, all right, because we know the punch line is over there, all right? [laughter] [student: are you going to go off the board]. Yeah, we'll probably go off the board, I usually do, right? We're gonna look at {bempo}, two kinds of {bempo}.

[silence]

Say {wangpo chisuk} [repeat] {wangpo chisuk} [repeat] {wang} you know, right? {wang} means what? Empowerment, right. {wangpo} means a sense power, the five sense powers. So the root is the same, the root that's used as the tantric empowerment, {wang}, is the same as {wangpo}. Generally both of those words

mean "strength," like energy or power. So {wangpo} refers to the five sense powers, and {chi}, well we'll get into {chisuk} later. So what are your five {wangpo's}? They're stated in the heart sutra, {mikme, nawame, name, cheme, lume}. It's the eye, the ear, the nose, the tongue, and the skin, the body, responsible for sensing visual objects, audible objects, gustatory objects, I don't know, olfactory, gustatory, and tangibles. Anyway, things you see, things you hear, things you smell, things you taste, and things you feel. In the Abhidharma, and in Buddhist philosophy in general, it's believed for example, that at the back of your eyeball, there's a small patch of cells that can sense visual objects, and as, as an object changes in front of that group of cells it senses a difference and it conveys that difference to eye consciousness. It is not eye consciousness. It's a patch of cells that has a sense function, it has a sensitivity to changes in color and shape, and that's called the power of the eye, the sense power of the eye. So it's not your consciousness of the eye, its, its a physical group of stuff in the eyeball, the back of the eye. We call it the optic nerve that senses changes in colors and shapes, and, and sends, transmits that data to the, and actually helps stimulate a consciousness of the eye, consciousness of colors and shapes, not mind. It's physical stuff. It's living matter, so you can say {wangpo} here refers to living matter. It's not mind. It's physical stuff. It's sensitive, but it's not knowing. [John Stilwell: Why couldn't you say that the mind is simply that accumulation or compilation of all that sensing stuff which is processing?] It's a long story. In the Abhidharma the mind comes a moment later. You're always a moment in the past, you know. The object has been presented to the optic nerve, and the mind is only aware of it the next moment, after it is stimulated by a conjunction of an object, the sense power, and then that stimulates a mental awareness. So it's a different thing to sense colors and to be aware of colors. The optic nerve has some kind of sensation and it sends it to the, it stimulates a consciousness, but it's not the consciousness, it's the physical stuff. If you scrape off, you know, the back of the eyeball, you can't see any more, the pow, there's no more sensing of colors and shapes. So, that's one option, for what? What are we looking for? [student: the cause of the mind] We're looking for the thing that flopped over into the first moment of your consciousness. Where did it come from? I mean, you don't spend your nights worrying about it, right, but this is the key to, to finding past and future lives. We don't accept in normal Buddhism the method of saying, "oh, some people remember their past lives." We don't accept it. Why? It cannot be communicated to me in a logical way. I cannot perceive past lives based on this person saying "oh, I remember my past lives." I can't have a {tsema} about it, based on someone coming up to me and saying "I remember my past life" doesn't help me. I cannot have a valid perception of my past life based on someone else claiming that he remembers his past life. So we're not

interested in that kind of proof. It's not a proof, is what I'm saying. We need something like this. This is not just an exercise. It's airtight. If you follow with me and if you accept each step, by the end of this evening you must accept that you had a past life, and you can go home and worry about the details, or say that I don't accept one of these things up here, but if you're really a reasonable person, a reasoning being, you don't have any choice but to accept that there was a, some kind of {nyerlengyigyu} of mind before that, and that's, and you won't believe it, and you won't change tonight, but it'll affect you, and that's the id, slowly it should affect you. [John Stilwell: It's not clear to me why the sense powers aren't... ] Aren't mind itself? [John Stilwell: ... valid. Well maybe I'm taking this a step farther. The way you're describing sense powers as a conglomeration of...] Active, living cells [living cells interacting with its surroundings, as you describe that as a sense power, why can't that same definition apply to mind as a conglomeration of living cells interacting, you know, amongst themselves and with the external environment?] That's a tough question for me. I don't know, but I'd say that basically, the basic difference between mind and matter, you're asking the difference, what's the difference between mind and matter in Buddhism. Matter consists of atoms, matter is not aware. It doesn't have awareness. Does it have life? Yes, it can be living, and the sense powers are living, and and and physical things, it's interesting, the definition of, for example, visual objects are anything I can point to as a visual object [laughs], you know, it's that basic. So I'd say the differences are many and it'd take a long time, but basically matter is composed of atoms, matter is not aware, matter is not crystal clear, which awareness is. [John Stilwell: In a way, are you saying then that in a way awareness is produced as a result of the interaction of all the organic matter.] Yeah, the confluence, and the joining together of and object and the sense power, and it's actually in the wheel of life, one of the links which is, {shipa minsu...drupa rikpa} Number six. That's the confluence of those two things. [student: in experimental psychology they make the distinction between sensation and perception, I mean they emphasize [unclear] sensation is a physical thing that can be measured very easily, how much light gets into the pupil or something like that. There's a part of the brain that does interpretation of all the senses, and they make the same distinction. I don't know if that answers your question.] [John Stilwell: Yeah, it does]. OK. We'll get into the definition of mind. You'll study mind, you'll study Buddhist psychology at some point. So {wangpo} is living matter, and {chisuk, chi} means "outer, outside," and {suk} means "form." {chisuk} means "out, outside, outside physical stuff," okay. Not, not included into a living being. So it'd be like the wall, the carpet, the smell of my dog. Those are {chisuk}. I wish they were more {chisuk} [laughs] {Chi} means "outer" and {suk} means "form." These are the two



kinds of physical matter and we're going to try to, what, eliminate them. We're going to try to eliminate them, because we want to, we want to prove that, that the cause of that first moment of mind is is {rikpa}, over on the other side of that tree. So take a break now. Come back in about ten minutes, and...[student: You said it was not included]. Right. Well there's a big debate, okay. The tip of your hairs and the end of your fingernails, 'cause they don't sense. The powers don't reach that, so are they outer form or not? And they're considered to be outer form. Once your fingernail grows so long that you can't feel it anymore it's considered outer form. That's a debate. [student: Point of clarification: You said awareness is produced by the confluence of an object and its sense consciousness.] Sense power. [student: Sense power]. Not, and then the sense consciousness is, is generated by that, it's inspired by that. [student: But is there any other form of mind that exists outside of this confluence of those two things?] Mental consciousness. [John Stilwell: Say that again.] Mental consciousness does not depend on a physical sense organ to be stimulated, to occur. [John Stilwell: So you're saying it exists independently of the mind, the brain?] Long story. Didn't say that. But what I mean is you could have a person who is totally blind, deaf, couldn't smell and taste, and couldn't feel anything, and they would still have a mind, and that's actually what a form realm being is. Have some tea.

[break]

We're trying to decide whether or not, you know, focus your mind again on what we're trying to figure out. Focus your mind on the first moment of awareness in this life, and then we're trying to figure out what caused it, what flopped over into it. We're trying to see if it was physical, and right now we're trying to see if it was something living, one of your five sense organs, five sense powers, and Kyedrup Je's argument is "If you say that it's one of the five sense powers that flopped over in the way that the acorn flops over into the oak tree, if you say that it's that that caused your mind at the first moment of conception, then do all five have to be together, or is any one enough?" So he's actually giving another choice, right, and I'm just going to write it in English. All five, or any one. He says, "Do all five have to come together, or is any one okay." He says, "If you say it has to be all five, then suppose a person's optic nerve is damaged or something, then are you saying that that mind wouldn't occur?" So if, if the combination of all five organs is what turns into mind, then if a person lost his eyes, would he lose his mind, would his mind stop? If you say that all five have to come together for mind to occur, then you're saying that as soon as a person ever loses his eyes, his mind stops? And you say no. So he eliminates

that one. Then he says, "How about any one?" And he says if, let's take mind, let's take optic nerve, okay, the eye organ, the eye sense power. He says, "If that were enough to flop over into mind," this is according to Kyedrup Je okay, "the quality of that sense organ is that it perceives colors and shapes very distinctly, then it should also be a quality of the mind, independently of the, of anything else, independently of the eye, to, to capture colors and shapes as distinctly as the eye does." [student: And in the same way] And it doesn't. In other words, when you try to, you know, you can see your apartment right now, you can see your, your refrigerator, in, in your mind's eye you can imagine your refrigerator at home, but you will never have as clear of an image, as clear shapes, and as clear, and as vivid colors as you do when you look at your refrigerator. The mental image is always less distinct and less vivid than the physical perception, and, and Kyedrup Je says, "Since causes and results have to have a similarity, then if the optic nerve were the cause of your mind, then your mind would have to be able to capture colors and shapes with the same vividness that your eye does, but that's not what happens." And the same applies for hearing and tasting. You can imagine the taste of cotton candy right now, but it doesn't match up to the, you know, the experience of cotton candy by the sense organ, so he says, "therefore no one of them can be either," and that's his argument. [John Stilwell: So Michael, in the division, the {bempo} division there of physical matter, I mean it seems by saying the sense powers and things outside of our senses, external physical matter, that leaves out the inner organs and other organic matter of the body, by just saying the five sense consciousnesses] The five sense organs. [John Stilwell: Okay, five sense organs doesn't include the whole totality of our...] The physical body, yes, it does. There's nothing about your physical body that's not related to one of those five sense organs. Every one of your physical organs is tactile, I mean at least. [John Stilwell: So you're saying like the brain, the lungs, the inner organs...] Yeah, you can feel, all of those things can feel. [John Stilwell: But is the feeling nature of that organ the sum nature of that organic matter?] No, no. [John Stilwell: And so is it really, if you're only talking about the sensory aspect of the organs, and not the whole totality of the organ's aspect as organic matter, well it seems like we're leaving out some of physical matter]. No, because he did say all five. He gave you a choice, all five together, yeah, all five sense organs together. [John Stilwell: But what I'm saying is is any of the five or all of the five sense organs don't seem to me to be a complete description of say the lung]. Yeah, you have to get used to that idea, it's Abhidharma. It's the first chapter of Abhidharma. You have to get used to perceiving yourself as a conglomeration of those five sense powers, your physical bodies is. There's nothing outside of that that's not that. You're hung up on the visual appearance of the lung. You know, your western conception of the body is "this many long

things, this many round things, this many short things." It's not what the body is. The body is the sum of those five organs, and that's just, it takes time. An organ can be the object of another organ. I mean, you can feel the shape of your lung. You know, it could act as an object of the sense powers, that's true. You could see the veins in your arm. [John Stilwell: Those five senses don't seem to describe the complete functioning of say a lung.] They do. You just gotta get used to it. It takes time, it takes time. That's Abhidharma. When you study Abhidharma really well, you start, your vision of yourself starts to change, and that's why Abhidharma is useful even though it's hinayana. So that eliminates {wangpo}. Then he goes to {chisuk}, okay, outside form, outside matter, and I'm not going to go into it too much 'cause I don't, I want to finish on time. The ba..

[flip to side B of tape]

... okay, the four elements. We'll talk more about them next week. Did Buddhist scholars, or the Buddha himself, who supposedly could see all objects, did he really believe in this primitive idea that there's little fires going on in you, and there's dirt in your arm, and, you know, there's lakes in your arm. I mean, the four elements, is that primitive idea really acceptable to Buddhism. Yes, very much, and you'll learn more about it next week. They are not, they are, the word, {sachumelu}, the word, earth, water, fire, and wind, they are just metaphors. They didn't believe there was little pieces of dirt in you or little pieces of fire in you or something like that. They describe basic types of energy that would be perfectly acceptable to a scientist, and it's people that don't, that haven't studied Abhidharma that explain it wrong, and it sounds weird, and stuff like that. It's certain characteristics of physical matter that you can accept, any westerner can accept easily. Those are the four elements. So what he says, he uses the same process of elimination. Do you mean to say all of the four elements have to act together, or is any one of the elements sufficient? Which would imply that if one of the elements were, or or if any of the atoms were not present then the mind wouldn't occur. You know, if one of the atoms happened to be missing would mind never occur, or are you saying any one of the atoms could have created mind, could have flopped over into mind? Are you saying that all those atoms have to be present together, in which case if one of them happens to be missing, there's no mind? Or are you saying any one of them can turn into mind, and the others are just helping? And neither one is correct. It's the same argument. If they all have to be present for the mind to start in your mommy's tummy in the first moment of your awareness, then the minute one of them weren't there, your mind should go away, and that's not what happens. Or if it's any one of them turns into mind, then how does the mind resemble that

one? You know, is the mind hot if it comes from the element of fire? Or is the mind more feric if it comes from iron atoms? You know, there's no similarity between the iron atom and the mind. If, if the iron atoms flopped into the mind, the mind should resemble iron in some way, in the way that a tree resembles an acorn. There has to be some similarity, and there isn't. [student: But there, are they considered secondary factors?] Is it, is it thought that the mind, that changes in the physical constituents affect the mind? Yes. Can they be a factor? Yes. Are they {nyerlengyigyu}? No, and we get hung up on the secondary factors. Western people get hung up on the chemicals that happen, that happen to be present when mind starts, and they mistake that for the {nyerlengyigyu} of the mind. The mind in no way resembles matter. There's no similarity at all. Mind is, is invisible, crystal clear and aware, and physical matter is the opposite. There's no similarity. It's, it's, it's, it's, to a Buddhist philosopher it's red, it's, it's, it's a, it's a laughing, what should say, it's a, it would, it would be a joke to laugh about for someone to come and say, you know, all these chemicals in your body could turn into these crystal clear, ineffable, invisible, unaffected, knowing thing called mind. They just think it's silly. Who, who would ever imagine that? The mind is, you could blow up an atom bomb next to a mind and it doesn't move a half an inch. The mind is different. The mind is not affected by, by matter. You can't push your mind to the left or to the right. You can't split your mind up, you know. You can't say that the left side of the mind is different from the right side of the mind. You can't dis, distinguish its boundaries. The mind can stretch to, to Kansas right now, the moment you think of Kansas. The mind, the stuff of mind is totally different from matter, and, and it's just some kind of funny thing that we grew up with that we, we think any other way. The mind is invisible. The mind is ineffable. The mind somehow hangs around the body but it's in no way restricted by the body. The mind can, the mind can go anywhere right now. [John Stilwell: Is it appropriate to be kind of taking it to that almost metaphorical level of comparing the physical nature of the body to the physical nature of the mind to say that if it's not physically resembling it, it doesn't come from that. I mean is that just a, not a relevant... ] It's just a nature of a {nyerlengyigyu} There should be some similarity. [John Stilwell: I mean it should look the same, in appearance... ] Must be some similarity. Same characteristics. Now do the characteristics have to be physical? But in this case, yes, because you're talking about matter [student: Michael, I'm really confused. What is the definition of mind, because when you say... ] The definition of mind is very simple. It's {sel shing rikpa, sel shing rikpa}, "clear and knowing, clear and aware." [student: So this is like sort of Buddha mind you're talking about, not our ordinary consciousness?] No, absolutely talking about your ordinary consciousness. It only has two qualities, clear, ineffable, and it's aware. [student:

But, like a lot of us don't feel particularly clear or aware right now. [Laughter] Clear in the sense, you see, that the word "clear" in Buddhism even is very difficult. People, when they try to translate it, the word "clear" in the definition of mind is very difficult. Does it mean that you can't see it, or does it mean that it's always clear of bad thoughts or clear of confusion? Obviously it can't be the second one. Obviously your mind is often confused or unclear. So I, I should say it refers more to its quality of being ineffable. "Clear" here means "can't see it, can't touch it, can't taste it, can't move it, can't squish it, can't make it bigger. It's just not like that. It's different stuff. It's a totally different stuff. It doesn't resemble physical stuff at all. It's a different material, and, and, and that's a very important distinction. In Buddhism you have to become aware, the mind resides somewhere in the vicinity of the body, right, it's somehow related to the body, and we'll talk more about that, but, but it's difference, I mean a Buddhist philosopher at a certain point in his training would say "What are you, you know, why, why, what, how could you possibly think that mind could come from anything physical? They're completely different." You know, you can't shoot the mind, you can't squish the mind, you can't make a hole in the mind, you can't... The mind is a different thing. Mind is different, mind is totally different stuff. Where is your mind? [student: The thing is, I'm really confused because there's the mundane definition of the brain. I mean, you can destroy somebody's brain]. Brain is some, is some gray color and round shape. [student: Right, and if you squish that their mind won't work.] Are you sure [laughs]? [student: Well maybe in their next life... ] I'm not asking, it's not a facetious question. You're assuming the mind [unclear]. [student: Well, there are people that let's say were in a car accident, and their mind never works the same way afterwards, so... ] You don't know that. [student: Nobody says their brain, mind dead is, is brain dead] [student: Right, if they go into a coma, I mean we don't really know what they're thinking about, but it appears to us... ] It, it appears, and the Charvakas have the same argument. They said, "It seems to be that if the body undergoes a certain level of shock, that the mind stops, and until that level of shock is, is, is made to the body, the mind continues," and if you beat the brain, or if you hit the head at a certain ki, level of force, it appears that the mind stops, and that's all you can say. You don't know that the mind stopped. [student: No, but that person will have a very hard time functioning in this incarnation, their next incarnation... ] [laughs] Oh, no, yeah, obviously there's some relation between, that's a {kyen}, some, some conditions for the functioning of the mind have been altered. The mind, is the mind made less mind? No, and, and we gotta talk about it, and I'll give you a fore, a foretaste, okay. Dharmakirti is going to try to argue that not only does the mind not rely on the brain, the brain relies on the mind. That's gonna be his argument, and I,

I'll get into it next week. But you've reached mentally a very important point because he, he, he must bring it up. By the next class he's going to bring it up. [laughter] Does the mind rest on the body, or perhaps the body rests on the mind, and, and that's, we'll do that next week. [student: Where does sensory consciousness fit in in relation to the mind?] It's, it's, the mind is composed of six consciousnesses acting together. Five sense consciousnesses and one mental consciousness. [student: But you said that the mind is something that couldn't be influenced or altered and when the sensory... ] Its, its nature is not, no. But we had said before it's like a mirror. You know, if you present, if you, if you put this blue, if you put a blue wall in front of the eyes, the mind takes on some kind of blueness, and we accept that. It takes on some kind of, like, like a glass, or, or like when you, when you take water and, and, when you paint a bottom of a swimming pool blue, and then you pour water into the swimming pool, the water takes on some kind of blue appearance. It's not blue, but it, it takes on some kind of blue tint. It's not that the water got blue, it's the, the blueness is being reflected in the water. They say the mind is the same way. [student: So if you damage one of the sensory powers, organs, the mind doesn't change?] No. [John Stilwell: The content changes, but not the mind]. The content changes. You can't have a blue color any more, but actually you can... [student: So sensory consciousness in itself is what? In other words...] It's a clear and aware about, about, okay, we gotta, she has to leave... But, we'll talk about it. You have to study first chapter Abhidharma. It's a long long story. The first chapter of the Abhidharma presents this, and it's almost a quarter of the whole book. It has eight chapters and the first chapter is so important, that it's about a quarter of the whole book, and it explains the six sense, the six consciousnesses, and it's accepted by all the other schools pretty much. We got one more place to go.

[silence]

He says, now, "the last choice is mine." The last choice for what? [student: {nyerlengyigyu}] Good, {nyerlengyigyu}. What flopped over into the first moment of consciousness? What, what's right behind the door that, that pushed this consciousness through the door at the moment of birth, at the moment of conception? What, what was behind that unknown? You know, what shoved our mind into the first moment of this life? He says, now, now you have no, if you accept all of my arguments, which you don't, which you probably shouldn't. Yeah, I mean, I, I, I think we all have some trouble with some of them. I, I'm presenting, you know, Kyedrup Je's arguments, but I think they need to be cooked, you know, but if you, let's say you accept all those arguments, then the

only place left to go by the process of elimination is that it had to have been mind that flopped over into mind, that became mind. Now Kyedrup Je says "Was it your mind or someone else's mind?" And not a silly question. I mean, we generally, I think, believe that somehow our life, you know I've been thinking about it because I have to teach it, but I think somehow you think that life has been transmitted to those, to those cells from the parents, that somehow there's this stuff you call life, and in a certain point in the child's development it gets transferred to those, to that jelly, you know [laughs], and it comes from the parents, you know. I mean you, I, I think you really, if you're a scientist you're probably over here I think. It's chemicals. Certain chemicals under certain conditions become mind, and if your, you know, mommy, [laughs] I don't know, you know, all, all the, the living parts of my body have become life, you know, or me and husband's body have become life, and, or, or maybe you think, you know, somehow the father and the mother's mind have flowed, flowed into the little spot of jello. [student: So it's them thinking that the things they base on in their life are going to determine what's in their child's mindstream]. Well, no, but that the child of the mind came from the minds' of the father and mother. I mean, Kyedrup Je says "that's your, I'll give you two last choices." This is where he wants to go, right? This is his, the whole object of the whole thing tonight. This is where he wants to prove, that it came from your own mind from the past, but he's allowing you, okay, maybe it was your mommy and your daddy. Now how does he argue against that? He says "sometimes the father is a master carpenter, and the kid can't do anything with his hands. Sometimes the father is an idiot and the kid is brilliant." So he says "It can't be." And it sounds simple, and it sounds childlike, and some of the, some of Dharmakirki's arguments are going to sound very childlike, but I warn you maybe they are true, and maybe they are very deep, and maybe they're right [laughs]. So, you know, you can't go to the office and give these arguments to everybody there, but if you really think about them, you might conclude that you did live before. [student: But it seems to me a lot of these things [unclear] like very often in these discussions the distinction isn't made between mind as something that animates the brain, the body, everything the body's composed of, and is in some sense the spirit, let's say, to be called that also, that animates this body that is separate from genes, from which, you know, by means of which you may inherit certain physical characteristics, certain talents, certain whatever, so that there isn't necessarily a contradiction between acknowledging that there is something besides body, and the mind and the body are not equivalent, or, you know, are they integral parts of one another.] Yeah, I understand. I had a, I sat with a psychologist on the last flight [laughter]. No, we talked a lot about this. It's part of his work, and he said ultimately they don't really understand, you know, they can't really affect certain

genes and the child is more intelligent or something. Right now they can't do it, but anyway... [student: So how does, what's the argument then... ] So the argument, he's saying that, that's his final argument, okay, and that's nine o'clock too [laughter]. He's saying, you know, it's not true that the child is more or less intelligent according, in other words the condition of the child's mind doesn't necessarily have any similarity to the condition of the parents' mind, and, and one of the rules of a {nyerlengyigy} is that it should have some similarity. A acorn has to somehow have oakness in it or else it would make a lemon, it might as well make a lemon tree, but it doesn't, does it? There's some similarity, so, so he eliminates that one. Therefore, you came from your previous mind. [John Stilwell: But how does, how do, you know, how does he support that the mind is retained intact, you know, how is that explained to travel from last to next]. We'll, we'll talk about it, we'll talk. That'll be next week. We'll get to Dharmakirti's own arguments, but it has to have been a previous state of mind of your own, and, and the last thing I'll say is once you've proved that last instance, that once you've proved the existence of a single moment of mind preceding the first moment of mind in your mommy's womb, then your lives are beginningless and your lives are endless. Period. Your mind is beginningless and your mind is endless. It's a necessary conclusion. Once I can prove a single instant of your own consciousness prior to your first consciousness in this mommy's womb, it might as well be beginningless, in fact, and in fact it has to be beginningless. [student: I keep coming back, and somehow it comes out as... ] Okay, last question because I know some of you want to go. Go ahead, go ahead, say, say, say [student: You know, I can understand that emptiness is a concept so it's ge, it's generated, it's being generated shall we say] Wha, wha, what? [laughs] [student: Well, it's, it's, I mean the emptiness, the emptiness of something is our labelling it, our naming it] No. The emptiness is negative, so how would you say it negatively? [John Stilwell: It's the lack of naming it, is its emptiness.] It's the lack of not naming it, okay. [student: Right, right, but, but, so that doesn't, I don't have a problem with that, as a permanent... but space, I thing I asked this before when we were talking about creators.] How is space unchanging? [student: How does space, what's the explanation for the existence of space, I guess I'm asking.] Where did it come from? [student: Yeah, I mean to say that it's always being... ] No. It's defined as an absence of something. [student: Okay, so it's just, in a sense it's like... ] It's totally {gaksang} is the definition of space, "the simple absence of anything concrete." [John Stilwell: Then when you put the pen in that space, you said the space isn't changed, and yet there's a concrete object in the space.] Yeah. If it weren't absent of any concrete object the pen couldn't get in there. [John Stilwell: Yeah, but so when the pen's there it's no longer space, is my point, in which case it is changing.]



And the answer to that by a Buddhist philosopher is that since the pen is there it's absent. [John Stilwell: The space is absent?] No, the concreteness is absent, because if it were already occupied you couldn't put the pen in there. [John Stilwell: Right, so the fact that it is occupied, and not space at that moment...] If it weren't space, the pen couldn't stay there. If the space went away you wouldn't have a pen occupying it. A pen couldn't stay there because there wouldn't be any space there to occupy. [student: So when a female that is pregnant [unclear] not to have these good pure thoughts it's to have an indirect effect upon their child's mind] Yeah, right. The mind doesn't come from that gross thoughts, doesn't turn into those things. Those thoughts don't turn into the mind. [student: But they affect the environment?] Absolutely. {umdzela...}

[prayer: short mandala] [prayer: dedication]

Note: the discussion continues between Geshe-La and students for a couple minutes after these prayers, with background conversation.

## TYPING TWO OF CLASS SEVEN

### **Proof of Future Lives**

#### **Class 7 Part 1**

**Transcribed by: Karen Becker**

(prayer: short mandala)

(prayer: refuge)

(student: (unclear))

There's three three verses, and in fact it's explained in the commentary of Pabongka to (unclear), he would be here and

(student: Could you spell that?)

Yeah, you see it spelled many different ways, in fact I have a handout now that I think of it. This one's just two pages long, no, four pages long. That's four pages. Kedrup Je's generally known for his tantric commentary and the other great student of Tsongkapa's who...)

(student: Gyeltsup Je)

Gyeltsup Je (laughter) and he's known for his logic commentaries, but both of them wrote about logic and both of them wrote about tantra, so we're gonna study Kedrup Je's presentation, and Kedrup Je's presentation about past and future lives hinges on what we call (nyer len gyi gyu). Say (nyer len gyi gyu) (repeat) (nyer len gyi gyu) (repeat) (nyer len gyi gyu) (repeat) as opposed to (kyen). Say (kyen) (repeat) (kyen) (repeat) (kyen) (repeat) all right. (Gyu) means "cause". (Gyu) means "cause". And (kyen) means "condition". Or secondary factor. And in Buddhism it's very important. A lot of books like (b:Abhidharma) talks about it and other books. What do you think is the...well, let me let me finish the meaning. (Nyer len, nyer len) means, I call it "material cause", okay. (Nyer len) means "material"

(student: Would it be like primary?)

Well, I'll give you an example and you tell me, okay? It's a very difficult word, but it's not a difficult idea. When you plant a tree...when you plant...what are those trees out over the...oak trees?

(student: Unclear)

When you plant a ac...what is it?

(students: Acorn)

It's an acorn, yeah, okay, so that the acorn is the (nyer len gyi gyu) for an oak tree. Why? Because it's the stuff that turns into the tree. It's the thing, in Tibetan they say "flop over", it's the thing that goes duh-duh-duh-duh-duh and then flops into a tree. It's called (nga wa tse chung wa) and (chi lo so chung wa). It literally mean...you know, it goes through its life cycle the acorn, and then at one point it transforms into the tree. It's the stuff that turns into the tree and by turning into the tree itself (laughter) disappears.

(student: Oh)

So you imagine that moment when the acorn is sprouting and it's become a small tree. So the acorn is...the acorn is the material that turns into the tree. That's why I call it material cause. There's a lot of other meanings of material cause in western philosophy, I don't know what they are. But when I'm when I say material cause I mean the stuff that turns into the result.

(student: Seed? That the (unclear))

Well, like in the case of a pot, a clay pot, what's the stuff that turns into the pot, what's the (nyer len gyi gyu)?

(students: Clay)

The clay. Okay. In in the case of the ceramic pot, the (nyer len gyi gyu) is the clay, and like that. What are the (kyens)? What

are the other conditions that are around when a when an oak tree grown.

(student: Sun, water)

Yeah, sun, water, fertilizer, earth. Okay. They don't directly turn into the tree. I mean, they... you can find some of the nutrients that were in the soil turn are in the tree, but they are not the main thing that flops over into the tree. There's always some similarity between the (nyer len gyi gyu) and it's results. There's always something in common, some characteristics in common between the (nyer len gyi gyu) and it's result. That's why you don't plant tomato seeds to get oak trees. There's something about a acorn that is some kind of similar stuff to the oak tree, and that's a that's the another quality of a (nyer len gyi gyu). There's some similarity. There is some kind of corresponding stuff between an acorn and an oak tree. And that's the rule of all (nyer len gyi gyus). There's always some similarity. And we accept that when we go out into a field...if we didn't believe in (nyer len gyi gyus), you would go out in a field and water and throw fertilizer and wait, without planting a seed, and if we had a wrong idea about (nyer len gyi gyus) we would go out and plant tomato seeds and wait for oranges to come up and you wait for a long time. It doesn't work that way. There must be some similarity between the (nyer len gyi gyu) and it's result. That's that's the nature of a (nyer len gyi gyu).

(student: Do you need both (unclear) or separately?)

You must have both. The thing won't grow without both. But the main one, which is important, is the (nyer len gyi gyu). We say (gyu dong la drup me do bi ta), it's that unique cause which if it's missing or if you destroyed it, the the result what?

(student: Couldn't come up?)

Could never come up, forget it. I mean, without enough sunlight, you know, maybe the tree grow but it would be wimpy, you know, without sufficient water it might be skinny, without nutrients in

the earth it would be like the corn in my monastery. (laughs)  
You know. But but without the acorn, forget it. If you if you  
damage the acorn or remove the acorn it can not be an oak tree.  
That's a (nyer len gyi gyu).

(student: How would you translate (kyen), contributing factor?)

(Kyen) I sometimes translate as "factor" or condition or  
secondary factor, and all those other things are (kyen). The  
water, the sunlight, the nutrients in the earth, those are all  
(kyens).

(student: Do you ever translate it as primary cause and  
secondary cause?)

Everyone translates them different ways (laughs) but you know  
what they are now, okay. I I would say, I like "cause" and  
"factor" because you say, you know, it was a factor but it wasn't  
the main cause, you know, it was a factor in the accident but it  
wasn't the real cause. Now we want to find out the (nyer len gyi  
gyu) for a very specific object. And that is the mind of the  
first moment of conception. Or where whenever you believe the  
first moment of mind occurs. According to Buddhism it's the it's  
the moment that the egg and the sperm meet...there is a...mind  
begins, consciousness begins, and we want to find the (nyer len  
gyi gyu) for that. Our our goal tonight is to establish the  
(nyer len gyi gyu) for that for that first moment of  
consciousness, okay. You can't remember it, you know you had it,  
okay, I don't care whether you think it happened at that first  
moment of conception or whether you think it happened later on,  
you know, after a month or after two months, but you have to  
agree and you can agree that there was a first moment of your  
mind in this life. That there was a first moment of  
consciousness in this life. What was what was the content of  
that first moment of consciousness? Definitely very primitive.  
You know, you were aware of heat...it was an awareness of heat or  
an awareness of wetness or or awareness of motion of the mother,  
or something like that, but you you can assume although you can't  
remember it, that you did have a first moment of consciousness in  
this life. And I don't think there's any western scientist that

would disagree, you know. We accept that the mind is a stream and that it had a beginning moment, and and there must have been. So you...put your mind...focus your mind on that moment tonight, you know, get that clear in your mind. There was a first moment in this life of consciousness, of awareness, something ver...some kind of very basic primitive thought...not even a thought, an an awareness, probably it was a sense awareness, of warmth, of wetness, probably it was tactile, I would guess, you know, it wasn't like a smell or hearing or or something like that. Some kind of a very primitive first consciousness in the sp in the spaghetti noodle of your mind that has come up to now. Do western people ac accept the idea of a of a stream of consciousness? Of course. You send your children to the first grade because you you you believe that by the fourth grade they collect knowledge. The knowledge is collected somewhere. And there has to be a connection between the mind in the first grade and the mind in the fourth grade, or you wouldn't send your children to school. You you wouldn't have grades. You wouldn't have second, third, fourth grade because there'd be no reason if there wasn't a mindstream. So we accept the mindstream, you know. You don't go to school and say to the teacher, I don't like the stuff you're putting in my kids' mindstream right now, you know, but but actually that's what you mean when you go in and complain about what they're teaching your kid, it's the idea of a mindstream. You're accepting a mindstream. So we're talking about the first moment of that mindstream in this life. What was the (nyer len gyi gyu) for that. Not talking (kyens). Not interested in (kyens), okay. Not talking about the the water and the earth and the sunlight that the other factors, the secondary conditions that were going on. We want to know the stuff that flipfopped into mind, into the first moment of consciousness.

(student: Previous moment of consciousness.)

Excuse me?

(student: Previous moment of consciousness. (laughter))

No westerner can answer that. No westerner can say that. I mean

according to our western...

(student: I'm surprised how many westerners believe in it, reincarnation these days (laughter))

(student: It's not quite the same (unclear) when the Buddha's)

Oh but not...people who do and even Tibetan Buddhists, and I'd say ninety-nine percent of Tibetan Buddhists, have no idea why it's correct. It happens to be correct. But they have no re... no they have no logical reason for it. They just, their mommy told them that and they believe it. I was in Russia and and somebody said religion is like language. You just do whatever your parents did (laughs), you know, she says...it was a lady and she she was very eloquent...she said, you know, I speak Russian because my parents spoke Russian. If my parents had spoke English I'd be speaking English, and and our religion is the same. Whatever they, whatever they did you do, you know, and that... there's no better reason than that. And even Tibetan Buddhists who happen to believe believing in the right thing have no idea why. In most cases. (laughter) Seems like. So Kedrup Je does a thing it's called a proof by elimination, okay. He's going to go through all of the possible things that the first moment of consciousness could have come from and he's going to eliminate them one by one. So to do that you have to have a this big outline of all the things that exist. And he does, and it's not so big. We've had this before in another class, I think, but we'll go through it again. Say (she ja) (repeat) (she ja) (repeat). What does (she) mean? What's the (she) in (yeshe) come from?

(student: cognizance)

(Sherub)

(student: Consciousness)

To know. Okay. And and (ja) means "something you can know - knowable thing". (She ja) means "knowable thing". The newspaper...the magazine that His Holiness' office puts out every

month in Dharamsala is called (Sheja). It means "stuff to know; news". Okay. Knowable object. (She ja) It's a synonym for all existing things. Anything that can be known. Why do you think it's a synonym for all existing things?

(student: It exists. Someone has (unclear))

Is it true that all things that exist are known by someone.

(student: The Buddha.)

The Buddha, okay, according to us. Therefore existence and thing which is known are equal, because there is a being in the universe who knows everything. (She ja) Two kinds of (she ja). Say (tak pa) (repeat) (mi takpa) (repeat) (tak pa) (repeat) (mi takpa) (repeat) (Takpa) means "unchanging" and (tak pa) means "changing"...(takpa) means "unchanging" and (mi takpa) means "changing". Don't get confused by the negative in the Tibetan, the (mi), don't get confused by that. It's a long story and if we had all night, I could tell you.

(student: For some reason I (unclear) permanence?)

Excuse me?

(student: Isn't (tak pa) permanence?)

Yeah, I don't like that word. I mean, I don't like that translation, I think it's wrong. And I'll...if..you want to know why? (laughs) Just briefly, why why I don't use that word. These wal...this wall is (takpa) or (mitakpa)?

(students: (mi tak pa))

Excuse me?

(student: (Mi tak pa))

It's (mi tak pa) It's a changing thing. It's impermanent, if you will. Okay. What about the emptiness of the wall. What is the



emptiness of the wall according to the highest school?

(student: (mi tak pa))

The fact that it's not anything else than my naming a an image in my mind. That that negative thing, okay. You got...don't write that down, it's not the point of tonights class. But when you...and that's (takpa) or (mitakpa)...the emptiness of the wall?

(student: (mi tak pa))

(Tak pa) It's unchanging. The emptiness of the wall is unchanging.

(student: But but when the wall disappears...)

The emptiness of the wall is unchanging.

(student: But it's not permanent...)

Coming, coming.

(student: Oh (laughter))

Okay. It never changes in it's in it's quality. Okay. It's it's nature never changes the least tiny bit. This wall is (unclear) As long as this wall is ever here, it will always be nothing more than my naming a mental image. Therefore it's it's emptiness is is (takpa), okay. Now when I destroy the wall, is there still an emptiness of the wall?

(student: No)

No. The basis of the emptiness is gone. Therefore that emptiness is no longer there. That emptiness is is still (takpa). That's why I don't u...like the word "permanent". The emptiness of the wall is not permanent in my opinion. Because when the wall is destroyed the emptiness goes away. But it is unchanging. It never changes in it's quality. As long as it

exists, it's it's constant. It's always the same thing. It's never more or less empty, okay. So that's why I don't use that word. In in a (lam rim) and you're talking about death and you use the word (mi takpa), impermanence, is fine. That's that's correct. Anyway, and by the way you'll you'll understand that one day in deep meditation and you'll have a direct perception of this distinction. And that's not a perception of emptiness but it's a very deep thing that can only happen to you in meditation. And and you'll see the subtle meaning of of impermanence. Changing is...anyway. Now we ask, could that, by the way, is the mind...I we're assuming the mind has to have a cause, is that correct? I mean is is is that much correct? Is it true that the fist moment of consciousness consciousness has to have a cause?

(student: Yeah but you, I asked...)

Can it be "causeless"?

(student: I asked once what the difference...what things were uncaused, and you said you weren't going to talk about it right now.)

Oh, I have to tell you...space, empty space

(student: But how do you explain it? Can you explain it?)

And emptiness. And it's a long...it's quality never

(student: But emptiness I understand (unclear))

No space is easy. It's quality never changes. Space is not the void outside and space is not the place between these two walls...it's a wrong explanation and you'll hear people say that in Dharma teachings. It's incorrect. And and it's taught in the first chapter of the (b:Abhidharmakosha). Space is a place where this pen is. And when I take the pen out of this space, does anything happen to the space? Does it ever change? When I fill the space does it ever change? Never changes it's quality. It doesn't become more or less "space"

(student: I'm not asking about place we're talking)

Okay, it never changes it's cause, that's why space is is one of the thing...is one of the few things in the universe which is unchanging and uncaused. Long story. We'll get it...we'll do it some day when we do...)

(student: Space seems inadequate.)

(laughs) Em...I think you ought to say "empty space" maybe, that's you know, it's a long story. There are...in the (b: Abhidharmakosha) some non-Buddhist and even some Buddhist come and try to present wrong ideas of space. For example, that it's the black stuff out there that the planets are resting in. And that's wrong. And then you see more sophisticated people say, it's the place between the two walls, and that's wrong. It's a little bit tricky. Anyway. Not tonight's subject. (Takpa mi takpa). So so first of all can we agree that the mind at the moment of conception or whatever you believe it started...does it have to have a cause?

(student: Yes)

(student: Why?)

It has to have, huh?

(student: Why?)

(student: Emptiness is (unclear) (laughter)

Well, I think the main reason you can say is that...it's what what were the arguments we already had, why did omniscience have to have a cause, why did omniscience have to be changing? Remember. You...Because it was focusing on a changing object.

(student: Right)

And therefore it was always changing its' quality. And also because it has...anything which is variable, has to have a cause.

(student: Why?)

I'll say it again. Anything that's variable has to have a cause. Because something is making it...as the cause loses its' power the thing changes. Anything chan...there therefore anything changing has to have a cause. I'll say it again (laughs).

Anything that changes has to have a cause. There's energy behind it and that energy is fluctuating and as long as the thing that's throwing it into existence is fluctuating, that thing is changing, and the thing is getting less or more, or here or there or farther or closer or bigger or smaller, it's it's fluctuating.

(student: (unclear))

(student: The mindstream has never been more (unclear))

We didn't prove that. (laughter) No, but each moment of mind has to have a cause. 'Cause the mind is changing. For example, I I I just changed your mind, okay (laughs). (laughter) All right. This this object stimulates certain kinds of visual consciousnesses in you, and as I remove the object or present the object, your visual consciousness fluctuates, it changes, and and mind is...that's the nature of mind. And it's obvious. It's not unchanging. If it were unchanging there would be no Buddhahood because you could never get rid of you (nyo mos), your bad thoughts. Might as well give up. It's it is changing. It fluctuates. And you experience that even as I speak, it's fluctuating. By the instant. Anything that fluctuates has a cause. Assuming that you agree...by the way everything I say tonight you won't agree to, and I don't expect you to accept everything I say tonight, but it starts the process of your doubting the bias that you were given when you were a child, which happens to be wrong. And which is a great obstacle to your achieving Buddhahood. So, as as this course goes on (laughs) if it ever does, (laughter)

(student: What does it mean?)

You will...at least you'll...it'll put a few cracks in your belief where you'll start thinking of where did that first moment of mind come from. And and and as you get more exposed to these arguments, which you won't accept the first night or the second night, you will start to doubt the position that you have now which is only because of your birth, it's that Russian language thing, you know, it's only because of where you grew up that you believe that. And as you start to doubt it your behavior should start to change, because if we're talking billions of years of future or rather than twenty years left at best, things change, you know, like I'd like to clean out my mind, if I'm gonna be stuck with this mind for millions of years then let me clean it up (laughs) you know. Then it becomes a different priority, and you'll start to experience that, it'll become so...hopefully this class...I mean hopefully these arguments will start to have that effect on you. Okay. If I'm gonna be around indefinitely rather than just for the next twenty years and then get some kind of, what do you call it, there's a Greek word for "mindlessness" (unclear), mente or something, I don't know. You know, if you could reach a place after death...subconsciously everyone in this room believes that you're gonna die and at that moment the mind just kind of goes away and you won't have to be around anymore, and whatever bad time you're having now will end. But if it were the other way, and and if, whatever anxieties you have in your mind now and whatever indecisions and whatever torments by desire or doubt or anger you have in your mind now are going to go on indefinitely if you don't do something about that now, that changes the, that changes things. You know. Then it's in your interest to clean up your mind now. Because if I gotta have this kind of mind forever, that's quite unpleasant (laughs) you know. So, okay. So, is that cause (nyer len gyi gyu) of the first moment of consciousness...put your mind back on the first moment of this life, of your consciousness, is the...can the cause be (takpa)? Can that cause be (takpa)? Can that cause be something unchanging?

(student: No.)

No. We had it when we discussed the creator. When the creator

creates, it has to change. The creator five minutes after he created the universe and the creator five minutes before he created the universe are different guys. He had to expend some energy. He has to be different, okay. Cause can not be unchanging. By delivering the baby, the mother changes. By delivering the result, the the oak tree sprout, the the the acorn changes, it must change. So tha tha the thing we're looking for, which is what...what are we looking for tonight?

(students: (Nyer len gyi gyus))

(Nyer len gyi gyu), the thing that flopped over into the first moment of consciousness...in this life, can not be (takpa). We can eliminate that one.

(student: Michael? Michael? Is there actually a point at which the cause ceases and the)

Big debate.

(student: the next)

Big debate in the monastery.

(student: I mean)

Huge fights. When you really put your mind on it and you try to imagine the moment that the cause stopped being the cause and became the result, it that's actually one practice for recognizing emptiness. You you you can't. It's inconceivable. Something...that concept if you really put your mind on it can lead you to a perception of emptiness. Because it's impossible. It's an impossibility. We live on it. We believe in it. You know, but if but but if you try to imagine it, if you try to conceive of it, you can't. And and it can lead you to a perception of emptiness. It is one method of perceiving emptiness. Long story. Okay.

(student: So you're saying it an artificial distinction (unclear)? (laughs) (laughter) That could have sweeping

ramifications.)

Yeah, it does. It really does.

(student: Karmically it certainly does.) (laughter)

Basically, and I say basically...when I say basically it means a perception, like a logician has to say that, but basically, (mi takpa) there are two kinds of (mi tak pas). Say (bempo) (repeat) (she pa) (repeat) (Bempo) (repeat) (she pa) (repeat). Okay. I want to change this word. I mean it's not the one... this it's synonym but I want to put a different word. Say (bempo) (repeat) (rikpa) (repeat) Same thing. (She pa) and (rik pa) are the same word. But I I prefer this word 'cause he used it. (Bempo) means "matter; physical matter". It's definition in Tibetan is (dul de dru pa), that which is composed of atoms. It's composite matter, physical matter. (Rikpa) means...do you know (rikpa)...I think some some Dharma some Dharma group uses it as

(student: Sogyal Rinpoche)

Yeah. (Rikpa) literally means just "mind" as opposed to (bempo), which is what?

(student: Physical matter)

Matter. Mind and matter. Okay. We have the word in English. Mind and matter. (Bempo) is matter; (rikpa) is mind. Basically, and there are a few exceptions, all changing things are either mind or matter.

(student: So when you refer to energy, would that be an exception? 'Cause is more subtle than mind?)

There's certain kinds of... John Stilwell is an exception. He's a changing thing which is neither mind nor matter.

(student: Combination)

He's a he's a concept, actually. But so...I'm not going to get

into it. But basically mind or matter, okay, basically mind or matter. We're gonna look at matter first. All right, 'cause we know the punch line is over there, right (laughs) (laughter) so,

(student: (unclear) probably go off.)

Yeah we'll probably go off the board, I usually do that. We're gonna look at (bempo), two kinds of (bempo). Say (wangpo) (repeat) (Chiy suk) (repeat) (Wangpo) (repeat) (Chiy suk). Okay. (Wang) you know right? (Wang) means what?

(students: empower)

Empowerment, right. (Wangpo) means "a sense power", the five sense powers. The root is the same. The root that's used as a (tantric) empowerment (wang) is the same as (wangpo). Generally both of those words mean strength or energy or power. So (wangpo) refers to the the five sense powers. And (chiy)...well we're gonna do (chiy suk) later. (Wangpo) So what are your five (wangpos)? They're stated the (b:Heart Sutra)...(mik may nawa may nam me chen may may), okay, the eye, the ear, the nose, the tongue and the skin... the body responsible for sensing visual objects, and audible objects, gustatory objects (laughs) I don't know, olfactory and gustatory and tangibles, okay...anyway, things you see, things you hear, things you smell, things you taste and things you feel. In in the (b: Abhidharma) and in Buddhist philosophy in general, it's believed, for example, that at the back of your eyeball there's a small patch of cells that can sense visual objects, and as an object changes in front of that group of cells it it senses a difference. And it conveys that difference to to eye consciousness, it is not eye consciousness, it's a patch of cells that has a sense function, it has a sensitivity to changes in color and shape, and that's called the power of the eye. Sense power of the eye. So it's not your consciousness of the eye, it's it's it's a physical group of stuff in the eyeball...the back of the eye...we call it the optic nerve that senses changes in colors shapes and and and sends, transmits that data to the...and actually helps stimulate a consciousness of the eye. Consciousness of colors and shape. It's not mind. It's physical stuff. It's living matter. So you



can say (wangpo) here refers to living matter, okay.

It is not mind, it's physical stuff. It's sensitive but it's not knowing.

(student: Why couldn't you say that the mind is simply that accumulation or compilation of all that sensing stuff which it's processing and)

It's it's a long story. In the (b: Abhidharma) the mind comes a moment later. You're always a moment in the past, you know, the object has been presented to the optic nerve and the mind is only aware of it the next moment. After it is stimulated by the conjunction of an object to the sense power and then that stimulates a mental awareness. So it's a different thing to sense colors and to be aware of colors. The optic nerve has some kind of sensation and it sends it to the...it it stimulates a consciousness. But it's not the consciousness. It's a physical stuff. Why? If you scrape off, you know, the back of the eyeball you can't see anymore. There's no more sensing of of (laughs) colors and shapes, okay. So. That's one option for what? What are we looking for?

(student: (unclear) Oh we're looking for (unclear)

We're looking for the thing that flopped over into the first moment of your consciousness in this life. Where did it come from. I mean you don't spend your nights worrying about it, right? But this is the key to finding past and future lives. We don't accept, in normal Buddhism, the method of saying, oh some people remember their past lives. We don't accept it. Why? It can not can be communicated to me in a logical way. I can not perceive past lives based on this person saying "oh I remember my past lives". I can't have a (tse ma) about it, based on someone coming up to me and saying, "I remember my past life", doesn't help me. I can not have a valid perception of my past life based on someone else claiming that he remembers his past life. Can not. Okay. So we're not interested in that kind of

proof. It's not a proof, what I'm saying. We we need something like this, you let...just this is not just an exercise. It's air tight. If you follow with me and if you accept each step, and by the end of this evening you must accept that you had a past life.

And you can go home and worry about the details, or say that I don't accept one of these things up here, but if you're really a reasonable person, a reasoning being, you don't have any choice but to accept that there was a some kind of (nyer len gyi gyu) of mind before that. And that that you won't believe and you won't change tonight. But it'll affect you and that's the id...slowly it should affect you. Yeah.

(student: It's not clear to me why the sense powers aren't...)

Aren't mind itself?

(student: valid. Well, maybe I'm maybe I'm taking this a step farther. The way you're describing sense powers as a conglomeration of..)

Active ce...living cells.

(student: living cells interacting with its' surroundings, as you described that as a sense power, why can't that same definition apply to mind as a a conglomeration of living cells interacting, you know, amongst themselves with the external environment?)

That's a tough question for me. I don't know. But I'd say that basically, the basic difference between mind and matter...you're asking the difference in...what's the difference between mind and matter in Buddhism...how...matter is...consists of atoms, matter is not aware, doesn't have awareness. Does it have life? Yes, it can be living. And the sense powers are living. And and and physical things...it's interesting, the definition of, for example, visual objects are anything I can point to as a (laughs) visual object, it's that basic, so I'd say the differences are many and it's take a long time, but basically matter is composed of atoms, matter is not aware, matter is not crystal clear which awareness is.

(student: In a way...are you saying then in a way awareness is produced as a result of )

Yeah

(student: it's interaction of all the organic matter?)

The confluence, the joining together of an object and the sense power. And it's actually in the wheel of life. One of the links which is...(shi ba ming dze rab (unclear) kei che tuppa rikpa), number six, it that's the confluence of those two things.

(student: In the in the some of the psychology you made the distinction between sen...sensation and perception. I mean they, even the scientists backs it up too, this sensa...sensation is a physical thing which can be measured very easily, like how much light gets into the pupil and something like that, there's a part of the brain that does interpretation with all the senses and they get the same (unclear)

We'll get into the definition of mind...you'll study mind. You'll you'll study Buddhist psychology at some point.

(student: Michael?)

So (wangpo) is living matter and (chiy suk), (chiy) means "outer; outside", and (suk) means "four". (Chiy suk) means "out...outside outside physical stuff", okay (laughs) not not included into a living being. Something like the wall, the carpet, the smell of my dogs (laughs) (laughter) okay, those are (chiy suk), okay. I wish they were in more (chiy suk) (laughs)

(student: What does (chiy) and (suk) (unclear?)

(Chiy) means "outer". And (suk) means "four". These are the two kinds of physical matter. And we're going to try to what?

(student: Prove them?)

Eliminate them (laughs). We're going to try to eliminate them.

'Cause we wanna, we wanna prove that that the cause of that first moment of mind is is (rikpa). Over on the other side of that tree. And a...

(student: You said it was not included in the (unclear).)

Right. Well, there's a big debate, okay. Tip of your hairs and the end of your fingernails, okay, 'cause they and they don't sense. There's no...the powers don't reach that. So are they outer form or not? They're they're considered to be outer form. Once once your fingernail grows so long and can't feel it when someone goes like that, it's considered outer. That's the debate.

(student: I'm so...point of clar...point of clarification, you said that awareness is produced by the confluence of the object and its' sense consciousness?)

Yeah, sense power.

(student: Sense power.)

Not it...and then the sense consciousness is it's generated by that.

(student: Okay)

It's inspired by that.

(student: But is there any other form of mind which exists outside of this confluence of these two things?)

Mental...the mental consciousness.

(student: Mental consciousness.)

(student: Say that again? Mental consci...consciousness exists outside...)

Mental consciousness does not depend on a physical sense organ to

be stimulated, to occur.

(student: Depend on...)

(student: So you're saying it exists independently of the mi...the brain.)

Long story. Didn't say that. But what I mean is, you could have a person who is totally blind, deaf, didn't couldn't smell and taste and couldn't feel anything and they would still have a mind.

(student: Okay)

And that's that's actually what a formless realm being is. Have some tea, okay.

We're trying to decide whether or not...you know, focus your mind again on what what we're trying to figure out. Focus your mind on the first moment of awareness in this life. And then we're trying to figure out what caused it. What flopped over. And we decided...we're trying to see if it was physical, and and right now we're trying to see if it was something living, one of your five sense organs, okay, your five sense powers. And Kedrup Je's argument is if you say that it's the five sense powers that flopped over in the way that the acorn flops over into the oak tree, if you say that it's that that caused your mind at the first moment of conception, then do all five have to be together or is any one enough? So he's actually giving another choice...go ahead...and I'm just gonna write it in English. All five or any one. He says do all five have to come together or is any one okay? He says if it's...if you say it has to be all five, then suppose a person's optic nerve is damaged or something. Then you're saying that the mind that mind wouldn't occur? So it it isn't if the combination of all five organs is what turns into mind, then if a person lost his eyes, would he lose his mind? Would his mind stop. If you say that all five have to come together for mind to occur, then you're saying that as soon as a person ever loses his eyes, his mind stops? You say, no. So he eliminates that one. Then he says, and how about

any one? And he says if...let's take mind...let's take optic nerve, okay? The eye organ, the eye sense power. He says, if that were enough to flop over into mind...this is according to Kedrup Je, okay? Then the quality of that sense organ is that it perceives colors and shapes very distinctly. Then it should also be a quality of the mind, independently of anything else, independently of the eye, to capture colors and shapes as distinctly as the eye does.

(student: And in the same way.)

And it doesn't. In other words, when you tried to...you know, you can see your apartment right now, you can see your your refrigerator, in yo..in in your mind's eye, you can imagine your refrigerator at home, but you you will never have as clear of an image as clear shapes and as clear...and as vivid colors as you do when you look at your refrigerator. The mental image is always less distinct and less vivid then the physical perception, and and Kedrup Je says, since causes and results have to have a similarity, and if then...optic nerve were the cause of your mind, then your mind would have to be able to capture colors and shapes with the same vividness that your eye does. But that's not what happens. And the same applies for hearing and tasting...you can imagine the taste of cotton candy right now, but it doesn't match up to the, you know, the experience of cotton candy by the sense organ, so he says therefore, no one of them can be either, and that's that's his argument.

(student: So Michael, in the divis...the (bempo) division there of physical matter, I mean it seems by saying the sense powers of things outside of our senses, external physical matter, that leaves out the inner organs and other organic matter of the body by just saying the five sense consciousness doesn't)

Five sense organs. (unclear)

(student: Okay. five sense organs doesn't include the whole totality of our...)

Physical body, yes, it does.

(student: It does?)

There's nothing about your physical body that's not related to one of those five sense organs. Ev...every part of your physical body is is tactile, just I mean (unclear)

(student: So you're saying like the brain, the lungs, the)

Yeah.

(student: inner organs)

You can you can feel, all those things can feel.

(student: yeah. But is the feeling nature of that organ the sum)

No, no

(student: nature of that organic matter?)

No, no.

(student: And so is it really, if you're only talking about the sensory aspect of the organ)

Yeah

(student: and not the whole totality of the organ's aspect as organic matter, well it seems like we're leaving out some of physical matter.)

No, 'cause he said all...he did say all five. He gave you a choice.

(student: All five)

All five together.

(student: sense)

Yeah, all five sense organs together.

(student: But what I'm saying is is any of the five or all of the five sense organs don't seem to me to be a complete description of say, the lung.)

Yeah, you have to get used to that idea. It's (b: Abhidharma)...first chapter of (b: Abhidharma). You have to get used to perceiving yourself as a conglomeration of those five sense powers...your physical body is...there's nothing outside of that that's (unclear). You're hung-up on the visual appearance of the lung, you know, your your western conception of the body is is this many long things, this many round things, this many short things...it's it's not what the body is. The body is the sum of those five organs, and that's just...takes time. An organ can be the object of another organ. I mean, you can feel the shape of your lung. You know, you could...it could it could act as a as an object of the sense power, that's true. You could see your...you could see the veins in your arm.

(student: Those five senses don't seem to describe the complete function in which they (unclear), or do they?)

They do.

(student: Yeah?)

You just gotta get used to it. Takes time. Takes time. That's (b: Abhidharma). When you study (b: Abhidharma) really well you start...your vision of yourself starts to change, and that's why (b: Abhidharma) is useful. Even though it's Hinayana. So that eliminates (wangpo). Then he goes to (chiy suk), okay, outside four, outside matter). And I'm not going to go into it too much 'cause I don...I wanna finish on time, but, okay the four elements. We'll talk more about them next week. Did Buddhist scholars or the Buddha himself, who supposedly can see all objects, did he really believe in this primitive idea that there's little fires going on in you, and the dirt in your arm, and you know, some lakes in your arm, and, I mean, the four



elements, that...is that primitive idea really acceptable to Buddhism? Yes, very much. And you'll learn more about it next week. They they are not...they are...the word (sa chu mei lung), the word earth, water, fire and wind, they are just metaphors. They didn't believe there's little pieces of dirt in you or little pieces of fire in you, or something like that. They describe basic types of energy that would be perfectly acceptable to a scientist. And it's people that don't...that haven't studied (b: Abhidharma) that explain it wrong, and it sounds weird and stuff like that. It's it's certain characteristics of physical matter that you can accept...any westerner can accept easily. That...those are the four elements. So what he says, he uses the same process of elimination. He says, you mean to say that all four elements have to act together or is any one of the elements sufficient...which would imply that if one of the elements were...if if or or any of the atoms were not present then the mind wouldn't occur? You know, if one of the atoms happened to be missing, would mind never occur? And...or are you saying that any one of the atoms could have created mind, could have flopped over into mind. Are you saying that all those atoms have to be present together in which case if one of them happens to be missing there's no mind, or are you saying anyone of them can turn into mind and the others are just helping? And and neither neither one is is correct. It's the same argument. If if they all have to be present for the mind to start in your mommy's tummy in the first moment of your awareness, then the minute one of them weren't there, your mind should go away. And that's not what happens. Or if it's any one of them turns into mind, then how does the mind resemble that one? You know, the is the mind hot if it comes from the element of fire or is the mind more ferric if it comes from iron atoms, you know, what...there's no similarity between the iron atom and the mind. If if the iron atom flopped into the mind, the mind should resemble iron in some way, in the way that a tree resembles an acorn. There has to be some similarity. And there isn't.

(student: Are there...are they considered secondary factors?)

Is it it thought that the mind that that changes in the physical constituents affect the mind, yes. Can they be a

factor? Yes. Are they (nyer len gyi gyu)? No. And and we get hung up on the on the secondary factors. Western people get hungup on the chemicals that happen that happen to be present when mind starts, and they mistake that for the (nyer len gui gyu) of the mind. The mind in no way resembles matter. There's no similarity at all. Mind is is invisible, crystal clear and aware. And physical matter is the opposite. There's no similarity. It's it's it's it's to a Buddhist philosopher, it's it's it's it's a laughing, what you say, it's a it would it would be a joke to laugh about for someone to come and say, you know, all these chemicals in your body could turn into this crystal clear, ineffable, invisible, unaffected, knowing thing called mind. They'd just think it's silly...who'd who'd ever imagine that? You know, the mind is...you could blow up an atom bomb next to a mind and it doesn't move a half an inch. Mind is different. Mind is not affected by by matter. You can't push your mind to the left or the right, you know, you can't split your mind up, you know, you can't say that the left side of the mind is different from the right side of the mind, you can't dis...distinguish its boundaries, the mind can stretch to to Kansas right now, the moment you think of Kansas, the mind...the stuff of mind is totally different from matter, and and it's just some kind of funny thing that we grew up with that we we think any other way. The mind is in visible. The mind is ineffable.

(student: It is...)

The mind somehow hangs around the body but it's in no way restricted by the body. The mind can...the mind can go anywhere right now.

(student: Is it appropriate to be kinda taking it to that almost metaphorical level of comparing the physical nature of the body to the physical nature of the mind, to say that if it's not physically resembling it, it it doesn't come from that. I mean is that just a not in a relevant)

It's just the nature of a (nyer len gyi gyu). There should be some similarity.

(student: And they should look the same)

Must be some similarity.

(student: In appearance...)

Same same characteristics. Now...do characteristics have to be physical characteristics? No. But in this case yes since you're talking about matter (laughs).

(student: Michael? I'm really confused. What is the definition of mind, because when you say...)

Definition of mind is very simple in Buddhism, (sel shing rikpa). (Sel shing rikpa). Clear and knowing. Clear and aware.

(student: So...So this is like sort of the Buddha mind (unclear) and not our ordinary consciousness.)

No, absolutely, talking about your ordinary consciousness. It only has two qualities. It's clear, it's ineffable, and it's aware.

(student: But psychologically I don't feel particularly clear or aware right now (laughter) (laughs))

Clear in the sense you see...the the word "clear" in Buddhism even is very difficult. People when they try to translate it, the word "clear" in the definition of mind it's very difficult. Does it mean that you can't see it, or does it mean that it's always clear of bad thoughts and and clear of confusion. Obviously it can't be the second one. Obviously your mind is often confused or unclear. So I I I should say it's refers more to it's quality of being ineffable, you know, "clear" here means can't see it, can't touch it, can't taste it, can't move it, can't cut it, can't squish it, can't make it bigger, it's just not like that. It's different stuff. It's a totally different stuff. It it doesn't resemble physical stuff at all. It's a different material. And and and that's a very important distinction in Buddhism, you have to become aware that the mind

resides somewhere in the vicinity of the body, right, somehow related to the body, and we'll talk more about that, but but it's difference...it's, I mean a Buddhist philosopher at a certain point in his training would say, we...you know, why why what how could you possibly think that mind could come from anything physical? They're completely different, you know. You can't shoot the mind, you can't squish the mind, you can't make a hole in the mind, you can't...mind is different thing. Mind is different...totally different stuff. Where's your mind? (laughs)

(student: (unclear) I'm confused because there's the mundane definition of the brain, I mean, you can destroy somebody's brain.)

Brain is some is some grey color and round shape.

(student: Right. And if you squish that their mind won't work.)

You sure?

(student: Well maybe (laughs) in the next life it will (laughs) (laughter) work but (unclear) (laughter))

But anyway, I'm not asking...not facetious question. You're assuming the mind doesn't work.

(student: Well, there are people that but they're in a car accident their mind never works the same way afterwards, so)

You don't know that.

(student: Nobody says they're brain-dead...mind-dead...they say they're brain-dead)

(student: A brain and a mind are still the same thing.)

(student: Right. (unclear) still goes into a coma, we we don't really know what what they're thinking about, but it appears to us they're in...)

It it appears and the Charvakas had the same argument. They said it seems to be that if the body undergoes a certain level of shock, that the mind stops, and until that level of shock is is made to the body, the mind continues, and if you beat the the brain, or if you hit the head at a certain kin...level of force, it appears that the mind stops. And that's all that you can say. You don't know that the mind stops.

(student: No, but that person who has a very hard time functioning in this incarnation, their next incarnation (laughs) (unclear) but

Oh no. Yeah. Obviously there's some relation between...that's a (kyen). Some some conditions for the functioning of the mind have been altared. The mind...is the mind made less mind? No. And and we gotta talk about it. And and I'll give you a fore...a foretaste, okay. Dharmakirti is going to try to argue that, not only does the mind not rely on the brain, the brain relays on it's mind. That's gonna be his argument, and and I'll get into it next week, but you've reached mentally a very important point, because he he he must bring it up by the next class, he's going to bring it up (laughter)does...does the mind rest on the body or perhaps the body rest on the mind? And and that's...we'll we'll do that next week.

(student: Where does sensory consciousness fit in in relation to the mind?)

It's it's...the mind is composed of six consciousnesses acting together. Five sense consciousnesses and one mental consciousness.

(student: But you said that the mind was something that couldn't be influenced or altered, and when the sensory...)

It's it's nature is not, no.

(student: It's nature)

But we as said before it's like a mirror, you know. If you present...if you if you put this blue...if you put a blue wall in front of the eyes, the mind takes on some kind of blueness and we accept that. It takes on some kind of a...like like a glass or or like when you when you take water and and when you paint the bottom of a swimming pool blue, and then you pour water into the swimming pool, the water takes on some kind of blue appearance. It's not blue but it takes on some kind of blue tint. It's not that the water got blue. It's that the blueness is being reflected in the water. And then...they say the mind is the same.

(student: So, if you damage one of the sensory (unclear), the mind doesn't change.)

No.

(student: The content changes)

The content changes. You can't have a blue color anymore. But ah actually you can.

(student: But a sensory consciousness in itself is what? In other words...)

It's a clear and aware about about, okay we gotta...she has to leave at nine, but we'll talk about it. You have to study first chapter (b: Abhidharma). It's a long long story. The first chapter of the (b: Abhidharma) presents this and it's almost a quarter of the whole book. It has eight chapters and the first chapter is so important that it's about a quarter of the whole thing. And it explains the six sense...the six consciousnesses.

(cut)

And it's accepted by all the other schools, pretty much, you got one more place to go. He says, now, the last choice is mine. The last choice for what?

(student: (nyer len gyi gyu))

Good. (Nyer len gyi gyu). What flopped over into the first moment of consciousness. What...what's right behind the door of the that pushed this consciousness through the door at the moment of birth...at the moment of conception? Wha wha what was behind that unknown, you know, what shoved our mind into the first moment of this life. He says, now now you have no...if you accept all of my arguments, which you don't, which you probably shouldn't yet, I mean I, I I think we all have some trouble with some of them. I I'm presenting, you know, Kedrup Je's arguments, but I think they need to be cooked, you know, but if you...let's say you accept all those arguments, then the only place left to go by the process of elimination is that it had to have been mind that flopped over into mind, that became the mind. Now Kedrup Je says, was it your mind or someone else's mind. (laughter)

(student: At another moment or the moment of (unclear))

It's not a stupid question. I mean, we generally I think believe that somehow our life...you know, I've been thinking about it 'cause I have to teach it, but I think somehow you think that life has been transmitted to those to those cells from the parents. That somehow there's this stuff that you call life, and at a certain point in the child's development it gets transferred to those to that jelly, you know (laughs) and it comes from the parents. You know, I mean, you..I I think you really...if you're a scientist you're probably over here, I think, it's chemicals. Certain chemicals under certain conditions become mind. And if you're, you know, mommy (laughs) I don't know, you know, all all the the living parts of my body have become life, you know, or me and my husbands' body have become life and or or maybe you think, you know, somehow the father and the mother's mind have flowed into the into the little spot of jello.

(student: It's them thinking that the things that they've done in the life are going to determine what's in their child's mindstream.)

Well, no, it...but the...the child of the mind came from the minds of the father and mother. I mean, Kedrup Je says, that's

your...I'll give you two last choices. This is where he wants to go, right? This is his...the whole object of the whole thing tonight. This is where he wants to prove that it came from your own mind of the past. But he's allowing you, okay, maybe it was your mommy and your daddy. Now, how does he argue against that? He says, sometimes the father is a master carpenter and the kid can't do anything with his hands. Sometimes the father is an idiot and the kid is brilliant, (laughter) so he says, it can't be. And it sounds simple and it sounds childlike and some of the...some of Dharmakirti's arguments are gonna sound very childlike. But I warn you, maybe they are true, and maybe they're very deep, and maybe they're right (laughs), so, you know, you can't go to office and give these arguments to everybody there. But if you really think about them, you might conclude that you did live before.

(student: There seems to be a lot of these (unclear) very often these discussions the distinction is made between mind as something that animates the brain, the body, everything the body's composed of and is in some sense the spirit, let's say, you call that also.)

Yeah.

(student: The (unclear) that animates this this body that is separate from genes from which, you know, by means of which you may inherit certain principal characteristics, certain talents, certain whatever, but there isn't necessarily a contradiction between acknowledging that there is something besides body and the mind and the body are not equivalent or you know, are they integral parts of one another.

Yeah, I understand, yeah, I had a...I sat with psychiatrist on the last flight (laughter) no, we talked a lot about this...it's part of his work. And he said ultimately they don't really understand...you know, they can't really affect certain genes and the child is more talented or something. Right now they can't, but anyway



(student: So, why is...what's the argument then)

So the argu...saying that, that's his final argument, okay, and that's nine o'clock too. (laughter). He's saying, you know, it's not true that the child is more or less intelligent according...in other words, the the condition of the child's mind doesn't necessarily have any similarity to the condition of the parents minds. And and one of the rules of a (nyer len gyi gyu) is that it should have some similarity. An acorn has to somehow have oakness in it or else it would make a lemon...it might as well make a lemon tree, but it doesn't, does it. There's some similarity. So so he eliminates that one. Therefore, (laughs) you came from your previous mind.

(student: But ho ho, you know, how does he support that mind is contained in tact, I mean, how is that explained in (unclear),)

We...we'll talk about it. We'll talk...it'll be next week.  
We'll get to Dharmakirti's own ideas. But

(student: So it has to be the mind)

It has to have been

(student: of the moment before, the first awareness.)

It has to have been a previous state of mind of your, and and the last thing I'll say is, once you've proved that last instance...that...once you've proved the existence of a single moment of mind preceding the first moment of mind in your mommy's womb, then your lives are beginningless and your lives are endless. Period. Your mind is beginningless and your mind is endless. It's a necessary conclusion. Once I can prove a single instant of your own consciousness prior to your first consciousness in this mommy's womb, it might as well be beginningless...in fact and in fact it has to be beginningless.

(student: I think, coming back, and this somehow comes out of a (unclear))

Okay, last question, now, because I know some people want to go.  
Go ahead.

(student: the idea of permanent. This is (unclear) the class)

Say, say, say.

(student: You know, I can understand that emptiness is a concept  
so it's gen it's generating being generated, shall we say.)

Wha.a.a.a what? (laughs)

(student: Well, it's it's, I mean, the emptiness, the emptiness  
of something is is our labeling, our naming it.)

No, the emptiness is negative, so how would you say it  
par...negatively?

(student: It's the lack of naming it (unclear))

The lack of not naming it.

(student: Direct. Right. But but so that doesn't...I don't  
have a problem with that at this time, the permanent thing, but  
space, I think I asked this before, when we were talking about  
creators)

How is space unchanging?

(student: How does space...what's the explanation for the  
existence of space, I guess (unclear))

Where did it come from?

(student: Yeah.)

It's the absence

(student: I mean if you say that it's always being...)

It's...no, it's defined as an absence of something.

(student: Okay. So it's just...it's in a sense it's like)

It's (to lay got sum) is the definition of space, the simple absence of anything concrete.

(student: Then when you put the pen in that space you say the space hasn't changed and yet there's a concrete object in the space.)

Yeah.

(student: So how can)

If it weren't absent of a concrete object the pen couldn't get in that space (laughs).

(student: Yeah, but so when the pen's there then it's no longer space? That's my point...in which case it is changing.)

And the answer to that by a Buddhist philosopher is that since the pen is there, it's absent.

(student: The space is absent?)

No, the the concreteness is absent, because if it were already occupied you couldn't put the pen in there

(student: Right. So the fact that it is occupied and not space at that moment)

If it if it if it weren't space the pen couldn't stay (unclear)

(student: But I'm saying the fact that it becomes occupied and unoccupied)

If the space went away... (unclear) the pen couldn't stay there 'cause there wouldn't be any space for it to occupy. Okay.

(student: But by definition)

Well (laughs)

(student: So when a female that is pregnant being taught to have these good pure thoughts, does it have indirect effect upon their child's mind?)

Yeah, right.

(student: Okay)

The the mind doesn't come from that those thoughts. Doesn't turn into them. Those thoughts don't turn into the mind.

(student: But they affect the environment?)

Ab absolutely. (unclear)

(prayer: short mandala)

(prayer: dedication)

(student: Do you see what I mean though?)

(laughs) I do see what you mean.

(student: The definition of space is the absence of something, then it's no longer absent, so then by definition, it's no longer space.)

Simple absence...I'll say it a different way. The simple absence of concreteness)

(student: Huh? The absence of concreteness)

Not the simple absence of a concrete (unclear)

(student: (unclear))

The simple absence of the quality of being concrete.

(student: Space is that)

Rather than simple absence of a concrete object.

(student: Space is the simple absence of a concrete object)

Of the quality (unclear)

(student: Of a quality of what?)

Being concrete. Physically concrete. As opposed to simple absence of a concrete object, how's that?

(student: That's entirely different. That makes sense.)

Of course it's different. It's the only way I can (unclear)  
(laughter)

(students: (All talking together.) Did you have the recorder on for that? (laughter) (laughs) (unclear) listen to that over again.

(student: So space is not composed of atoms?)

Well there's a debate about that if you want to know (unclear)

(student: Oh (unclear) this debate (unclear)

The physical part of (unclear) in a Buddha paradise.

(too hard to understand)



940922-1.aaa

**Course Four: The Proof of Future Lives**

**Class Eight: Proofs of the Existence of Future Lives**

**September 22, 1994**

**Geshe Michael Roach**

**transcribed by Amber Moore**

[laughter] I was up at Dr. Shen's. He let me have, he let me use his collection.

[student: Collection of what?]

He has about eight thousand Tibetan manuscripts. He said, you can just stay there all night if you want, so, [laughs] so I just about did. You know it's just good chance.

[student: is that Chan Yen Monastery? Is that Chan Yen Monastery?]

[student: What monastery is it?]

So he said you could use the key, you know, I don't care you could stay out all night. And I had to use it while I could use it. So I was a wreck today. I couldn't do anything, he let me stay today also. I found a lot of neat stuff we were doing a... the prayer book for tsechu and inside there there's a prayer book called The Source of All my Good. And we, it's an unknown commentary, it's by Pabonka, it was lost and we found it and then translated it. And also Tsongkhapa's, the book itself, that prayer which is always done at tsechu, isn't in his collected works, I mean it's very... the whole thing is very exciting. But, if you go into that kind of stuff. So that was like all night.

[student: Well how old is that book? Is it, is it older than the text that you've been working on with [unclear]]

Well he, since you ask, [laughs], no, there's no such work in his collected works, but it's buried in the middle of his bigger works and I don't think people know that. Then it looks like around the time of the Fifth Dalai Lama people started to attach it to the six... the {jorchu}, the preliminary practices, the {ngundro}. You

know, I don't know why it's the {jorchu}, but for some reason they started to take it out and use it at the end of the {ngundro}. Which is why we do it. I haven't figures out why yet. I have an idea who is the first person who did it. That's interesting. He wrote that in praise of... Maitreya or something like that.

[student: Michael? What's that letter on the bottom after the {ma}??]

This one?

[student: Yeah.]

That's a lazy {cha}. Hold on a second.

[student: Can we run that line, run in?]

Anyway, this is proof number seven, alright? This is the seventh proof. We had the first six right? Just to make sure I'm in the right class. I like this one. {Drubo wangden che chen} That means, "let's take the, the four elements", which have {wangpo}. What's {wangpo}?

[student: Sense powers]

Sense powers, okay? Sense powers, you know, I'm trying to think if living tissue is a good translation of that, I have a feeling it might be. I can't think of any living tissue which is not the four elements which have the sense powers, you know what mean? I can't think of any four elements that are included in your body which have sense powers which are not living tissue, I think it's... I think they're trying to say the same thing, okay. Consider that, the living tissue in your body basically. {Loykyu mayinde}, "it's not the main cause for your mind", okay, it's not that material cause for your mind, it's not what turns into your mind. Because {Tibetan..... }, which means, you can damage the sense powers but you don't damage the mind, necessarily.



[Student: You mean, you can damage living tissues?]

Yeah, this is a big argument of Dharmakirtis, and you have to, you have to listen to it in plain English, okay? He... the Shravakas say what? They say what about the body and the mind?

[student: That they're inseparable.]

What?

[student: They are inseparable.]

Yeah, that they're... that the body provides a unique basis for the mind to stay, to be there and to stay, that happens to be their belief and that happens to be the belief of western countries too. You know, that the, that the physical body and maybe the brain mainly provides this unique basis for the mind. And unique is a, is a word that Dharmakirti uses also. He agrees that in general the sense powers have some kind of supporting function for the mind. But he doesn't agree that they are the unique basis for the mind. He doesn't agree that they are the, the one main source for mind to come from, he doesn't agree with that. He agrees that they play a role but he doesn't agree that they are the one main source.

[student: So without them, I mean if you had no sense powers?]

{Su... sumeka} formless, formless realm, you can, according to Buddhism. You wouldn't have any sense perceptions, but you would have mental thoughts, you would have mental perceptions. So he says something interesting, you know, it... what is it for the mind to be healthy? Or what is it for the mind to be, there's a word in Tibetan called {gyerpa} which means... I don't know what it means. It means like when you're body is fat and happy. [laughter] You know, it means

like, healthy and happy, you know? [laughter] It means like healthy and happy, you know.

[student: Robust?]

Prosperous in a way, there's a word like that, I don't know how to say it. {Gyerpa} means, "why". It's like {sangye}. It means prosper or something like that. Just be chubby and healthy and, you know, shining with health, you know, stuff like that. That, that word is used for the mind when the mind is in a healthy, happy state. Like if the mind were well fed, like if the mind is in general, being sustained nicely, then it's clear and it's happy. And it's joyful in a way. That's the Buddhist definition of a nice, healthy well fed mind, okay. And what he's saying is that if there's this unique relationship that the Shravakas say there is, then somehow, the mind should become less contented, the mind should be somehow distressed if you, if you, poked your eye out or if you cut your finger, then the mind should, {kyep} always be distressed, okay. There should never be a case where the mind wasn't distressed, or you can say it this way. If you removed one of the sense powers, if you removed twenty percent of your sense powers then your mind should get twenty percent less {gyerpa}. Should somehow get distressed by twenty percent, it should lose its health by a, by a, similar ratio, if the body were the unique and ultimate basis for the mind. In the way that if you like took a certain amount of material from the acorn and the oak tree is somehow stunted or deficient. I mean it sounds like a silly argument, I mean who would believe that if you poked your eye out, your mind would get distressed, necessarily, okay or twenty percent smaller, or something like that. But, but that would be the necessary consequence if the mind had this unique relationship with the body, with the sense powers. He, he gives the example of bodhisattvas. And there was a famous bodhisattva, I forgot his name, anyway, he, he met a demon on the road in India, he was in Vimila... He was in Nalanda or one of the main monasteries and he was on his way there, and the demon said... and he disguised himself as a normal person and he said, "If you are a big bodhisattva then let me have your eyeball." He pushed his fingers into his eye socket and pulls out his own eye, and he gave it to him and he gave it to this being to make him happy. I mean, the story of Nagarjuna is the same, the way that Nagarjuna died is that someone asked for his head and he gave it to them, or something like that. So, so then the demon threw the eyeball on the ground and smashed it and the guy almost lost his bodhichitta, or it's a famous example you know, "Can you lose your bodhichitta after you have it?. Then he went to

the monastery finally and people used to make fun of him because he had a disfigured eye and he used to say, "Well I've understood... I've seen more of the scriptures with one eye than you see with two". or something like that. [laughter] Anyway, he, if you, by the way you're not allowed to do that until you're ready, [laughter] okay, they say start with vegetables. Shantideva says start with vegetables. You break your bodhisattva vow if you do it too early. I mean you shouldn't try...

[student: Give your eye away too early?]

I mean doing things like chopping your arm off or giving someone your kidney. If you're not ready, you're not supposed to do it. Cause then you'll regret it later and it'll be a very bad deed. If you regret it later then it'll be a very bad deed. If you regret a good deed, that's very bad deed. So they say don't do a good deed... don't like give away all your money cause then you'll regret it like three days later and then all that good power will become a very bad, negative power.

[student: Michael?]

Yes.

[student: What about the myriad exceptions to this particular rule? The fact that most ordinary human beings are distressed, and their minds...]

He says, "{ma kyepa}", he says, "{ma kyepa}". Now they say... there's an explanation in the reading of why people get distressed, but it's not, if it were a unique basis, an ultimate basis for the mind, then, then the mind should become always distressed regardless of who you are. So it seems to be a matter of training, and not of a, an innate relationship. There's no inherent relationship between your body and your mind of that type, there just is not. The bodhisattva feels something, he senses the feeling of the eye coming out but he just feels happy, he feels joy at that someone has asked him for something. I think when you get to that level and someone has asked you for something you just feel very happy to give it to them, you don't really think that you're not

gonna have it anymore.

[student: But if he's addressing the Shra, Shra, Shravakas...]

Shravakas.

[student: Shravakas, I would assume that they wouldn't believe in bodhisattvas and they wouldn't believe that you could poke your eyeball out and be content, so it's sort of a mute point isn't it?]

Well it must have been a good argument for them or Dharmakirti wouldn't have given it. You are not allowed to give an argument in two cases. You're not allowed to give an argument to somebody if they already believe it, that's bad logic, it's a bad, it's a bad, it's what do you call it? Illogic. It's one of the faults of logic. You're not allowed to argue to Dharmakirti that things are impermanent, because he already saw it. You don't have to argue it. If it's unnecessary, it's a bad argument, also if your opponent hasn't seen the truth of your reason, you're not allowed to give it to them. Dharmakirti wrote down those rules, so apparently there were some Shravakas who had seen a Buddhist do something like that, you know, I don't know. It would have to be.

[student: I mean, your average westerner would say that's a preposterous thing.]

Well no, would say that that's a very common that... I think the best one in the west is when a woman has a baby and she goes through that suffering. I've been at the bed side of a woman who was just gave birth maybe an hour before and they are like beaming, they are like happy and thrilled and the sense powers have undergone a pretty bad damage, you know. If, if the sense powers were the cause that turned into the mind, then the mind of a woman who had just given birth would be quite distressed and damaged, and it's not. It's actually quite beaming and happy, and {gyerpa}. Happy.

[student: But they don't feel the pain at the time they don't have the pain an hour later. If they had the pain they would be stressed.]

No. There must be some discomfort, I would imagine, not having been through it in this life, there must be extreme discomfort, would say. Especially, like a cesarean or something. If they're like smiling and holding the kid up and, you know. I, what I'm saying is... it's hard for you to imagine what I'm saying, but what I am saying is, he's saying that if... it's so silly that you can't accept it, if the sense powers were the unique cause that turned into the mind, or the unique basis for the mind, then a woman who just gave birth should, should suddenly be very depressed, very upset or very sad or....

[student: Some are.]

I know, some are, but not all. But, I mean, when you talk cause and effect you... when you take away the acorn, all oak trees don't grow. That's a {nyer linki gyu} That's a material cause. So there, obviously the pain has some kind of effect on a normal mind, but it's not necessary, so it's not the {nyer linki gyu} it's not a .... it's not a, it's not that necessary relationship which a direct cause must have with its direct result, it's just... it doesn't. And you know, I, I, I've been teaching this, this is the third time I taught it, right? In the last week or so. You can't go home and say now, "Oh, yeah now I believe in future lives." You know. But given all these ten arguments together, if you can get some kind of a sense, if you can start, if you put them all together as a sum, I think they can, they can affect your thinking about future lives, I don't expect you to accept it either, right away. But, but think about the relationship between your sense powers and your mind. The living tissue and your mind are just not like that.

[student: What about all these chemicals you know, that people take, they take you to a better place?]

[student: Prosaic.]

No, they talk about it, they talk about it.

[student: You know, acid, I mean, obviously there is a great connection between these things and the mind.]

The Shravakas, the Shravakas say that, they say, "what happens when a person get drunk", you know? The alcohol affects the sense powers and then the persons mind becomes crazy, you know. And they, they asked that question too, I don't remember the answer. [laughter] Obviously it affects, but it's not the main cause.

[student: So Michael...]

Obviously there is a connection, but it's not the acorn to the oak tree.

[student: So in meditation supposedly where, supposedly, you know, I mean whatever happens to the mind, is there not, is there not something happening to the senses when you meditate, I mean, is there not energy flowing through you? Is there not...]

Oh, no, on a higher level and on the {tumo mayinbe nam}, right, what's that? {Tumo mayinbe nam}. In the, in the teachings that I can't mention in the sutra class, there's obviously a relationship, but, but not to the gross physical body and not to the, not to the physical body that you are thinking of now. That's a different subject. [laughs] Okay, but that is very important for {dzog rim}, for the second stage of tantric practice, that's, that's, that's a great relationship, but different, different powers in there. Okay, yeah.

[student: I'm, I'm just having allot of with the first six and this one just trying to get the logical principal. And, and so would you say the logic behind this one, and probably some of the others, is that if there... because of the word always, if there's an exception, or if there is a higher case or some, then, then it disproves the...]

If there's an exception that shows it's not the {nyer linki gu}, it's not the main material cause, if it were the contributing factor, like with the exceptions, that would prove that the sense powers are a contributing factor to mind, but they are not the stuff that comes from mind. You did not come from sense powers, your mind did not come from sense powers. Which means that you didn't come from sense powers? Where did you come from? [laughs] I mean, you don't think of it, you just assume it was your mothers and fathers stuff. But, it's not and there's so many evidences that it's not and finally when you get to the evidence that it's the mind it's quite comfortable. I mean, you're almost relieved, by the end to hear, "Oh yeah, it was just your mind", oh well that makes sense, same stuff you know, came the moment before, turned into my mind now and that's why all these things are [unclear].

[student: Okay Michael...]

Yeah.

[student: I'm sorry, can you just re... translate that all in one piece?]

Yeah. Consider the, consider the elements... in the form of sense powers, you see, some people on that elimination chart got a little confused because the sense powers are made of atoms, are made of the four elements also. There are inner four elements and there are outer four element. Consider the inner four elements, they are not the unique, let me see what the right word is... they are not the unique cause of mind, because when they are damaged the mind is not always damaged.

[student: Are we going to read this?]

What's that?

[student: Are we gonna read it, you know going...]

I don't think so. If you wanna, you have to come on... you have to the other class. It's, it's in your, the Tibetan is in your hand out

[student: [unclear]]

{Dey} [repeat], {penje} [repeat], {yinbe yecheu} [repeat], okay. [laughter] Okay, number eight, {lo cheu chen} means, "let's consider mind", main mind. Now Dharmakirti's gonna...

[student: Sorry, can't take notes, [unclear] what to do?]

Let's take mind, consider mind, {lo cheu chen} means, "consider mind", okay. Now Dharmakirti's gonna turn the tables, what do you think he's gonna say? Turn the tables from number seven.

[student: Mind causes sense powers.]

Yeah. Alright, cause not only do the sense powers not provide the basis for mind, mind provides the cause for the sense powers.

[student: Mind does?]

Yeah. But if he says "cause", is, isn't he gonna get in trouble?

[student: Because it should disappear?]

Yeah, and turn into the sense powers right, so he doesn't say cause, he's tricky, he says basis, support. {De penje yinbe yecheu} {De penje}, {penje} means...



How do you say it? We're gonna get into this in the next class, but there are basically two kinds of karma, and they are two links in the Wheel of Life, two different links. I should bring the Wheel of Life next time.

[student: You mean two links in the chain of dependent origination?]

Yeah, do you know that Wheel of Life with the monster who's got the world in his hands? The second link is the potter making pots, that's, that's called... many weird translations, a good, a good translation would be immature karma, immature karma. Unripened karma, that's the karma that you do throughout your life.

[student: Do you mean causal? Creating the causes, karma in the sense of creating the causes?]

Karma in the sense of all the things you think, say and do in this life, good or bad, okay? Link number ten, do you know what the tenth link looks like? Number two I... it makes sense, it's a potter, number, number ten is a pregnant woman. And that means ripe karma, that's another kind of karma, the ripe karma is your mind, mainly, and it's gonna throw a new birth, it's gonna project a new birth, it's called projecting karma. And the difference between the second link, which is unripened karma and the tenth link which is ripened karma, is links number eight and nine. Links number eight and nine, we're gonna talk about it next week, basically they are types of desire which trigger the karma and cause it to project a new rebirth. And that's a very important subject to learn, if you want to get out of rebirth, [laughs]. You know

[student: Could you repeat that?]

Excuse me?

[student: Could you repeat that, about the...]

Yeah, what makes number ten ripe karma and number two unripe karma, is number eight and nine. Number eight and nine are forms of desire that occur as you die, which...

[student: That occur as you die.?)

That occur as you die, that make that karma powerful enough, that give it the potency to throw a new life, so in that sense the mind what? What's its real relationship to the sense powers?

[student: Taking form.]

It basically causes them, he's not saying it turns into the sense powers, but basically they are the, they are the thing that throws the existence of the sense powers...

[student: But in a way, they're saying it's what's causing life, and then life is...]

What's causing samsaric life.

[student: And then life is connected to the sense powers and that's... and then it seems like it's further down the line that the sense powers come about.]

Ah, yeah.

[student: Or he's saying that sense powers is life.]

Well, now don't forget he's being sarcastic. He's exaggerating the case, why? They are so attached to thinking that the sense powers are the basis for mind, so

he says, you know how you sometimes do when your trying to convince somebody of something, you, you say exactly the opposite for effect, you see, not only did I not, you know, lie to you that they are, I went out of my way to tell you the exact truth, it probably wasn't. But you say the exact opposite; not only does the sense powers not cause the mind, they come from the mind. And then he waits to see how they will react, this is Dharmakirti's argument. Now he's gotta prove that, obviously, obviously they can't take that on face value. A Shravaka can't say, "oh yeah your right, I didn't think of that". My, my , my mind from a former life threw my mind into, my sense powers into this life, they obvi... they don't accept that, that form of mind existed. They might have to accept that there was a {pen jyeki kyuba}. Mmm, what do you want to call that? Like a locomotive cause. It's the cause which pushes the thing into the future, it's a different kind of cause. Like projecting, it's a projecting.

[student: Throwing,]

It's, it's the one which pushes the event into the future, makes it happen. {Pen} means what you do to an arrow, with a bow. That's also called a {pen}, the {pen}. So that's, I think this argument is more for effect. I don't think he's expecting a Shravaka to say, "oh, yeah that's right". I think he's just trying to do a... a combat.

[student: [unclear]]

What's that?

[student: That's considered the mind, the mind provides the basis for he sense powers and the seed.]

Because it projects them.

[silence]

Right.

[student; At least the cold is keeping him awake]

Say, {lo cheu chen} [repeat], {wangpo} [repeat], {nyepey} [repeat], {kiryin tey} [repeat], nah, nah, that's wrong. [laughter] {Lo} [repeat], {nyepey} [repeat], {kiryin tey} [repeat], {lungyi} [repeat] {gyidey} [repeat], {di tar} [repeat], {che bey cheu} [repeat]. {Lo cheu chen} means, "let's consider the mind" again.

[student: {cheu chen}]

{Cheu chen} means "let's consider". And in a debate you go de, de, de... {cheu chen}. What does {cheu} mean?

[student: Dharma?]

{Cheu} means, "dharma" or existing thing, so when you say {cheu chen} it means "let's take this thing". {Cheu} has two completely different meanings. Dharma has two completely different meanings; one is the Buddhas teachings, and one is any object in the universe is called a, a dharma. So a couple of years ago when the Bon po's showed up for the winter debates, for the first and last time [laughs]. You know Bon right?

[students: Ohh...]

Bon.

[students: Bawn. [laughter] Bawn. [laughter]]

They, they came and they said, "{.... Bon chen!}". I said, "What?" "{Bon chen!}" I

said, "It's {cheu chen}, not {Bon chen}." And he said, "We don't believe {cheu}, we're Bon's." [laughs] It was, it was really funny. I don't know, it would be like if someone was reading in a newspaper and they were Catholic and it said "baptism by fire" and they said "Catholicism by fire", and you said, "what do you mean?", and they said, "Well we're not Baptists so we can't use the word Baptist [laughter] You know what I mean? It would be that, it would be that silly, you know. [laughter] It was like really silly you know, we were like "What?" [laughter].

[student: Their not coming back again?]

Bon is a religion that was in Tibet before Buddhism.

[student: They're never coming back?]

They never came back. [laughter] They did pretty good, but they just didn't come back. But one year they came, and the Sakyas came one year. It's like a, you know, it's, it's a... what do you call it, it's a competition, you know, they weren't really ready for it. It's very hard. {Lo mepey gyu}, {lo mepey gyu yin te} means, "It is the cause for the mind to stay". "Consider mind, it is the cause for the mind to stay".

[student: It refers to mind? ]

Yeah. Take your mind. What is, well we'll get to there. What is keeping you alive, basically ? Why does your mind go on? Why doesn't your mind just stop before you die, or does it stop when you die? [laughs] You know, but what makes it... what makes it go up.... why did Maria Placebes mother die, at that particular time? What made the mind stop at that particular time?

[student: Body stop or mind stop?]

I mean appear to stop. Oh, oh, we say that right, the body stops and the mind stops. I mean, but why... well first of all, you don't know if the mind stops, right? I mean that's not one of Dharmakirti's arguments, but that could be a pretty good argument. Actually it comes later in Dharmakirti's text. But he says, "you know, it's true that the mind, that the body stops flopping around when the mind, the mind, the body stops flopping around and then you think the mind is gone or something, or the mind died, but you have no evidence, you have no proof that the mind died, you haven't, you are enjoying a conclusion that may or may not be true. You, you can't prove that the mind stopped just because the body stopped flopping around". Like if the mind were still inside the body, but the body stopped working, then the mind would be like a captive in there saying, "ahhh, I'm still here, I'm still here!" You know, and the body just is not cooperating and the body can't move anymore, but, but what if the mind is still there. What if the just body stops working, and the mind is, the mind is stuck without a body?

[student: That's like a coma in a way.]

The mind doesn't die. We don't know that that's not true, in fact that's true. Just because the body stops doesn't prove that the mind has stopped necessarily, but that's not this argument. He says, "Not only does mind cause the sense powers, mind keeps your mind going". Mind is why your mind goes on in this life. Mind is why your mind doesn't stop in this life. What keeps you alive, basically? Why, why do some people die and some people live? Why do old people live and young people die? What keeps the mind going?

[student: Mind goes on, mind, You know aren't you, now isn't that, now I know that's what we're proving, but it sounds.... it sounds a little silly I mean, it's like saying the tree causes the tree, I mean how can you say something causes itself?]

That's.... oh good, yeah, he didn't say that technically. What he says was, "the mind causes the staying of the mind." Mind causes the sticking around of the mind. Okay, it's true that in a logical proof you are not allowed to repeat one element twice. You can't say, take the mind, it's a mind, because, you know what I mean? I, I... actually you can. [laughs]

[student: What is the third sentence of this argument?]

I didn't give it to you yet. [laughter]

students: Why? Why?]

Why does your mind stay? Basically, I mean, didn't you wonder why you're still alive? [laughter] It's kind of unlikely, you know, I mean, cars get older, I have an eight year old car and it's like well made but it's getting old, you know. Yeah, what makes the mind, why does the mind stay you Shravakas? I mean, houses don't stay past fifty years, you know, normally. Cars don't stay past ten, normally. Why do people stick around for so long, why, why, why does your mind stay? What keeps your mind here?

[student: Why doesn't it stay around for longer?]

Yeah, why doesn't it? Yeah, and he says, "Former cases of mental karma cause it to stay." And we'll talk about it.

[student: Former cases?]

Yeah. Mental karma from the past, how's that?

[student: What does that mean?]

I'll tell you. [laughter]

[student: It looks like, it looks like it's the deterioration of the body, I mean, I

would have to agree with whoever these guys are, it looks that way.]

[student: Yeah, cause the elements go out of balance.]

[student: It certainly looks like your mind goes when the body goes.]

Well, why does the body go?

[student: Because it deteriorates.]

[student: Because that's the way it is, impermanent.]

You see this is this is... no, this is the argument. It's so elementary, that you can't see it cause of your cultural background. It's has nothing to do with the truth of the thing. Why, why do they go out of balance?

[student: It's, it's not like a {unclear}, it's not just...]

[student: Why do you age?]

Why? Why? Why you? Why them? Why her? You know, why at that moment? You know, why?

[student: Because of circumstances.]

[laughs] Why did those circumstance occur? You see, that's what a Buddhist has to be thinking. There's causes for everything. You're not even a good western scientist, you're not even a good western thinker, you're not even a good western normal person if you, if you say there a cause for some things but there's no causes for other things. It doesn't make sense. If everything has a



cause then there has to be a reason why this person died today and not tomorrow. And why she died before he died, he's much older. I saw Dr. Shen, he's like eighty-two years old and he's like "Haro Michael! How are you?" [laughter] And, and then a Maria Placebes mother, you know, she's a big healthy lady and she just... they, they gave her everything, they used everything, she died healthy, I mean she just suddenly died, you know. They had her, they said everything's fine, you know, then boom, she's just dead, you know, why?

[student: Is that the ripening karma that you were talking about? ]

It's sim... not exactly the same, this re... this is referring to the general mental karma of your whole past life. What we just talked about were those very specific last minute triggering karmas that, that throw your life into the future, that if you could affect those karmas, if you could affect the, those emotions at death, and were gonna talk about it next class cause it's so important, your next birth could be quite different. That's that's a big deal, that's so important that we're gonna go to another book actually for that, which is [b: Abbhisar...], we're gonna go back to the Perfection of Wisdom book. But, that's his, that's his argument. So let's pretend that you're a Shravaka and I'm Dharmakirti, basically the argument is this; you know, "well, why do you think I'm still alive, what do you think is keeping you going?" And they say, "Well my elements didn't dissolve yet." And then, and then he's got to try to prove, why do some people with such good elements die quickly? [laughs] You know. And other people with shaky elements live a long time, you know, years and years, you know, why? Why do some people die before others?

[student: Because maybe you build a resistance towards sickness.]

But then some old people die before the young people. [laughs] When you're talking causation, it has to be all the time the same. I mean, it should be an absolute rule that the older people die before the younger people.

[student: Well, it is.]

[student: But there has to be some exceptions.]

Healthy people die after unhealthy people.

[student: Yeah, but you're, you're assuming the causes are always supposed to be the same. ]

And then you say, "Well it does." Because even Vitas Scaralitis or whatever, he was very healthy, but then the elements got so messed up so fast that he died.

[student: But there was a cause, there was carbon monoxide that was in the...]

They messed up his elements to such a high degree, fifty percent of his blood became carbon monoxide. The oxygen in his blood but then he died. But then a Buddhist wants to know, why him? You know, the newspaper said sixty people in the United States die this way a year. Okay, so out of two hundred million people, why him? And that's, it sounds obvious, it sounds silly, it sounds like, oh that's the way it goes, but you are brainwashed by your culture.

[student: I know, but, but, but, that's what medical research does, they use, they go into the body and they check and they say, why him? They say, "Yeah well it happened to him because this is... " , you know...]

Because he was sleeping in that room and the propane leaked out and he died.

student: Yeah.]

And but the Buddha say's well, "Why didn't the propane leak out when he was in the room?" [laughter]

[student: There's a good example is that there's, there's a very rare disease where a child ages, and by the time they're eight years old they've gone completely through the whole normal life cycle and their body becomes very old and then they die. I mean there's probably a medical explanation for it, but it doesn't explain...]

No there should be a...

[student: ...why it happened.]

Explaining... well, anyway, I get your argument, what you're saying is, "Michael Roach, you're just explaining, you've accepted that the elements cause the mind to die, because when the elements cause the mind to get messed up to a certain point, the mind dies and you're just trying to argue to me why the elements got messed up or not."

[student: Right.]

That's what you should be debating to me, but your hands are hurt so you can't do it, okay. [laughter] There's one kid in the monastery that, he has his arm cut off, [ohh] so he goes [slap] you now, and it like that, it's cool. [laughter] Change the subject when you can't get out of an argument. [laughter] Old debating trick.

[student: It has to be true, it has to be always true, what about, what about many cases when they say, "killing is wrong", and yet we find that the Buddha killed this person, they have an exception there, and you have allot of these in Buddhism, where you say, "This is wrong, this is wrong, you're not supposed to do this." But then you hear this great Lama, he was a great Lama, he did something, but he was a great Lama, you know what I'm saying?]

Well, because there's exceptions to some things, doesn't mean there's exceptions to everything.

[student: Yeah, but I'm saying, you know, why do you have to say that everything has to be true all the time, because it's not the case in Buddhism that everything's true all the time because even the greatest Lama made exceptions for that rule, you now?]

Let's say, people try to say that...

[stud

940926-1.aaa

20a.txt

ACI 4, Class 9

**Proofs for the Causes of the Mind**

**Transcribed by Winston McCullough**

... means {normor}, and if you know {tamel nangshen} from the Vajrayogini teachings, you know what that means, so {tamelpa} here means "normal person." It means a non-arhat, a person who has not yet destroyed his bad emotions permanently. {tarmelpa} {Chika} means, {chiwa} means "death." {chika} means "in the mouth of death," and it means "at the moment of death," okay {chikay} {rikpa} means "mind" okay, and {chu chen} means "let's, let's consider that," and that's the typical way to start a debate {unclear}. Let's take the mind of a normal person at death. {rikpa chimar} means {rikpa} means "mind." {chimar} means "into a future mind," okay. The {ra} means "into," and {chima} means "later, future" mind. {tsam jortay} {tsam jortay} means "it must cross the line into a future mind." It must cross the line from death to rebirth into a future mind, mind. {tsam jortay} Why? {chakje gyi rikpa yinpay chir, chakje gyi rikpa yinpay chir} {chakje} means "it has desire," okay. [student: I apologize for saying this but I can't both write everything down, and then be able to write down what you say, I'm behind by about two minutes.] Oh, okay. {chakje} means, {charpar} means "desire." {chakje} means "it has desire, he possesses desire." What? His mind possesses desire. {rikpa} means, this is misspelled. {rikpa} means "mind." {yinpay chir} means "it is." So the whole proof, you know, if I say it just in one shot means "consider the mind of a normal person at the moment of death." {rikpa chimar tsam jortay} which means "he will cross the line, or that mind will cross the line into a future mind." And then number th, the third part is {chakje gyi rikpa yinpay chir}"because that state of mind has desire," meaning the state of mind at death has desire. Dharmakirti is giving this argument to whom? The Charvakas, okay, Hindus, and they're supposed to buy this? I, I didn't feel comfortable. You know, I don't even think, you know, I don't see how it works. I don't see the mechanism by which having desire in your mind at your death is gonna ensure that you have another state of mind, samsaric state, I don't understand it, you know. I didn't, I wasn't satisfied with it, but it seems to be important. It seems to be the key to not going back to samsara, you know, to not getting born into this lousy kind of life. This is a lousy kind of life. If you could get out of it to a nicer kind of life, it'd be great, you know, and that's just Buddhism. That's the whole point of Buddhism. You know, you don't have to die, you don't have to get old, you don't have to live

this kind of lousy stinky life, you know. You can, there is a better one. You can get there. You just have to know how. [student: unclear] Well I, I don't see how a Charvaka is supposed to buy this, and I don't understand perfectly the mechanism either, and I, we're going to talk about that tonight. I think it's important. [student: It's not explained [unclear]]. Oh, we're going to go through the whole thing. Michael, could you bring me that wheel of life picture? [student: But this one doesn't seem any less understandable] Yeah, yeah, I know. They wouldn't buy the other ones either. Not all of those other proofs are meant to be, I mean there's different levels of proof. I don't know if you could see it, but it'd be a whole course to teach you the wheel of life. [student: I'm sorry, I really got lost, but I got everything down except for the last line "has desire," {chakje}] Because that state of mind at death has the emotion of desire, it has desire. That's why he's going to have to take a future life. [student: Excuse me, what's the "kyi"?] "Of" In Tibetan, you have to say "a mind of having desire." [student: I didn't get the second line...] Okay. Consider the mind of a normal person at the moment of death, it will have to pass, it will have to cross over into a new mind, meaning a new lousy suffering mind, okay [laughs]. Why? Because at the moment of death that mind has desire. [student: What's {yupay chir?}] "It is." {chir} means "because." I didn't think you guys cared about the Tibetan. [student: Has desire of {chakje kyi} and {rikpa}...] {rikpa} means "mind." {yinpa} means "is," and {chir} means "because." So I want to, I don't have time to go over the whole wheel of life. It's a big subject. It's a great subject. We'll probably have to do a whole course on it sometime, but we're going to concentrate on four of the links, okay. The twelve links of dependent origination are contained in the wheel of life. They're here. They start here, and they go clockwise, you know, one, two, three, four, five, up to twelve, okay? You all right? You can't see it very well, but I'll, by the way anyone can have one of these posters. We have a lot. Someone gave them to us, and if you treat it nice I'll give you one, maybe as a, when you come to take your final. The second link here is a man making pots, and that's called {duje kyi le, samskaris} and there's a lot of strange translations, a lot of lousy translations. What it means is "the karma that you collect during your life, making karma," and doesn't it make sense? You have a guy there making pots, okay. That's all it means. You can see "compositional factors" and you don't know what it means. I mean people translate it very weird stuff. It has nothing to do with that. It's the making of karma during your life. {chakje kyi, nyiba duje kyi le} That's the second link. Then all these other links occur during your life. You get to link number eight, eight, okay. Link number eight, if you want to come up and see it after, you know, during the break, there's a man, there's a lady pouring wine into a man's cup. There's normally a man pigging out. He's having a feast, and that, that's

number eight. Link number eight is called "craving," {gepa sepa}. Number eight is called "craving." Number nine, {gupa lenba} is, usually it's a monkey grabbing fruits. In this one it's a person, but normally it's a monkey grabbing fruit. So there's "craving" and then "grasping." Those are link number eight and link number nine, okay. [student: Is it a monkey?] It's usually a monkey grabbing for a fruit, and that's "grasping." I'll explain them later. {chupa sipa}, number ten, is normally a pregnant woman. Here they have a man and a woman lying together, but normally it's a pregnant woman, and that's the one they translate as "becoming" or "existence," and that means ripe karma, very very ripe karma, the kind of karma that can make you take another life. Now where does, where does, by the way, number ten, which is ripe karma is just number two, the karma that you did during your life suddenly made potent. I like to compare it to plutonium, you know, like there are people running around with plutonium nowadays, but if you, if you got a bag of plutonium you can't do anything with it. You need a, you need another TNT explosive inside of it, and that one blows up and then the plutonium blows up. You need a trigger. The bomb needs a trigger. There has to be a normal explosive inside the plutonium to make it blow, or else it won't blow up, and this is the same. {nyipa duje kyi le}, the second link, which is the karma that you've done during your life, physical, mental, or verbal can't do anything unless it's triggered. It has to become ripe karma before it can what? {student: Blow up in your face} and create a new life which is, you know, naturally the next link. Here's a woman giving birth. That's birth. That's rebirth. [student: Eleven is birth?] We'll get to that. [student: Is that this one?] Not exact, similar, similar. [student: Are you saying eleven is birth or twelve is birth?] Eleven is birth. Number eleven is birth. Twelve is old age and death, okay, but we're not going to go into the whole link. [student: unclear] Okay, so number eleven here is very graphic. It's a lady giving birth. So, why doesn't birth come after number two? [student: Because it has to ripen.] It has to ripen. Something has to trigger it. Something has to make it potent. Some other thing has to occur for karma to, to cause a new birth, and that thing is, are these two links, number eight and number nine. What are they? [students: Craving and grasping.] Yeah, craving and grasping, okay. That's the key to Dharmakirti's argument. Why? [student: Because he said desire.] He said "desire." He said if the mind has desire, when? [students: At the time of death] At the moment of death, then, then that, that mind will flow on, flop over into a new mind. Now we finally saw what really, where, where really the first moment of your mind came from, what was the material cause that turned into the first moment of your mind. It was, it was the last moment of your mind in the last life. [student: What kind of desire?] We're going to get into it in great detail, and that's why this class is important and it's a sweet subject for the tenth

class tonight. [Vilma Staiano: So, so you can do all kind of really awful things as long as it's not connected to grasping?] We're gonna talk about it. I mean, that was the feeling I felt people had last class. That's why I wanted people to come to this class,

you know. When Dharmakirti gives this argument, he says, I mean, the, what we call the {keba}, the {dokya je kyab}, the logical inferences here are if you could die without desire, you'd be okay. It seems like he's saying that. [student: I'm having a problem with the definition of [unclear]] We'll get there. {nyerlengyigyu}? [student: No, I understand material cause.] Okay, what other causes. [student: The first problem that I have is that you use the term in the first question in the homework or the quiz "unique cause," but in the text "unique cause" is used in the way that you would not use "material cause."] Right, that's why he used a different word. [student: So I assume that when you say "unique cause" you mean "material cause."] No, not necessarily. [student: Well then how are we supposed to know what you're talking about?] When I say "unique" it's different from material. Now, what's unique? Unique means, unique, in the arguments about body and mind, have, has a lot of meanings, but it basically means, the, the one that's such that, it basically refers to the way that body, according to the non-Buddhists is said to support the mind. It's, it's a different subject than we're on now, but I, but, it's to distinguish from an ordinary basis to say a unique or special basis. Dharmakirti accepts that the body is an ordinary basis for the mind. It contributes to supporting the mind. It does in a way base the mind, but it's not a unique basis. It's not such that it turns into the mind, or something like that. [student: But are you referring to unique cause or material cause in question one?] I don't know. What was the question? [student: When you talked about it.] What was the question? [student: Consider the, it's the first proof, it's the seventh proof.] Which was? [student: Consider the, the elements, the internal elements in the form of the sense powers. They're not the unique cause] Does it say unique cause or unique basis? [student: causes] Cause or basis? Okay, well that just the wording that, that they used in the text, but that, but I would say in that case, in that proof, it means {nyerlengyigyu}. It does mean the material cause. [student: And then in the text we have the words, the term project, projecting cause. What is a projecting cause?] We're going to talk about that tonight. Okay. So eight and nine are the trigger. So you want to know the nature of eight and nine. That's what I'm saying, and it's very important for a normal person. It's, it's very important. If somehow you could affect number eight and nine as you die then you'd be saved a lot of future lives, lousy lives, okay. [student: But it's not just, you talk about the unripened karma from this life that you've accumulated ripening at that moment of death based on your emotions, your desire, craving, whatever, but there's also karma from



previous lives that affects rebirth.] That too, that too. You also have that. It's in your pocket. It's in your karmic pocket. Now whether or not it will blow up depends on these two emotions. I don't call them even emotions, but we call them these two mental states. [student: So those are the trigger for all past karma?] Yeah, all past karma. Whatever karma is gonna create your next life. Mainly karma in this life, but it could be also karma from last life. All right. So we gotta talk about the nature of those two. [student: Then how would you go from life to life carrying anything that was previous to the, to the present life?] We're gonna discuss that in the next course, at the end of the next course, okay. [student: At least you're not saying four years from now.] We're gonna, in the early part of the next course, we're gonna study the principles of karma according to Abhidharma at the, and the last two classes, say, of the next course we'll discuss the Mind-Only school's explanation of how karma is transmitted, and it's a great explanation and it's accepted by the highest schools. They, they say "that's fine." In fact they accept the Abhidharma's presentation from all sides, basically, so they, it's a nice way to present it. Okay, so we gotta talk a little bit about {gepa} and {gupa}, number eight and number nine, okay. I'll give you the definition of number eight. You don't have to have it word for word, but you just understand it. It says {unclear} which means "based on the seventh link," okay, based on link number seven, which is what? You have a guy with an arrow in his eye [laughs]. What do you think that represents? [students: Pain. Ignorance.] Feeling, sensation, the ability to feel. Based on the ability to feel, okay {ten ne} [student: physical sensation?] It could be physical or mental pain or pleasure. "Based on the ability to feel, which is link number seven, it is the desire not to be separated from, it is the desire not to be separated from its object." What does that mean? All these links here, all these links here which occur after you're born represent the development of the body and the senses, and they represent milestones in the life of a, of a young person. He, he, he gets his first, his sense organs develop for the first time. He has his first contact with outside objects. He gets his first consciousnesses growing from those contacts. Those consciousnesses start to have emotions and feeling. He, he has certain kinds of contact, like with food and then sex, and then he, he starts to feel good, and that's {tsorwa}. He starts to have good and bad feelings. His, his, his psyche starts to develop to a point where he can feel good things and feel bad things, and then he, he starts to get naturally what? [student: attached.] The desire to, not to lose the nice feelings, and that's what basically human endeavors are, most of all human endeavors in the world are based on trying not to get separated from what you want, you know. It's always stated negatively, by the way. I don't know why, but it's important apparently, and, and you know this is one of those things where a good lama will say "I don't know why the text always says it

negatively, we'll go look for the reason, but please be sure to pass it on this way to your students, you know." It's the desire not to be separated, okay, from its object, all right, and that's only possible because, because you have the capacity to feel good [student: Well, because it's more stimulated by the threat of its being withdrawn than it is by the satisfaction of it... ] Well, we're going to talk about it, but mostly, people spend their lives trying not to lose whatever nice things they have. That's the function of giving up... [student: Is all of this supposed to be taking place over a period of time? I mean, this is simultaneous at the moment of birth.] There's three or four, there's three or four explanations on that. Some take a moment, some take a minute, and some explanations take three, four, five lives, so there's, there's a whole school on that. You know, I'm not going to go into that, you know. It's a whole study of its own. We spend months on it in the monastery. Okay. Three kinds of craving. So now you know the definition of craving, right? We're talking about the definition of the link of craving. There are three types.

[cut]

[repeat] {si se} [repeat] Okay. Three kinds of the eighth link, all right. Three kinds of craving. This is the trigger that triggers your karma. If you could get rid of this trigger, you wouldn't have to be reborn. That's the idea of an arhat. {duse, duse, du} means "desire" and {se} means "craving" {se} is the general word for "craving." {duse} means "desire craving." What does that mean? It's defined as {unclear} which means "the craving which desires not to lose an attractive object" okay? The craving which desires not to lose an attractive object. That's {duse}. On your homework, don't just put "desire craving." Some of the Tibetan... [student: Say it again.] [laughs] Ah [unclear], you're going to make your mother take another life [laughter]. "The desire not to lose an attractive object." Okay? {jik, jik} means "fear," like {jikche} is Yamantaka [unclear] {se} means "desire." So {jik se} means "desire..." What do you think? What do you guess? [students: fear of desire? Fear of losing... The wish to avoid the unpleasant?] Yeah. It's the craving which wishes to avoid an unpleasant object. [student: Does {se} means "craving" or "desire"?] {se}, I like to use the word {se}, craving for {serpa} because {dupa} is more "desire." {sepa} is supposed to make you, {sepa} is supposed to give the feeling of sort of an intense desire. That's the difference between {dupa} and {sepa} in Tibetan. [student: Could you repeat that again.] {jikse} is the desire to be, is the desire to, to lose an unattractive object, you know, like when you walk down the corridor at work and this guy you don't like is walking down towards you [laughs] and you kind of turn down a hallway if you can, you know? That's {jikse}, all right? {duse} is, you know,

grabbing for that position. That's {duse}, all right? We have both. [student: So {duse} is "desire craving"?] You can call it "desire craving," but what it means is "the desire not to be separated from an attractive object." It's simply given that name, you know, "desire craving." There're all desire, right? [student: Yeah but number one is also "desire craving"] It is, it is. They, those are just, they're not descriptive names. They are just names, okay. {sise, sise} the word literally means "craving for existence." {se} means "craving." {si}, same spelling except for a different vowel. {sise} means "existence, craving for existence." What is this wheel of life called in Tibetan? {sipe korlo} That's the {si} in {sese. sipa korlo} means "wheel of life, wheel of existence." So {sise} means "craving for existence." How is it defined? {unclear} which means "a craving which craves for yourself, okay, because at the moment of death you fear that you are ending." It's a craving for "me" because at the moment of death I have this great intense fear that I am ending. [student: You fear you're ending?] You think you are, the word in Tibetan is {che. Che} means "discontinued," you know [laughs], "chopped off." [student: So is, for you ego, I mean is it... ] Now, now, that's a good question. That's a very nice question, okay. Is it related to grasping to self-existence. It's, it's obviously very very close, right? And, and it's what makes people scream when the airplane's falling down, they have this tape of the airplane that flipped over, and the people are talking, you know, and then, then there're struggling to control the airport, airplane, and then for the last thirty seconds it's obvious that nothing's going to happen and they're headed straight down, and they're just screaming, you know. They're just screaming. It's {sise} is expressing itself, you know. They, they think, they truly believe at that moment that they are going to end, and they, they have this {sepa}. They have this craving. Craving asserts itself very strongly in the last moments. You, you truly believe you're going to end and you don't want it to happen, and you will do anything, if someone holds you over a rooftop and tries to push you, you will, you will fight back. {sise} will fight back. {sise} is afraid that it's going to, that I'm going to end now, and that's {sise}. All three are active, or constitute the eighth link. It means that the, the craving that triggers your rebirth involves all three of these, but mainly which one? [student: The last one.] The last one, obviously, okay. Obviously the last one. [student: The last one what?] Obviously it the {sise}, the desire for existence, the craving for existence, it's that fear that you are ending which helps trigger your, the karma that you've had in your life and then blows it up, makes it blow up. [student: So what's the difference between that and grasping... ] Gras, oh, now we're going to talk about, that's a, that's a natural, that's the next thing I was going to talk about [laughs]. What's the difference between that craving, and number nine which is grasping? Okay. Number nine is defined as, I'll define it for you. {unclear} which simply means

"the craving of link number eight, increased to a very high degree." I don't know how to say it in English. Craving of number, the craving of link eight, you know, increased to a very very high state. Apparently, there's two degrees of, of this trigger. There's two degrees of the emotion or the mental function which at the moment of death triggers your karma, and one of them is, is like the very last moments, and when your, when your desire to live, the desire not to end gets very powerful, and that's {gupa}, that's number nine. So number nine is the actual trigger. {gepa} is all the stages that lead up to it. Now what's the relationship between those two mental functions, right, those two emotions as you die, and, and craving for self, the ignorance which sees self-existence, okay. We, we gotta talk about that. The key is in there somewhere, okay. It's, it's, I don't see how just wanting not to die would force you to go into another mind stream. You know what I mean? I, I still don't see why, and, and the answer is deep in the scriptures and it has to do with grabbing to self-existence at that point, and we'll talk about that after the break. So have some... Am I on time today or what? [student: ...just very fast.] Well, you know, I'm on vacation [laughs].

[break]

[cut] ... if. {jik tsok ta, jik tsok ta} is a very very strange word, "view of the perishable assemblage, view of the perishable assemblage." There is no nice translation. It's easier to describe it than to try to explain the words. It's "to grasp you or the things that belong to you as self-existent." It's the habit of grasping to yourself and the parts of you as self-existent. [Tom Kylie: So it's to imply that it's the wrong view of... ] Yeah. It is a wrong view. There are five wrong view. It's one of them. When they say ignorance causes this wheel, spins this wheel, [student: That's what they mean], and when you see the two blind men with sticks, you know, ignorance, it is this very mental function. It is this one mental function which is the ignorance which spins the wheel. It's not just not knowing something, or not being aware of something. It's not that kind of ignorance. It's the active grasping to yourself as self-existent. [student: ...to wrong view?] Excuse me? [student: Would that be wrong view?] It's one of the five wrong views. We'll study it one day. There are six major, I mean I'm not, this is not part of the class, I mean there are six major mental illnesses [laughs] {ngomo's}, kleshas, and one of them is ignorance, or view, wrong view, and that has five forms. There's a total of ten really. That's the answer to your question. We'll do it some day, okay. {jik tsok ta} is the, is the villain, okay. {jik tsok ta}, that ignorance, that view, is, is the villain, all right, and we'll talk more about it in a second. [student: When you first defined view of the perishable assemblage,

you said the habit of grasping at self and others...] I shouldn't have said "what belongs to you." I should have said "you and your parts." How's that? [student: Oh, okay.] You, you and yours, meaning your arms, your leg, your mind, okay, not meaning your house, your kids, your family, okay, meaning... [student: The skandas? Could you say the skandas?] You could say that. You and your parts. How's that? {drel, drel} means to, "not to have something, to lose something," okay. It's actually the word I've been using all night, when it said, you know, "lose something you like, don't lose something you don't," you know. {chir} means "because." {chir} means "because." {lam} you know. What's {lam}? [students: Path.] Path. Like {lam rim}, steps of the path. {tang por} means "at the beginning," and the {lam} here by the way, and you can make a note, is the path of seeing. Which, what number is that of the five paths? [student: Third] Number three. Why is it called "path of seeing." [students: Because it's where you see emptiness directly.] Directly. It's the first moment. It's, it's the process of seeing emptiness directly for the first time in trillions and trillions, actually endless lives, beginningless lives. It's losing your virginity. It happens once in the whole length of your trillions of life times. It happens once, and you, you see emptiness directly for the first time. [student: You mean after you, you've seen emptiness once you cannot see it again?] You'll, you'll see it many times again, but I'm talking about that first time, and you change totally after that. You're a totally different kind of being after that. You're an arya, and arya has a big meaning. There's only two kinds of beings in the universe. You're either an arya or you're not. You've either had this experience or you haven't had this experience, and once you have had this experience you're on your way out. You're a, that's why you're called a "stream enterer." You see your future lives. You see how many lives it's going to be. You meet Buddhas. You see the truth of suffering directly. All these things happen within these couple hours. [student: Is it possible that this happened to one of us in previous lives?] You would know. [student: How would you know?] You would know because, because the lives that you will live after the moment that you see it are exceptional, you know. You, you live, you're always born in a comfortable family, you, you never have much go wrong in your life, you're always successful, I mean basically, and it's, it's, it's the, even the last few samsaric lives are, are very comfortable. [student: Are you involved in Dharma necessarily?] You might not be as a child, but you will be attracted to it as a child, but you will be attracted to it and get into it at an early age. [student: So anybody that is out of Dharma... ] You don't know [unclear] [student: What about some lamas who have like difficult lives? What about all the lamas who have been kicked about of Tibet?] They're either pretending, or ... [student: This is a little off, but I just don't get, I mean since we start with the omniscient being and the beginninglessness, I

don't get, what I don't get is if, you know, if everybody can become a Buddha, and these are all separate mind streams, so is there some, it almost seems like there's some plan that we're all supposed to become Buddhas at some point in time.] We will study that, you know, some day, but it is the {sangye kyi rik}. It is the {rangshin nye rik} It's the Buddha nature of a being. We have to study that subject. It's a long subject, and it's a beautiful subject. It's a deep subject, and it takes a long time to learn. [student: But then what happens if everybody becomes, then what happens to samsara? I mean does the world... ]. Buddha, yeah, Buddha, Rinpoche used to joke about it. He'd say "Well what, is everybody going to die? I don't know." It will come. [student: So then certain worlds will disappear.] Oh, yes. [student: So then other worlds will, I mean then their will be other kinds of worlds?] Yeah. There will be no more hells. There will be no more hells. [student: Yeah, but Michael, if that's the point then what about all the great lamas, supposedly the great lamas that came out of Tibet because they were pushed out of Tibet. I mean, that's not really a happy thing to happen to them. Supposedly they are Buddhas.] No, but you have no idea if they are putting it on. Mao Tze Tung was a bodhissatva. You don't know. Was it a plan, you know, the Tibetan lamas and Mao Tze Tung, I don't know. You don't know. That was the first thing Buddha said at the beginning of this class. You really don't know. You don't know for sure. [student: What do you mean you don't know? You don't know what?] I don't know. I can't tell you that Mao Tze Tung wasn't a bodhissatva in, in collusion with all the Tibetan lamas, and they made up this whole thing to get them out. I don't know. It's possible. Okay. {lamdo} What's a bodhissatva? I mean a bodhissatva can, can pretend to live a whole life of fifty years in order to talk to you for ten minutes. He would do that. He would do that. He would get close to you for your whole life just to have a conversation with you at age thirty or forty to affect your mind. It's worth it for him. It's possible. It's not at all improbable. {lamdo borni}, "at the beginning" {si me, si} you know because this was {sipay korlo}. What does {si} mean? [student: Existence?] Life. You know, another life. In this case it means "rebirth," life in the sense of rebirth. {me} means what? [students: No. Not] There will, there is not. {gyu} means "there wouldn't, where, there would be no, there would be no rebirth," okay. [student: What is {nyi}] {nyi} is a filler [laughter]. He needs to make his beads. Down here you're going to see him cram two beads into one because he has to make his beads the other way. So what does it mean? It means, it means "if you got rid of this view, this wrong view..." I should say, I want to rephrase that. "If getting rid of any kind of this wrong view, if getting rid of any kind of this wrong view," okay, we're going to talk about it. I'll repeat it. "If getting rid of any type of this wrong view could stop your rebirths." That's what this first line means, okay. If an, "if getting rid of any kind of this wrong

view could stop your rebirths then at the beginning of the path of seeing, the third path, all right, you would reach a state where you didn't have to take birth any more." [student: Okay. If getting rid of this kind of wrong view] If getting rid of any kind of this wrong view... [student: ...then, at the beginning of what?] Got you out of rebirth, you know, stopped all your rebirths, then the minute you see emptiness directly you, what? You would, you'd never have to take a rebirth, but that's not true. [student: Well do you also, are you saying that you permanently lose the view at the, at the... ] We're gonna talk about it, we're gonna talk about it, and I wanna... You don't have to write this down. There's three, there's three levels I'm talking about. I saw people's ears prick up in the last class when Dharmakirti said "the reason you're re, that you have to take a rebirth, is at the moment of death you have desire." So I got, I got this feeling that people were thinking "oh, you know, I could collect all the karma I want, get to the last moment of my life, clean up my act in that last ten minutes, my other karma, all that karma wouldn't be activated, and I would be, reach nirvana, you know. I mean it sounds like that, right? And that's not what it means to have desire at the last moment of your life. That's is what I'm trying to say. Having desire at the last moment of your life means grasping to a self-existent you, and wanting that self-existent you to be happy, and wanting that self-existent you not to get lost, and that's what triggers your karma. It's not just that you want something, and, and this relates to a very bad view, I think, that's prevalent among people that don't study Buddhism very well, which is they think that Buddhas somehow reach a point where they don't care about anything, they don't want anything. Well then, don't you want nirvana, don't you want to be a Buddha, don't you want to help other living beings? I mean, is, is, is being a Buddhist, is the perfection of your practice to somehow reach some state where you don't care about anything, you don't want anything, you know, it just doesn't ever make sense to me, and it's a prevalent viewpoint among Buddhist schools. You, you hear it in Buddhist teachings sometimes, or you get that feeling that, oh, I'm not a good Buddhist because I actually want to get out of samsara. You know, when I reach this high state, I won't even want to get out of samsara. It's obviously not right. You want to get out of samsara. You want to get out of pain, okay. What I mean is that {sepa}that we talked about, link number eight, craving, is it wrong for you to want to get out of samsara? Isn't that a form of craving? [student: unclear... Isn't it really a qualitatively different kind of emotion?] Well that's what I ask you right now. Is wanting to get out of samsara, which is an undesirable object, craving, and could that trigger a rebirth? Could it act as, as a cause of samsara rather than a way to get out of samsara? Is renunciation craving? [student: I think it could be. I think it depends upon the motivation and how it's done.]

Well, think, ab, I mean just think about it. I mean, I want to get to a place of permanent pleasure. I want that. That's why I became a monk. That's why I'm a Buddhist. I, I enjoy pleasure, I like it. I want to get to a place like that [laughter]. I do. Frankly, I do. I want to reach a point where I'm happy all the time, and I want to avoid a place where I have to get old and die and see bad things happen, things I don't like, and, and that's the reason I'm here. Is that bad? Is that wrong? [students: Isn't that self-existent? Doesn't that have a different karmic effect than other cravings? It's a craving... what you should be saying, or what you mean, I guess, by saying craving to get out of samsara, that's one and the same thing as saying, wishing to see myself as I truly am, which is at that point, what self is there, who's craving what, what's craving who?] No, I don't think like that. [student: Well that's what it means. Samsara means seeing yourself the wrong way.] The Buddha, by the way, this is on your homework, the Buddha perceives himself, the Buddha, this is the most, this is the first way of perceiving yourself. It's called unanalyzed, unchecked, un, just the Buddha, when he looks at the Buddha, he says "me," and there's nothing wrong with that. It's okay. Even the Buddha things of himself as "me," and, and the example given in the scripture is, the Buddha thinks his begging bowl is his. The Buddha thinks his robes are his, and if someone came up and stole them, the Buddha does think "they're stealing my begging bowl." He has an awareness of that as being his, and of himself as being "me," and there's nothing wrong with that. [students: unclear] That's called, that's called the {yigay dak, yigay dak}, Tom Kylie's unexamined perception of Tom Kylie is acceptable. There is a Tom Kylie. It's a {tsema}. It's a pramana. You see a Tom Kylie. To deny a Tom Kylie would be ridiculous. [Tom Kylie: Right, but the way that Tom, the way I believe that Tom Kylie exists, and the way the Buddha believes the Buddha exists are two different things, and that difference is samsara.] But on a, what I'm saying is on a basic, on an unexamined level, the way you just, you know, I'm Michael Roach. That's all. That's not wrong. There's nothing bad about it. There's nothing {jik tsok ta} about it. It's okay. It's unexamined, conventional perception of myself. Don't mix that up with, now we'll get to the bad one [laughs]. The bad one is to, to want Michael Roach to be happy and misperceive who he is. And who is he? He's a blank, and I'm perceiving him as Michael Roach in a certain form because I'm force to by what? My karma, my past deeds. I'm blank. I could have been Yamantaka. I could have been Gautama Buddha. You know, I could have been Vajra Yogini. I, I'm blank. I could be seeing myself that way. I didn't get the right causes in line. I, I messed up. That's why I have to see myself as getting old and, and getting, and dy, and going to die. That, I, I didn't prepare the right causes and now this blank thing I must see as, as Michael Roach, as a samsaric being. [Tom Kylie: And we're craving to continue to see that wrong thing.] I'm,



I'm trying to make myself happy simply by wanting to be happy, and I'm trying to make myself happy by doing deeds which are not the ones to make myself happy, and that's ignorance, and that's a misperception of my nature. Look, I want Michael Roach to be happy. It has nothing to do with, you know, outsmarting someone else at my job, or, you know, being able to corner the market on donuts, you know. That's not how I'm going to get happy. I have to do good deeds. I have to forget all the temporary causes that are involved, and I have to go for the real causes that are going to make me happy. [student: So if you see yourself as a mind stream, you're saying that that is then legitimate? I mean...] Oh yeah, I mean, I am a mind stream. What do you want? [student: No, because I've always been very confused about this.] {che tsam} They say, in Tibetan, they say {che tsam}, that's why I talking about it, you know, I mean, that's why we're talking about it, because otherwise this whole stuff is very confusing. [student: Yeah, I never could understand, because also they say you're empty but they say there's something that continues on. What's continuing on if you're empty?] It's this perception. Yeah, I am blank. I prefer, I prefer "blank." I really prefer "blank." Blank, blank gives you the right idea. The word blank is great. You're blank. [student: But "mind stream" has a sense of continuation but "blank" doesn't.] There's moments of consciousness that are blank. Even the mind streamness of it is a per, is a appellation. [student: But if you say that each one of these mind streams are separate...] They are. [student: ... then there is something very continuous about this mind stream] [unclear] ... of course. It's your karma continuing, but we're not going to talk about it today. What I'm saying is that, what triggers karma? What makes that desire bad desire is the misperception of yourself linked with the wrong actions that that inspires. It, all your normal activities aimed at getting some kind of contentment or happiness in this life are mis-directed. If you knew what you were doing, you, you would just go out and do the most charitable things you could do, because that's the only cause for you to see your blank self as, as, as happy. It's not figuring out how to do the best business deal, or figuring out how to find the person you like, you know, it's, it's, that's just wrong, and, and, and if you do those deeds you are proving that you don't understand your nature and you have ignorance, and that will cause you trouble. [student: So what is it that becomes happy, and what is it that becomes a Buddha.] You have a perception of a blank thing as being happy, and that perception is forced on you by your karma. [student: What is this blank thing?] Your parts, your mind and your body. [student: Your mind and your body? So you can go beyond the formless realm and... ] No, you see your mind and your body as happy, and when you focus on your mind, you see the parts of your mind as your mind. When you focus on one of the parts of your mind, you see that last moment and

the next moment as the mind, and it's endless, and it's okay, and it works, and that's how you'll be a Buddha [laughs]. That's Nagarjuna's viewpoint, Tsongkapa's viewpoint, pure middle way, and everything else is just false. That's how you will become a Buddha. [student: When you focus on parts of your mind you see the last moment and the next moment and it continues... ] I'm saying that you always go, you're always looking at the parts, and, and imputing the mind, the whole on it. You see the parts of yourself and call it "Lee." I mean, you focus on your body, you see your arms and legs and you call them "Lee's body," and then when you focus on Lee's arms you see Lee's hand, Lee's wrist, and Lee's elbow, and when you focus on Lee's elbow, you see the upper part of your elbow and the lower part of your elbow, and you call that elbow, and it's, it, you, you can go back endlessly. [student: Like the pencil, right.] [student: But there's no good or bad attached to that?] Sure. If I see a mortal elbow, you know, a breakable elbow, a arm that has pain, that's because I, I did the deeds to force myself to see that. [student: No but when you're talking about looking at your body and sort of labeling it body... ] No, I didn't, I'm just describing what you do as a result of your karma. [student: And the preferable focus is... ] And you'll reach a point in your career, Dharma career, where out of cold knowledge, you do the right things, and then you'll be forced to see yourself as a Buddha [unclear]. [student: Michael, what about... ]

[tape side two]

[unclear] [student: You wouldn't call what he's doing grasping toward a self simply because he labels it that way]. Not at all. That first one, and I've described four kinds of grasping at yourself, or four ways of seeing yourself, and you better know, they could be on your homework. The first one, the first one is what we call conventional perception of me. I am Michael Roach. Come on. {tseme drupay chir}, because I saw it with a tsema. Is that wrong? Is that somehow mistaken? Is that somehow not a {tsema}? No, not at all. The second level of seeing yourself, I'm Michael Roach, I see my self-existent, I see myself as self-existent, and I believe myself to be self-existent. How does that manifest itself? I think I can be happy by manipulating causes that have nothing to do with my happiness. [student: I believe I can be happy by manipulating others... ] Manipulating causes has nothing to do with my happiness, and that's how we spend our lives. Now there is, now there's a person who has seen emptiness directly. How is he different from the second person I've described? [student: He sees himself as self-existent, but doesn't believe he is.] Right. By the way I'm talking about, very important, I'm talking about after he comes down after that

first experience, okay. While he's in that experience, forget it. It's a very different thing, but when he comes down, he sees himself as self-existent, but he knows he's wrong. He doesn't even believe himself any more. He sees but he does not believe. [student: He's seen emptiness?] Yeah, directly. [student: Michael, this is number three?] That was number three. Number two is like people who haven't seen emptiness directly yet. They see it and they believe it. [student: unclear] That's what I do when I, when I'm at number two. A arya no longer collects karma. [Tom Kylie: Just have to have seen emptiness the first time?] Yeah. He no, he no longer collects the causes for suffering. It's very interesting, it's very interesting. [Tom Kylie: Even if he gets angry.] It's very interesting. We'll debate it sometime. It's a huge debate in the monastery. There's a, there's a reputable text that says he doesn't collect [unclear] kinds of karma any more. Okay, number four. Big debate. I don't say it's an easy thing. We have to debate it. [student: He collects negative karma but doesn't collect causes] We'll talk about it, we'll talk about it. Number four. What do you guess is number four. [student: Buddha]. Buddha or an arhat. No longer sees himself and no longer believes himself. He, he never did believe, right, since he was an arya, but now he's purified himself to such a point that he doesn't even see things as self-existent. [student: This is habituation] That's what the path of habituation is for, to go from three to four. [student: No longer sees himself as self-existent] And doesn't believe it anymore, and that's why there's five paths and not only four. It takes number four to get to number five. Which of those can trigger your karma at the moment of death? [student: two]. Which of those four people have to take rebirth? [students: two, and three also] Two and three. That's where, by the way, there in number three is where you get those once returners, non-returners, stream enterers. You gotta study that some day. Guy number two is a person who has not reached the path of seeing yet. He sees things as self-existent and he believes them as self-existent, and he's going, if he dies in that state, he, he will trigger his karma, his, his karma will get triggered because he will look at himself and wish himself to be happy, or wish himself not to end, and it'll be an ignorant perception of himself. That's what I'm saying. It's not just enough to desire. Therefore, it's not enough at the last moment of your life just to not have desire for five minutes as you die, and you're okay. It doesn't work that way. [student: Well it couldn't. I mean if you had desire your whole life, you couldn't just at the last moment say... ] Let's say the odds are very low. That's why this {powa} stuff, you have to study {powa}. There is a Gelugpa {powa}, it's very secret, it's very fine, and, and it, it's very very delicate, and that's that whole thing, but the likelihood of living a very lousy life, and then in the last five minutes, in the most terrifying moments of your existence, thinking clearly and doing the right thing is almost, it's beyond impossible. [Tom Kylie: There's

an irony working here as well because that second person's gonna be very terrified at the prospect of there being an end to their mind stream, which can't be. They're terrified of something that couldn't exist.] They didn't study enough of Dharmakirti, and they do believe they're gonna have a, they're gonna end. They go from, you not only have to study Dharmakirti's proofs, you have to meditate on them so much that it becomes part of your being, and at the moment of death it's so strong in you that it doesn't get pushed aside by your fear at that moment. That, that's going to take a lot of... [student: They're afraid of something that couldn't happen if they did everything to try to make it happen.] Right, right. [student: Michael, did you translate the bottom two lines?] So it's number two and three which are going to trigger. That's why aryas still have to take rebirth until they become arhats. All right, so what he's saying is, I ask you a question: If you got rid of ignorance in the form of grasping to a self-existent me, would your karma be triggered? [student: Say that again.] If you got rid of ignorance as {jik tsok ta}, meaning perceiving a self-existent you, would you, if you got rid of that kind of ignorance would you have to take rebirth? [student: If you, say it again.] If you got rid of the kind of ignorance which sees me as self-existent, or believes me as self-existent, would you have to take rebirth? No. So why does he say just because you don't have that view doesn't mean you don't have to take rebirth? He's talking about the first type. It's called "intellectual grasping," and that's the one where you don't believe it but you do still see it. What he's saying is even if you reach that point where you no longer believe in a self who is self-existent, it's not enough to stop your rebirths. [Tom Kylie: That's number three.] Right. Even if you reach number three, it's not good enough, because if it were enough, if it were enough, then you would get out of rebirth at the first moment of the path of seeing. [Tom Kylie: unclear, become an arya, apply themselves, and go all the way through.] Exactly, exactly. They are called, there's even a name for them. [Tom Kylie: But those are also the people who achieved nirvana in this life, and then they have the remainder, right?] Yeah, you, there is the kind of being who does it in one life. They go from arya to arhat in one life, in the same life. [Michael: Intellectual grasping and... ] Believing, I, I'm saying, you could say intellectual, you can say believing in a self, okay. What he's saying is believing in the self-existence of yourself, getting rid of that believing is not enough to get rid of the triggers, the two triggers that trigger your karma when you die. You must get rid of the {hlenkye. Hlenkye} means, {hlen chi kye} means "that innate grasping to a self," which all beings have. In fact, it is the very seeing of a thing as self-existent, it's the predilection, it's the habit of seeing things as self-existent, which even an arya has after he comes down, and you have to get rid of that, much more difficult. [student: Michael, let's say that you [unclear] you no longer see yourself as self-

existent] You no longer believe yourself... [... you no longer believe yourself as a self, but you know that you've accrued bad karma, so couldn't you be, even though you know that your self doesn't exist, couldn't you have fear that the negative karma might trigger a rebirth even though you don't believe in your own existence.] Right. That's exactly what happens, unless in that same life he becomes an arhat, because if he doesn't, he does get these two, and it is triggered, and he does have to be born again, and that's why there are all those classifications called stream enterer, once returner, and non-returner. Those are all people who have to be born again. [student: So in other words, if you don't see yourself, and you know that yourself is not self-existent, even though you have bad karma, you won't feel fear.] Yeah, that's a good point. Arhat's pockets are full of bad karma, but they just don't have the triggers, so they never take rebirth. They have collected piles of bad karma, but they don't have the triggers. It's not that they have cleaned out all their bad karma. Karma is there. It's never triggered. It's never activated. [Tom Kylie: Therefore, it'll never be, it'll never grow.] It will never produce a result. [Tom Kylie: Now, I think the same goes for Buddhas as well, but you disagreed with me in the last class about that.] I'll look it up. [Tom Kylie: I think Rinpoche taught that even Buddhas have the same phenomena, because I asked him is it a matter of cleaning out all of your bad karma before you can reach

Buddhahood, and he says "no, even Buddhas have it.] It's sort of the difference between Jain and Buddhists. What do Jains believe, I mean in India? If you talk to [unclear], he'll say "you can never become a Buddha. It's impossible. You can't prevent killing germs, you can't help stepping on bugs, you know. We Jains believe that in trillions of years only one person ever gets to nirvana, and we just believe it will go on almost endlessly. We don't believe you can ever stop. When you eat a piece of bread, how many bugs did you kill just to get that piece of bread. We don't believe that." [student: unclear] Arya. What do you have to do between arya and arhat to stop seeing things as self-existent. [student: What is the difference between [unclear] Arya has seen, arya has seen emptiness directly. He's, he's lost that virginity, that lousy virginity. He has seen emptiness directly. What is an Arhat? He no longer has any bad emotions, period. Permanent cessation of his bad emotions. [Tom Kylie: But even the arya, having had bad emotions, is not going to generate bad karma.] Long story. If the arhat has bodhichitta on the day he becomes an arhat, what happens? [student: He becomes a bodhissatva.] He becomes a Buddha. [students: unclear] If you become an arhat with bodhichitta in your mental stream, you're a Buddha. If you're, if you get rid of all your bad thoughts but don't have bodhichitta, what happens? You become a hinayana arhat. That's a hinayana, that's what they call self-made Buddhas, solitary realizers, sravakas and pratieka Buddhas. Those are

the two. They're not real Buddhas. They're just arhats. [student: But an arhat has to have bodhichitta the same day he becomes an arhat, unclear]. No no no. If you become an arhat under the influence of bodhichitta, with bodhichitta in your heart, you become, at that moment you become a Buddha. If you don't have bodhichitta, and just clean out all your bad thoughts permanently, you become a lower arhat. Now what happens to lower arhats? They gotta go up again to the bodhissatva level and go all the way down through the bodhissatva, and then finally get to Buddhahood, so they still have a lot of work to go. [Tom Kylie: But they're, also Michael, this is Buddhahood and arhatship are the last birth or reincarnation?] That's what arhat means. A arhat does not have eight or nine. He never triggers karma. [Tom Kylie: Right, so when you become either a Buddha or an arhat, okay, and an arhat just being, you know, we can say a hinayana Buddha... ] Well, you can say a hinayana arhat. You have to distinguish. A mahayana arhat and a Buddha is the same thing. [Tom Kylie: Right, so it makes, you know. So a Buddha or a hinayana arhat then, that's their last incarnation, I mean that's the same form that they have all the time?] That's their last samsaric life. [Tom Kylie: It's their last samsaric life, okay.] Life of suffering. [Tom Kylie: Okay. So then they incarnate as something then that is not going to reincarnate any more in non-samsaric fashion? So that's a permanent, whatever they, the last samsaric life, the very next life after that, that's a permanent form for them for the rest of eternity?] With hinayana arhat you gotta talk about it, and the different schools have different beliefs, and I'm not going to get into it. Basically, all Buddhists believe... [Tom Kylie: Or is it something where they don't, they'll end that existence but they'll have another enlightened existence some place else or... ] Something like that. It depends on which school [unclear] Okay, you ready, and then we'll stop, but, but I just wanted to get you the key. That's what you always wanted to know, and what always was confusing, right, how does that last moments work? What, what's the point of saying "if you don't have desire"? It doesn't refer to desire, right? It refers to desire that a self-existent me be happy, that a self-existent me not stop. It depends on the perception of me as self-existent. [student: But would you say that you want to be happy, unclear]. Because it makes [student: you] I'll get there. I'll get there. I understand, but, but it makes sense, doesn't it, you know? It's not wrong to want to be happy, and it's, otherwise why would you ever strive for Buddhahood? Why would you strive to become Vajrayogini if it's wrong to be happy, or if it's wrong to want to be happy? You know, that's... Now, when I say "Michael Roach wants to be happy," am I perceiving a Michael Roach who will undertake actions that have nothing to do with my happiness to be happy [student: No]. If I do, it's, it's {sepa}, it's craving. If I don't think of myself in that way it's not craving, and it will just help me, and be great. That's

the key. Why? That's the one thing that will keep me here. [student: But what you were saying, that somebody who has had seen emptiness, right?] Yeah, yeah. [student: ... wouldn't they feel the way you do?] Sure. [student: But you're saying they do take rebirth.] Yeah, because they still see themselves as self-existent. [student: And you don't?] You can't ask me that question. I'm just a normal guy. {Hlen chik kyepa} means, {hlen chik kyepa} means "that innate grasping to a self," seeing yourself as self-existent. Bugs have that. Amebas have that. Dogs have that. {Hlen chik kyepa makpong chir}, {makpong} means "they have not gotten rid of it." {Chir} means "because." So what he's saying here is that if, if getting rid of all forms of seeing yourself as self-existent, and believing yourself as self-existent was all it took to finish your rebirths, well then the moment you saw emptiness directly what? You'd never have to be born again, but he says it's not true because they have not yet given up the innate form of grasping to themselves which means to see themselves as self-existent, and then the last line is a nice line to end on. {Pong nyiyong} But if you were to {pong}, what's {pong}? [student: seeing yourself as self-existent.] If you were to give it up, what, seeing yourself as self-existent, [student: then you wouldn't have any...] {Sipa}, yeah, good. {Sipa} means "rebirth." {Kali yu} means "where on earth could it happen," how on earth could you ever have to take a rebirth. [student: {na ong}, I'm sorry, I lost the {na ong} part.] {Pong na ong} means "but if you did get rid of it," this habit of seeing yourself as self-existent. {Pong} means "get rid." {Na ong} means "but if you were." [student: Thank you.]. {Sipa } means "rebirth" {Kali yu} means "come on, how could it ever happen." The basic is this. Dharmakirti said at the beginning of the class "the reason a person has to take rebirth, the reason the mind has to flop over into the same stuff again, is, is that that mind has desire." I didn't like that. It didn't seem reasonable to me. What's desire got to do with the mind continuing into the other mind? Ah, but if it's, if it's that that desire means desiring for a self-existent me not to end, then that perception of a self-existent me karmically causes me to have another perception of a mind, and that's a little tricky. What I'm saying is that the desire that Dharmakirti's talking about is the trigger. Trigger desire. Trigger desire depends upon misperceiving yourself. He wants me to be happy, and has no knowledge of what I'm supposed to do to get that. It, it, it's going to go to work tomorrow and work hard to be happy, to work hard to get more money. It has nothing to do with getting more money. If you want more money, collect a similar cause. What's a similar cause? Give away money. I mean the, the best Wall Street young broker who wants to get ahead should go give money away. That's the only cause for getting money. [student: unclear] Yeah, yeah, okay. That's a long, that's a difficult. If you're going to try to write the whole thing that's very, okay. "If getting rid, if getting rid of any form of ignorance." Let's

say it this way. "If getting rid of the basic forms of ignorance, okay, if getting rid of the basic forms of ignorance," and then he doesn't say the rest of the sentence, okay. This is code, okay, "were enough to take rebirth, were enough not to have to take rebirth," okay. "If getting rid of the most basic forms of ignorance were enough not to have to take rebirth." [student: You're saying that's implied?] Yeah, yeah it is implied, sorry, okay, well then "at the very beginning of the path of seeing {implied}, well then, at the very beginning of the path of seeing," then you fill in the rest. What would happen? [student: There's no more rebirth.] You wouldn't have to take any more rebirth. You wouldn't have to do anything else, because he did get rid of what? [student: Of believing.] Of believing in a self-existent me So we got two lines covered, right? Now we're on the third line. [student: What was the last part of this.] Yeah, okay. I was afraid you'd say that. You read to me what you have, and I'll fill it in. [student: If getting rid of any basic form of ignorance were enough not to take rebirth, well then, at the very beginning of the path of seeing. ] You would never have to take rebirth again. [student: Okay, and then you said something else.] That's all. You would never have to take rebirth again, and I like it because we're ending with, like, I consider Dharmakirti's most important verse of all the hundreds of verses he wrote. Then I don't mind if you put in that translation how "why, question mark" Understood, "because he has not gotten rid of, he or she, has not gotten rid of the inborn ignorance, form of ignorance." What, how would you describe {pedron}, the inborn form of ignorance? It, it sees things as self-existent. [student: Right, if sees things as self-existent... ] It doesn't have to be a belief. You, you can not believe it. If you're an arya you don't believe it. If you're not an arya you do believe it. It's just seeing things as self-existent, and the last line says 'but if you were to get rid of it,' what, get rid of what? [student: seeing things as self-existent.] Yeah good, that, that advanced form of ignorance, right, that deep form of ignorance, okay? I'll say it again. "But if you were to get rid of that deep form of ignorance," and you all know that I mean, as you start to grasp to yourself at the last moment of this life, well then, {sipa kali yu}, how could you ever take rebirth, meaning a bad rebirth, samsaric rebirth. Good place to stop. So next class is a review, right, and did we set a date for your final? One week later, okay, coo, and by the way, if you feel you need more time for your final, I don't care if you want to come and take it another time. If you're going to be going somewhere and you want to do it on another night earlier, I don't care either. You're welcome to do that, but the finals will be on this table. You find somebody who has a key. If you don'td have a key and you want a key, let me know. I'll give you a key. You're welcome to come here any time and to use this room for good purposes. Just please remember to lock the door. I'll give you a key, and then you can come and take it any time you want. You can find



somebody who has a key. Kylie, you have a key, anybody else have a key? You know, you can copy Kylie's key, or I'll give you a key, you're welcome, I'll go out and make them tomorrow. You're welcome to come and use this room, and you're welcome to give yourself your own exam. And then your new classes start on October 18th. I'm sorry, the 17th. [student: Will there be a quiz on Monday.] Yeah, sure quiz ten. [student: unclear]. Oh we covered them already. That was because of this he's that, because of that he's this. See what I mean? By proving that he's the, because he has compassion, that proves he's the protector, those were the other three. We already did them. Okay Mr. Kylie

[prayer: {Sashi pukyi jukshing metok tram

[tape ends with some additional comments about taking the final exam, etc. and the beginning of the short mandala prayer.]

## Course 4 – The Proof of Future Lives

### Class Ten – Now Ignorant Desire Triggers Another Life

September 29, 1994

Transcriber - Su Foo proofread by Linda Salmon

{sang myelpa} and it also means 'normal'. And if you don't {Tibetan} from the Vajrayogini teachings, you know what that means. {sang myelpa} means 'normal person'; it means a non arhat, a person who has not yet destroyed their bad emotions permanently. {Chi ka} means... {chi wa} means 'death'. {chi ka} means in the mouth of death and it means at the moment of death. okay {chi key, rigpa} means mind. And {chi che} means lets consider that. That's a typical way to start a debate. {Tibetan} Lets take the mind of a normal person at death. {Rigpa chi ma} means....{rigpa} means mind; {chi ma} means into a future mind; {ra} means into; {chi ma} means later, future mind. {tsam dor che, tsam dor che ..} means it must cross the line into a future mind, must cross the line from death to rebirth into a future mind, mind. okay. {samjo te} why?

{chagso} means it has desire. Okay.

[student: I'm not judged for saying this but I can't both write everything down and then able to write down what you say, I'm behind by that.]

GMR: {Chakpa} means desire. {chak che} means it has desire, he possesses desire; what, his mind possesses desire. {Rigpa} means mind, {rigpa} means mind; {yi be ye che} means idiot. So the whole proof you know if I say it just in one shot, means consider the mind of a normal person, at the moment of death, {rigpa chi ma tsam dor te..} which means he will cross the line or that mind will cross the line into a future's mind. And then number...third part is {tsamjo te} because that state of mind has desire, meaning the state of mind at death, has desire. Dharmakirti is giving this argument to whom? Sharvaka, okay, Hindus and, and they're suppose to buy this? I didn't feel comfortable, you know. I don't even think, you know, I don't see how it works; I don't see the mechanism by which having desire in your mind at your death is gonna ensure that you have another state of mind...samsaric state, I don't understand it. You know I wasn't satisfied with it but it seems to be important. seems to be key that...to not going back to samsara you know; to not getting born into this lousy kind of life. This is a lousy kind of life. If you could get out of it to a nicer kind of life that will be great you know. And that's just Buddhism. That's the whole point of Buddhism. You know you don't have to die; you don't have to get old; you don't have live this kind of lousy, stinky life. You know, you can...there's a better one, you can get there, you just have to know how.

[student: I don't know understand the mechanisms that repeats itself ]

I don't see how Sharvaka is supposed to buy this and I don't understand perfectly the mechanism either. And I'm already talked about that tonight, I think it's important.

[students] Oh we're going through the whole thing. Michael could you bring me that Wheel of Life picture. [student: but this one doesn't seem any less understandable ...] Yeah, yeah I know. They wouldn't buy the other either. Not all of those, other proofs are meant to be...I mean there's different levels of truth. I don't know if you can see it but I need a whole course to teach you the Wheel of Life.

[student: sorry I really got lost but I got everything done except for the last line 'have desire captured...'] because that state of mind at death has the emotion of desire, has desire. That's why he has going to have to take a future life. [student: excuse me what's the key...has desire of] In Tibetan you have to say, 'mind of having desire'. [student: I didn't get the second line {rigpa tseme...}] This is the mind of a normal person at the moment of death, it will have to pass...it will have to cross over into a new mind, meaning a new lousy suffering mind. Why? Because at the moment of death, that mind has desire. [student: what is nu pe chu?]. It is. {Chu} means because. I didn't think you guys care of the Tibetan, okay. [student:[...has desire of {chag chu kyi and rigpa, I'm sorry}] {rigpa} means the mind. {yi pa} means is and {chu} means becomes. But I want to...I don't have time to go through the whole Wheel of Life, it's a big subject, it's a great subject [unclear] but we gonna concentrate on four of the links okay. The twelve links of dependant origination are contained in the wheel of life; they're here. They start here and they go clockwise, you know, one, two, three, four, five up to twelve, okay. You alright? You can't see it very well but I'll...by the way anyone can have one of these posters, we have a lot...someone gave them to us and if you treat it nice I'll give you one. Maybe it's a....when you come and take your finals.

The second link here is a man making pot and that's called {du je kyi le..} samskara and there's a lot of strange translations. There's lot of lousy translation. What it means is the karma that you collect during your life, making karma. Doesn't make it sense? You have a guy there making pots. That's all it means. You can see compositional factors and you don't know what it means, right? I mean people translated it very weird. Has nothing to do with that; it's making of karma during their life. {[unclear] du je kyi le ('du byed kyi las)} that's the second link. In all these other links occur during your life you get to link number eight, eight, okay, link number eight if you want to come up to see it afterward, you know, during the break – there's a man...there's a lady pouring wine into a man's cup; it's normally man pigging out, having a feast – that's number eight. Link number eight is called craving, {gyepa sepa} number eight

is call craving. Number nine {gupa lenpa} is...usually it's a monkey grabbing fruit and this one is a person but normally it's a monkey grabbing a fruit and that's grasping. So there's craving and then grasping – those are link number eight and link number nine. [student: a monkey] it's usually a monkey grabbing for a fruit and that's grasping. I will explain them later. {Chuba sipa} number ten is normally a pregnant women; here they have a man and woman lying together but normally it's a pregnant woman and that's the one they translate as becoming or existence. And that means 'ripe karma', very, very ripe karma. The kind of karma that can make you take another life. Now where does...where does...by the way number ten which is ripe karma is just number two, the karma that you get during your life suddenly made potent; it's made...I like to compare it plutonium you know like they're... people running around with plutonium nowadays but if you got a bag of plutonium you can't do anything with it, you need a...you need another TNT explosive inside of it and that will blows up and then the plutonium blows up. You need a trigger. You need a...the bomb needs a trigger. There has to be a normal explosive inside the plutonium to make it blow or else it won't blow up and this is the same. {du che kyi la} the second link which is the karma that you done during your life, physical, mental, or verbal can't do anything unless it's triggered; it has to become ripe karma before it can what...[student: blow up in your face] and create....a new life which is...naturally the next link, here's a woman giving birth, that's birth, that's rebirth. [student: eleven?] We we'll get to that. Not exact....uh similar. [student: you're saying eleven is birth or twelve is birth?] eleven is birth, number eleven is birth. Twelve is old age and death but we're not going to go into the whole link. . [Student: Could you turn the air down...] Okay. So number eleven here is very graphic – the lady giving birth. So why doesn't birth come after number two? [student: because it has to ripe] It has to ripen, something has to trigger it. Something has to make it potent; some other thing has to occur for karma to cause a new birth and that thing is...are these two links, number eight and number nine – what are they? [student: craving and grasping] Yeah craving and grasping okay.

That's the key to Dharmakirti's argument, why? [student: it's a desire] It's a desire. He said that if the mind has desire when? At the moment of death, then that mind will flow on, flop over into a new mind. Now we finally saw what really...where really the first moment of your mind came from; what is the material cause that turned into the first moment of your mind – was the last moment of your mind in the last mind. [student:[What kind of desire?] What's that? We're get into it in great detail. That's why this class is important for the tenth [unclear]]

[student: so you can do all kinds of really awful things as long as it's not

connected to grasping]. We're going to talk about it. I mean that was the feeling I felt people had last class, that's why I wanted people to come in this class you know when Dharmakirti gave this argument he says...I mean the...what we call the {kyeba the dokyab jekyab} the logical inferences here are if you could die without desire you'll be okay. Seems like he's saying that. Yeah? [student: I'm having a little problem with the definition of the causes ] We'll get there. [student: I understand material cause] Okay what's the real cause? [student: the first problem that I have is that you use the term in the first question in the homework and in the quiz, unique cause but in the text 'unique cause' is used in a way that you would not use material cause.] Right, that's why you use a different one. [student: so I assume that when you say, 'unique cause' you mean material cause.] No not necessarily. [student: well how are we suppose to know what you're talking about?] Right, the unique is different from material. Now what is unique? Unique means...unique in the arguments about body and mind have a lot of meaning but it basically means that...the one that such that...it basically refers to the way that body according to the non-Buddhist is that which supports the mind. It's a different subject that we are on now. [student: okay and the....] But I...but it's to distinguish from an ordinary basis, to say a unique or special basis. Dharmakirti accepts that the body is an ordinary basis of the mind; it contributes to supporting the mind; it does in way base the mind but it's not a unique basis; it's not such that it turns into the mind, something like that. [student: but are you referring to unique cause or material causes?] I don't know what, what was the question. [student: when you talked about it...] what was the question? [student: consider the first proof...the second proof] which was? [student: consider the elements, the internal elements in the form of the [unclear]] Okay, alright. [student: they are not the unique cause...] Is that the unique cause or the unique basis? [student: the cause] causal basis? Okay... that's just the wording that they use in the text, I would say in that case, in that proof it means [unclear] it does mean the material cause. [student: and then in the text we have the word, the term 'project, projecting cause' what is a projecting cause?] We gonna talk about that tonight. [student: we are?] we are. Okay.

So eight and nine are the trigger. So you want to know the nature of eight and nine. That's what I'm saying. And it's very important for a normal person. It's very important. If somehow you could affect number eight and nine as you die then you'd be saved a lot of future lives, lousy life, okay. yeah? [student: but it's not just, you talk about the unripen karma from this life, accumulated ripening at that moment of death based on your emotion, your desire, craving whatever, but there's also karma from previous life] that too [student: that [unclear]] yeah you also have that. It's in your pocket; it's in your karmic pocket. Now whether

or not it will blow up depends on these two emotions. I don't call even emotions, call these two mental states. [student: so those are the trigger for..] yeah all past karma. [student: all past karma] whenever karma is good or... create your next life; mainly karma this life but it could be also karma from last life. All right, so we're gonna talk about the nature of those two. [student: then how would you go from life to life carrying anything from previous [unclear] to the present life?] We're going to discuss that in the next course, at the end of the next course. [student: at least you're not saying four years from now] In the early part of the next course we going to study the principle of karma according to Abdhidharma and at the last two classes of the next course, we'll discuss the Mind Only school explanation how karma is transmitted and it's a great explanation and it's accepted by the higher schools. They say that's fine. In fact they accept the Abdhidharmist presentation of karma also, basically. So they... it's nice way to present it. Okay so we're going a little bit about {gyepa} and {gupa} number eight and number nine. Okay. I will give you definition of number eight. You don't have to have it word for word but you just understand. It's says {tshor ba la tens} which means based on the seventh link, okay, based on link number seven, which is what? We have a guy with an arrow in his eye [laughs] what do you think that represents? [student: pain] Feeling, sensation. The ability to feel. Based on the ability to feel [student: physical sensation?] could be physical or mental pain. Based on the ability to feel which is link number seven it is the desire not to be separated from... it is the desire not to be separated from its object. What does that mean? All these links here, all these links here which occur after you're born represents development of the body and the senses and they represent milestone in the life of a young person. He gets his first...his sense organs develop for the first time; he has his first contact with outside object; he gets his first consciousnesses, growing from those contacts; those consciousnesses start to have emotions and feeling. He has certain kinds of contact like his food, and then sex and then he starts to feel good and that's {korwa} he starts to have good and bad feeling. His psyche develops to a point where he can feel good things and feel bad things. And then he, he starts to get naturally what? The desire to...not to lose the nice feelings and that's what basically human endeavors are most of all human endeavors in the world are based on trying not to get separated from what you want. It's always stated negatively by the way. I don't know why but it's important apparently. And, and this is one of those things where a good lama will say, 'I don't know why the text always say it negatively, we'll go look for the reason, but please be sure to pass it on this way to your students.' It's the desire not to be separated from its object. And that's only possible because, because you have the capacity to feel good. [student: well because it's more stimulated from the threat of it

being withdrawn then it is by the fact... ] Yeah I think...well we're going to talk about it but mostly people spent their lives trying not to lose whatever nice things they have; that's the function of getting...[student: [we are supposed to be taking parental [unclear] moment of birth?] there's three or four explanations. Some take a moment, some take a minute and some explanation says three, four, five lives. So there's a whole school on that; I'm not going to into it, it's a whole study on its own. We spend months on it in the monastery, okay.

Three kinds of craving. So now you know the definition of craving, right?

We were talking about the definition of link of craving. There're three types.

{du se} [repeat]

{si se} [repeat] okay.

Three kinds of the eighth link, right? Three kinds of craving. This is the trigger that triggers your karma. If you could get rid of this trigger you wouldn't have to be reborn...that's if you're an arhat. {du se}, {du se} {du} means desire. And {se} means craving. {se} is the general word for craving. {du se} means desire craving. What does that mean is define as {Tibetan} which means the craving which desires not to lose an attractive object. The craving which desires not to lose an attractive object. That's {du se}. On your homework don't just put 'desire, craving'. [student: say that again] [laughs] Ah Stanley, [student: craving not to...] [unclear] make your mother to take a [unclear] [laughs, laughter] Desire not to lose an attractive one. {jik} {jik} means fear, like {jik [unclear]} is Yamantaka [unclear] {se} means desire. So {jik se} means desire...what do you think? What do you guess? [student: the fear of losing... wish to avoid] {jik se} means...[student: to avoid the other subject] yeah, it's the craving which wishes to avoid an unpleasant...[student: is {se} means craving or desire? {se}...I like to use the word craving for {se pa} because {du pa} is more desire. {se pa} is suppose to make you...{se pa} is suppose to give you the feeling sort of intense desire. That's the difference between {du pa} and {se pa} in Tibetan. [student: could you repeat that again. The craving and...] {du pa} is the desire to be, is the desire to lose the non attractive object you know, like when you walk down the corridor at work and this guy you don't like is walking down towards you and you kind of turn down the hallway if you can. That's {jik se} all right. {du se} is your grabbing for that position. We have both. [student: so {du se} is desire, craving] You can call it desire, craving but what it means it, the desire not to be separated from attractive objects. It's simply given that name you know, desire, craving. They're all desire right? [student: yeah but number one is [unclear]] It is, it is. Those are just...they're not descriptive names. They're just...names. {si se}, {si se} the word literally means craving for existence. {se} means craving. {si} same spelling except different vowel, right? {si se} means existence, craving for existence. What is this wheel of life called in Tibetan? {si pe korlo} that's the {si}

in {si se}. {si pe korlo} means wheel of life, wheel of existence. So {si se} means craving for existence. How is it defined? {Tibetan} which means a craving which craves for yourself because at the moment of death you fear that you are ending. It's a craving for me because at the moment of death I have this great intense fear that I am ending. [student: you're ending?] You think you're... the word in Tibetan is {che} {che} means discontinued, chopped off. [student: so it's for your ego? I mean is it...] Now, now, it's a good question, it's a very nice question. Is it related to grasping for self existence? It's obviously very, very close, right. I mean it's what makes people scream when the airplane is falling down. They have this tape of that airplane that flipped over and the people are talking you know and then [unclear] struggling to control the airport...the airplane and then for the last thirty seconds obvious that nothing is gonna happen and they headed straight down. And they're just screaming, you know, screaming...{si se} is expressing itself, you know, they think, they truly believe at that moment that they're going to end. And they have this {se pa} they have this craving. Craving exerts itself very strongly in the last moments. You truly believe you're going to end and you don't want it to happen and you will do anything... if someone holds you over a roof top and tries to push you, you will...you will fight back; {si se} will fight back. {si se} is afraid that it's going to... that I'm going to end now and that's {si se}. All three are active, constitute the eighth link. It means that the...the craving that triggers your rebirth involves all three of these but mainly which one? [student: the last one] The last one obviously. Obviously the last one. [student: the last one was?] Obviously it's the {si se} it's the desire for existence; the craving for existence. It's that fear that you're ending which helps trigger the karma that you have in your life and then blows it up, makes it blow up. [student: so what's the difference between that and grasping?] Oh, now we're gonna talk about...that's, that's a natural...that's the next thing I was going to talk about. What's the difference between that craving and number nine which is grasping.

Number nine is defined as {Tibetan} which simply means the craving of link number eight increase to a very high degree. I don't know how to say it. The craving of number...the craving of link eight you know, increase to a very, very high state. Apparently there's two degrees of this, of this trigger. There's two degrees of the emotion or the mental function which at the moment of death triggers your karma and one of them is, is like at the very last moment when you're, when your desire to live, desire not to end gets very powerful and that's {gu pa}. That's number nine. Number nine is the actual trigger. {Gye pa} is all the stages that lead up to it. Now what's the relationship between those two mental functions, right, those two emotions as you die and, and the craving for self deepens – ignorance, and she's self existent. We gotta talk about that. The



key is in there somewhere. Okay. I don't see how just wanting not to die would force you to go into another mind stream. You know what I mean? I, I still don't see why. And the answer is deep in the scriptures and it has to do with grabbing to self existence at that point. We'll talk about that after a couple of days. Has some...[Student:..have we got time for it?] well you know, it's very fast don't worry.

{jik so ta}, {jik so ta} is a very, very strange word. View of the perishable assembly. View of the perishable assembly. There's no nice translation. It is easier to describe than to explain the words. It's to grasp you or the things that belong to you as self existent. It's the habit of grasping to yourself and the part of you as self existent. [student: so it's implied of the wrong view of the perishable assembly] Yeah it is a wrong view. There are five wrong views, this is one of them. When they say ignorance causes this wheel, spins this wheel and when you see the two blind men with sticks, you know ignorance, it is this very mental function. It's this one mental function which is the ignorance which spins the wheel. Not just not knowing something or, or not being aware of something, not that kind of ignorance. It's the active grasping to yourself as self existent. [student: would that be wrong view] Excuse me? [student: would that be wrong view?] it's one of the five wrong views. We'll study it one day. There's six major...I mean, this is not part of the class, there're six major mental illnesses, {nyong mong} kleshas and one of them is ignorance of a view, wrong view, and that has five forms. There's total of ten really. That's answer to your question, we'll do it some day.

{jik so ta} is the villain. {jik so ta} that ignorance, that view, is, is the villain. Right? And we'll talk more about it in a second. [student: when you first define the view of the perishable assembly, you said the habit of grasping at self and others..] I didn't say what belongs to you, I should have said, 'you and your parts' how's that. You and yours, meaning your arms, your legs, your mind, not meaning your house, your kids, your family, okay? [student: can you say skandas?] You could say that. You and your parts, how's that?

{dral}. {dral} means to, to not to have something; to lose something. It's actually the word I've been using all the night when it said, you know, lose something you like; don't lose something you don't you know. {Chir} means because. {Chir} means because. {Lam} you know. What's {lam}? [student: path] Path. It's like lam rim, steps of the path. {Dangpor} means at the beginning. And the {lam} here by the way, you make a note is the path of seeing. Which, what number is that of the five path? [student: third?] Number three. Why is it call path of seeing? [student: it's when you see, experience emptiness directly] Directly. First moment...it's the process of seeing emptiness directly for the first time in trillions and trillions and trillions, actually endless lives, beginningless

lives. It's losing your virginity, it happens once in the whole length of your trillions of lifetimes, it happens once. And you see emptiness directly for the first time. [student: you mean after you see, you see emptiness once, you cannot see it again?] You will see it many times again but I'm talking about that first time and you change totally after that, you're totally different kind of being, after that. You're an Arya. An Arya has a bigger meaning. There's only two kinds of being in the universe, you're either an Arya or you're not. You either have this experience or you haven't had this experience. And once you have had this experience you're on your way out. That's why you're call the stream enterer. You see your future lives; you see how many lives it's going to be; you meet Buddha; you see the truth of suffering directly; all these things happen within that couple of hours. [student: is it possible [unclear]] You would know. [student: how would know?] You would know. Because, because the lives that you would live after the moment that you see it are exceptional. You know, you live...you're always born in a comfortable family; you never have much go wrong in your life; you're always successful, I mean basically, it's, it's...even the last few samsaric lives are very comfortable. [student: are you involved in dharma necessarily?] You might not be as a child but you will be attracted to it and get into it at an early years. [student: [unclear] dharma, have happy live, basically [unclear]] You don't know. [student: so are they Aryas?] [unclear] [student: some lamas do have like difficult lives; [unclear]] [student: this is a little off but I just don't get, I mean, [unclear] what I don't get is, if everybody is, can be become a Buddha, and these are all separate mind streams, so is there some... it almost seem like there's some plan that we're suppose to become Buddhas at...in some point in time?] We will study you know, some day but it is the {sangye ge [unclear]} it is the {rangshin [unclear]} buddha nature of a being. You have to study that subject. It's along subject. [student: there's a sutra [unclear]] and it's a beautiful subject, it's a deep subject. [student: but then what happens if everybody becomes ...then what happens to samsara? I mean does the world change [unclear]] Rinpoche used to joke about it, he said, 'is everybody going to retire?' I don't know. It will come. [student: then certain world will disappear] yeah [student: so then other worlds will...I mean then there will be other kinds of world?] There will be no more hell. There will be no more hell. [student: Michael, [unclear] the point then what about the older [unclear], the great [unclear] they were pushed out of Tibet, I mean that's not very happy thing to happen to them. And supposedly they ....] But you have no idea if they're putting it on. Mao Tse Tung was a Bodhisattva you don't know, was it a plan, you know Tibetan Lamas, I don't know. You don't know. That was the first thing Buddha said beginning of this class, you really don't know. You don't know. [student: what do you mean, you don't know? You don't know what] I

don't know. I can't tell you Mao Tse Tung wasn't a bodhisattva in collusion with all the Tibetan lamas and they made up the whole thing [unclear], I don't know. Okay, what is a bodhisattva? I mean a bodhisattva can, can pretend to live a whole life of fifty years, you know, to talk to you for ten minutes. He will do that. He will do that. He will get close to you for your whole life just to have conversation with you at age thirty or forty, to affect your mind. It's worth it for him. It's possible. It's not at all impossible. {dangpor ni} at the beginning. {si me}, {si} you know because this was {si pe korlo}. What does {si} mean? [student: [unclear]] Life, another life. This case it means rebirth, life in a sense of a rebirth. {me} means what? [student: not] there's not. {Gyur} means there wouldn't ....there will be no, there will be no rebirth. [student: what is {ni}?] {ni} is a filler. Oh. He needs to make it beat. Down here you're gonna see him cram two beats into one, have to fit the other way, okay. So what does it mean? It means if you, if you got rid of this view, this wrong view, I should say, I want to rephrase that. If getting rid of any kind of this wrong view, [student: any kind of?] If getting rid of any kind of this wrong view, we're going to talk about it. I'll repeat it. If getting rid of any type of this wrong view could stop your rebirth, that's what the first line mean, okay? Getting rid of any kind of this wrong view, could stop your rebirths then at the beginning of the path of seeing, third path, right, you would reach a state where you didn't have to take birth any more. [student: okay if getting rid of this kind of wrong view ...] Is getting rid of any kind of this wrong view [student: then at the beginning of what?] got you out of rebirth, you know. Stops all your rebirth. Then at the minute you see emptiness directly what? You would...you'll never have to take a rebirth. But that's not true. [student: are you saying that you're permanent lose the view at the...] we're going to talk about it. We're going to talk about it. And, and I want...you don't have to write this down, just listen. There's three levels I'm talking about. I saw people's ears prick up in the last class when Dharmakirti said, 'the reason you have to take a rebirth is at the moment of your death you have, you have desire'. So I got, I got this feeling that people were thinking, oh, you know I could collect all the karma I want, get to the last moment of life, clean up my act in that last ten minutes, my other karma... all that karma wouldn't be activated and I would be...reach nirvana, you know. I mean it sounds like that, right? And, and that's not what it means to have desire at the moment of your life, that's what I'm trying to say. Having desire at the last moment of your life means grasping to self existent view. Like wanting that self existent you to be happy. And wanting that self existent you not to get lost and that's what triggers your karma. It's not just that you want something. And, and this relate to a very bad view, I think that's prevalent among people who don't study Buddhism very well which is they think that Buddhist somehow

reach a point where they can't care about anything; they don't want anything. Well then don't you want nirvana? Don't you want to be Buddha? Don't you want to help other living beings? I mean is being a Buddhist...is the perfection of your practice is somehow reach some state where you don't care about anything; you don't want anything; you know it just doesn't ever make sense to me and it's a prevalent view point among Buddhist schools. You hear in Buddhist teachings sometimes. When you get that feeling that, oh, I'm not a good Buddhist because I actually want it, to get out of samsara. [laugh] you know when I reach this high state I won't even want to get out of samsara. It's obviously not right. You want to get out of samsara; you want to get out of pain, okay. What I mean is that {se pa} that we talked about, link number eight, craving. Is that wrong for you to want to get out of samsara? Isn't that a form of craving? [student: Art taught that's what I think. Isn't it really qualitative different kind of emotion?] That's what I asked you right now. I mean is wanting to get out of samsara which is a undesirable object, craving, and could that trigger a rebirth? Could it act as a cause for samsara rather than a way to get out of samsara? It's renunciation, craving. [student: I think it would be. I think it depends upon...] [student: your motivation] [student: not if your have the correct fear] I mean just think about it. I mean I want to get to place that's permanent pleasure, I want that. That's why I become a monk; that's why I'm a Buddhist, I enjoy pleasure, I like it. I want to get to place .... I do. I do. Frankly I do. I want to reach a point where I'm happy all the time and I want to avoid the place where I have to get old and die and see bad things happens, things I don't like and that's reason why I'm here. [students] [student: doesn't that have a different karmic effect from other cravings?] [student: wait a minute though I mean it's a craving...what you should be saying or what you mean I guess by saying, craving to get out of samsara that's one and the same thing as saying 'wishing to see myself as I truly am' which is at that point, what self is there? Who's craving what? What's craving who?] No, I don't...no I don't think like that. [student: well that's what it means.] The Buddha....[student: samsara means seeing yourself the wrong way] By the way this is on your homework. Okay. The Buddha perceives Himself, this is the most...this is the first way of perceiving yourself. It's called unanalyzed; unchecked; un...just the Buddha when he looks at the Buddha, he's says 'me' and there's nothing wrong with that. It's okay. even the Buddha thinks of himself as me. Okay? And, and an example given in the scripture is, the Buddha thinks he's begging bowl is his. The Buddha thinks his robes are his. And if someone came up and stole them the Buddha does think, they're stealing my begging bowl. He has an awareness of that as being his. And of himself as being me. And there' nothing wrong with that. [students] That's called the {yu je dak} Tom Kiley's unexamined perception

of Tom Kiley is acceptable. There's a Tom Kiley. It's a {tsem ma}. It's a pramana. You see a Tom Kiley. To deny a Tom Kiley will be ridiculous. [student: right but the way, the way I believe that Tom Kiley exist and the way the Buddha believes that Buddha exist is two different things] what I'm saying is that...[student: and that's difference is samsaric] On a unexamined level, the way you just, you know, I'm Michael Roach, that's all. That's not wrong, there's nothing bad about it. There's nothing {jig tso tar} about it. It's okay. It's unexamined, conventional. So don't mix that up with, now we get to the bad one. The bad one is to want Michael Roach to be happy and misperceive who is he? And who is a blank and I'm perceiving him as Michael Roach in a certain form because I'm forced to by what? [student: by karma] My karma; my past deeds. I'm blank. I could have been Yamantaka. I could have Gauatama Buddha. I could have been Vajrayogini. I'm blank. I could be seeing myself that way, I didn't get the right causes in life. I, I messed up. That's why I have to see myself getting old and, and gonna to die. I, I didn't prepare the right causes and now this blank thing I must see as Michael Roach as a samsaric being. [student: and we're craving to continue to see that wrong thing] I'm, I'm trying to make myself happy simply by wanting to be happy. And I'm trying to make myself happy by doing deeds which are not the right ones to make myself happy and that's ignorance and that's a misperception of my nature. So if you want Michael Roach to be happy it has nothing to do with...you know, outsmarting someone else at my job or you know, being able to corner the market on doughnuts, you know, that's not how I'm going to get happy. I have to do good deeds. I have to forget all the temporary causes that're involved I have to go for the real causes that are making me happy. [student: so if you see yourself as a mind stream? You're saying that, that is less legitimate? I mean...] you're a mind stream what do you want? [student: no. because I have always been very confuse..] They say in Tibet, they say {je dak} that's why I'm talking about it. You know, I mean that's why we're talking about it or otherwise this whole stuff is very confusing. [student: yeah I never could understand it. They also say you're empty but then they say there's something that continues on. So what's continuing on if you're empty, you know [unclear]] it's your perception. Yeah I'm blank. I prefer blank. I really prefer blank. Blank gives you the right idea. You're blank. The word blank is great [student: but mind stream has a sense of continuation whereas blank doesn't] There is moment of consciousness that are blank. Even the mind stream itself is an appellation. [student: but if you say that each one of these mind stream is separate that you say] they are [student: then there is something very continuous of the mind stream] what do you mean, of course. It's your karma. But we're not going to talk about it. What I'm saying is that what triggers karma? What makes that desire, bad desire? Is the

misperception of yourself, linked with the wrong action that inspires. All your normal activities aimed at getting some kind of contentment or happiness in this life are misdirected. If you knew what you were doing, you would just go out and do the most charitable thing you could do because that's the only cause for you to see your blank self as, as happy. It's not figuring how to do the best business deal or figuring out how to find the person you like or, you know it's... that's just wrong and, and if you do those deeds you're proving that you don't understand your nature and you're ignorant and that will cause you trouble. [student: so what's that becomes happy or what is it that becomes a buddha?] You have a perception of a blank thing as happy. [student: what's the blank thing?] and that perception is forced on you by karma. [student: what's the blank thing?] Your mind and your body. [student: your mind and your body?] Mmm hmm. [student: so you go beyond the formless realm and to...] No you see your mind and body as happy. And when you focus on your mind you see the parts of your mind as your mind. And when you focus one of the parts of your mind, you see the last moment and the next moment as the mind. and it's, it's empty. And it's okay. and it's works. And that's how you will be a Buddha. [laughter] [laughs] That's F's view point and covers pure Middle Way. Everything else is wrong. That's how you will become a Buddha. [student: when you focus on parts of your mind you see the last moment and the next moment and that's how it continues] What I'm saying is you always go...you're always looking at the parts and, and imputing the mind that's the whole of it. You see the parts of yourself and call it Leigh. When you focus on your body, you see the arms and legs and you call them Leigh's body. And then when you focus on Leigh's arms you see Leigh's hands, Leigh's wrist and Leigh's elbow. When you focus on Leigh's elbows you see the upper part of your elbow and the lower part of your elbow and you call that elbow. You can go back endless...[student: like the pencil right?] [student: but there's no good or bad attached to that] Sure. If I see a mortal elbow, you know breakable elbow or arm that has pain, that's because I did the deeds to force myself to see that. [student: but when you're talking about looking at your body and sort of just labeling [unclear]] I didn't... no I'm just describing what you do as the result of your karma. [student: and the preferable focus ...] You'll reach a point in your career....dharma career where out of cold knowledge you do the right things and you'll be forced to see yourself as a Buddha. [student: but Michael when you...] [student: you wouldn't call it he's doing grasping at self simply because he labels it that] That first one, and I described four kinds of grasping at yourself or four ways of seeing yourself and you better know because it could be on the homework. First one, the first one is what we call conventional perception of me. That's fine. I'm Michael Roach, come on. {sem me du ..cher} because I say it with a {sem

ma} I'm Michael Roach. Is that wrong? Is that somehow mistaken? Is that not a {sem ma}? No. Not at all. The second level of seeing yourself – I'm Michael Roach I see myself existent...I see myself as self existent and I believe myself to be self existent. How does that manifest itself? I think I can be happy by manipulating causes which has nothing to do with my happiness. [student: I believe I can be happy by manipulating causes ...] Manipulating causes has nothing to do with my happiness and that's how we spent our lives. Now there is...now there's a person who has seen emptiness directly. How is he different from the second I described. [student: he sees himself as self existent but doesn't believe he is] Right. By the way I'm talking about...very important I'm talking about after he comes down after that first experience. While he's in that experience forget it, it's a different thing. But when he comes down, he sees himself as self existent but he knows he's wrong. He doesn't even believe himself anymore. He sees but he does not believe it. [student: that he has seen emptiness. [student: number three ] Yeah, directly. [student: Michael, this is number three] That was number three. Number two is like people who haven't seen emptiness directly yet. They see it and they believe it. [student: [ and what about [unclear]] That's what I do when I'm at number two. An Arya no longer collects karma. [student: just after having seen emptiness the first time] Yeah, he no longer collects the cause of suffering. [student: even if he gets angry] very interesting. It's very interesting. [student: even if he gets angry] Very interesting. We'll debate some time. It's a huge debate in the monastery. There's a reputable text that says he doesn't collect. Okay number four. Big debate, I don't say it's an easy thing. We have to debate it. [student: no, no it sounds like a nice...] we'll talk about it. Number four – what do you guess is number four? [student: Buddha] Buddha or an arhat? No longer sees himself and no longer believes himself. He never did believe right, since he as an arya but now he has purified himself to such a point that he doesn't see things as self existent. [student: it's just habituation] that's what the path of habituation is for – to go from three to four. [student: no longer sees himself as self existent?] and doesn't believe it any more and that's why there's five paths and not only four. It takes number four to get to number five. Which of those can trigger your karma at the moment of death? [student: two] which of those four people have to take rebirth? [student: two] [student: well, oh three also] That's where...by the way there in number three is where you get the once returner, non returnerS [student: by why number three?] stream enterers. You gotta study that subject. Guy number two is a person who has not reached the path of seeing. He sees things as self existent and he believes that they're self existent. And he's got...if he dies in that state it will trigger his...his karma will get triggered he will look at himself and wish himself to be happy or wish himself

not end and that will be ignorant perception of himself. That's what I'm saying. It's not enough to desire. Therefore it's not enough at the last moment of your life, just to not have desire for five minutes as you die and you're okay. Doesn't work that way. [student: it couldn't, I mean if you have desire you whole life you couldn't just the last minute say, oh...] that's why this powa stuff. You have to study powa. There is Gelugpa powa, it's very secret. It's very fine. And, and it's very, very delicate and that's that whole thing but the likelihood of living a very lousy life and the last five minutes, in the most terrifying moments of your existence, thinking clearly and doing the right thing it's almost...it's beyond impossible. [student: there's a... an irony working here as well because that second person is going to be very terrified at the prospect of that there being an end to their mind stream which can't be] Yeah, yeah. [student: they're terrified of something that couldn't exist] they didn't study enough what Dharmakirti [unclear] They didn't go from...you not only have to study Dharmakirti's schools, you have to meditate on them so much that it becomes part of your being and the moment of death it's so strong in you that it doesn't get pushed aside by your fear at that moment. That, that is going to take a lot [student: they're afraid of something that couldn't happen if they did everything to try to make it happen] [student: we not they ] [laughter] [student: Michael could you translate the other two lines] So it's number two and three which are going to trigger so that's why arya still have to take rebirth...arhat. [student: purified] So what he's saying is.... I'll ask you a question – if you got rid of ignorance in the form of grasping to a self existent me, would your karma be triggered? [student: say that again] If you got rid of ignorance at {jiktso ta} meaning perceiving a self existent you, would you...if you got rid of that kind of ignorance would have to take rebirth. [student: if you got...say it again] If you got rid of that kind of ignorance which sees me as self existent, or believes me as self existent would you have to take rebirth? No. So why does he say just because you don't have that view doesn't mean you don't have to take rebirth? He's talking about the first type – it's called intellectual guessing, that's the one where you don't believe it but you do still see it. What he's saying is even if you reach that point where you no longer believe in a self, your self existent, it's not enough to stop your rebirth. [student: number there?] You have...right. Even if you reach number three it's not good enough to get out of rebirth. Because if it were enough, if it were enough then you would get of rebirth at the first moment of the... [student: direct perception] the path of seeing. [student: now Michael some beings must, in a the same way, to become an arya apply themselves and go all the way to it] Exactly. Exactly. They're called... there's even a name for them. [student: but does that also people who, who achieve nirvana in this life and then they have the remainder, right?] You...there's a



kind of being who does it one life. They go from arya to arhat in one life, in the same life. [student: Michael, intellectual grasping and...] Believing, I'm, I'm saying...you could say intellectual, you could say believing in self, okay. What he's saying is believing in the self existent there's no self. Getting rid of the believing is not enough to get rid of the triggers. The two triggers that trigger your karma when you die. You must get rid of the {tan kyi} {tan chi kyi} means that innate grasping to a self which all being have. In fact it is the very seeing that a thing as self existent. It's the predilection it's the habit of seeing things as self existent which even an arya has after he comes down. And you have to get rid of that...much more difficult. [student: Michael, what say that you, you... with the path of habituation you no longer see yourself as self..] You no longer believe yourself [student: you no longer believe yourself as the self but you know that you've accrued bad karma so couldn't you be...even though you know yourself doesn't exist could you have fear that the negative karma might trigger a rebirth even though you don't believe your own existence?] Right. That's what exactly what happens, unless in the same life he becomes an arhat. Because if he doesn't he does get these two and it is triggered and he does he has to be born again. And that's why there're all those classification called stream enterer, once- returner and non returner. Those are all people who have to be born again. [student: so in other words if you don't see yourself and you know that yourself is not self existent even though you have bad karma, you won't feel fear?] Yeah that's a good point. Arhats' pockets are full of bad karma [cut]

Side B

[cut]

so they just don't have the triggers so they never take birth. [student: what about Buddhas?] they have collected piles of bad karma but they don't have the triggers; not that they clean out all the bad karma. The karma is there. It's never triggered. Never activated. [student: it will never be...it will never grow ] No. It will never produce the result. [student: now I thought that's same for Buddhas' as well but you disagree with me in the last class about that] Go look it up. [student: I thought Rinpoche thought even Buddhas have the same phenomena because I asked him is all a matter of cleaning out all of your bad karma before you can reach Buddha, he said 'no'. so much that even Buddhas have it] It sort of difference between Jain and Buddhist. What does Jain believe, I mean in India? He'll say you can never become [student: it takes too long] [unclear], it's impossible. You can't prevent killing germs; you can't help stepping on bugs you know. We Jains believe that in trillions of years only one person ever gets to nirvana. And we just believe that it will go on almost endlessly, we don't believe we could even stop the bad deeds. When you even

eat a piece of bread how many get killed to get that piece of bread you know. So we don't believe that. [student: Michael what is it from being an being the difference between an arya and arhat – stop seeing things as self existent. [student: what is the difference between an arya, arhat?] Arya has seen...arya has seen emptiness directly. He has lost that virginity, that lousy virginity. He has seen emptiness directly. What's an arhat? He has no longer has any bad emotion created – permanent cessation of his bad emotions. [student: but even the arya having bad emotions, is not going to generate bad karma from it] Long story. If the arhat has bodhicitta on the day he becomes an arhat what happens? He becomes a Buddha. [student: who does that?] you become an arhat, with bodhicitta in your mental stream you're a Buddha. If you're...if you get rid of all your bad thoughts...but don't have bodhicitta then what happens? You become a Hinayana arhat. That's Hinayana arhat. That's what they call self made buddha or solitary realizer. [student: what are you saying, the day you become an arhat...] shravakas and pratekya buddhas, those are the two. They're not real buddhas. They are just arhats. [student: an arhat can...that's with bodhicitta the same day he become arhat?] No, no, no. If he become an arhat under the influence of bodhicitta, with bodhicitta in your heart, at that moment you become a Buddha, if you don't have bodhicitta and just clean out all your bad thoughts permanently you become a lower arhat. Now what happens with lower arhats they got to go up again to the bodhisattva level and go all the way down to the bodhisattvas and again finally they get to buddhahood. They still have a lot of work to go. [student: but they...also Michael this is buddhahood and arhatship are the last birth or reincarnation or...?] That's what arhat means. Arhat does not have eight and nine. He never triggers his karma. [student: so when you become either a buddha or an arhat okay, and an arhat just finish with you say a Hinayana buddha for instance...] Well you can say Hinayana arhat [unclear]. Mahayana arhat and a buddha is the same thing. [student: right. So the next...so a Buddha or a Hinayana arhat then that's their last incarnation and mean that's same form they have all the time?] that's their last samsaric life. [student: last samsaric life, okay. So, so okay then they incarnate then as something then that is not going to reincarnate any more in none samsaric fashion or ...? So it's a permanent, whatever they, the last samsaric life is the very the next life after that, that's the permanent one for the rest of eternity] Hinayana arhat you gotta talk about a little and the different schools have different ideas and I'm not going into it. Basically....[student: or is there something where they don't...you know, they will end that existence but they will have another enlightened existence some place after somewhere] Something like that, depend on which school. [student: can we go over the last two lines?] Okay are you ready and then we'll stop. But, but I just want to get

you the key...that's what you always wanted to know and what always was confusing, right? How does the last moment's work? What's the point of saying if you don't have desire. Doesn't refer to desire, right? Refers to desire that a self-existent me be happy; that a self-existent me not starve. It depends on perceptions of me as self. [student: but you say that you want to be happy and what are you talking about?] Because it makes...[student: you] I understand, I understand. But, but I make sense doesn't it? It's not wrong to want to be happy. Otherwise why would you ever strive for buddhahood? Why would strive to become Vajrayogini if it's wrong to be happy? Or if it's wrong to want to be happy, you know, that's...now when I say Michael Roach wants to be happy, in my perceiving in Michael Roach who would undertake actions that has nothing to do with my happiness, be happy? [student: no.] If I do, it's, it's {sepa} it's craving. If I don't think of myself that way, it's not craving and it just helps, it would be great. That's the key, why? That's the one thing [student: but you were saying that somebody who had seen emptiness, right, wouldn't they feel the way you do?] Sure. [student: but you're saying they do take rebirth] Ah yeah 'cos they still see themselves as self-existent. [student: and you don't] Can't ask me that. [laughs] I'm just a normal guy. {hlenchik khepa} means that innate grasping for the self; seeing yourself as self-existent. Bugs have that; amoebas have that; dogs have that. {hlenchik khepa mapang chir} {mapang} means they have not got rid of it. {chir} means because. So what's he is saying here is that if, if getting rid of all forms of seeing yourself as self-existent and believing yourself as self-existent was all it took to finish your rebirth, well then the moment you saw emptiness directly what? [student: you'd never have to be born again...] you'd never have to be born again. But he says it's not true because they have not yet given up the innate form of grasping to themselves, which means to see themselves as self-existent. And then the last line is a nice line to end on {dang na-ang} but if you were to {dang}, what's {dang} if you were to give it up what? Seeing yourself as self-existent...[student: then you, then you not have any] Yeah good. {si pa} means rebirth. {Gala yu} means where on earth could it happen; how on earth could you ever have to take another rebirth. [student: na-ang, I'm sorry I lost the {na-ang} part] {pang na-ang} means but if you did get rid of it this habit of seeing yourself as self-existent... [student: so {pang na-ang}] {Pang} means get rid [student: oh sorry] {na-ang} means but if you were [student: thank you] {sipa} means rebirth. {Gala yu} means come on how could it ever happen? [student: could you [unclear] the whole thing, just ..] The basis is this. Dharmakirti said at the beginning of the class, the reason a person has to talk rebirth, the reason the mind has to flop over into the same [unclear] is, is that mind has desire. I didn't like that. He didn't sound reasonable to me. What's desire got to do with the mind

continuing into the other mind? Ah but if it, if it's that desire means, desiring to self existent me, not to end and that perception of a self existent me karmically causes me to have another perception of the mind. That's a little tricky. What I'm saying is that the desire that Dharmakirti is talking about is to trigger, trigger desire. Trigger desire depends on misperceiving himself. Wants me to be happy and has no knowledge of what I'm suppose to do to get that. It... it's going to work tomorrow and work hard to be happy; to work hard to get more money. Has nothing to do with getting more money. You want more money collect the similar cause. Similar cause – give away money. I mean the best Wall Street young broker who wants to get ahead is to go give money away, that's the only cause getting money.. [student: Michael I would just like to reread through that] Yeah, yeah okay. that's a difficult....if you're going to chariot the whole thing it's very difficult. Okay. If getting rid, if getting rid of any form ignorance...let's say this way, if getting rid of the basic forms of ignorance, okay...if getting rid of the basic form of ignorance and then he doesn't say the rest of the sentence, okay, this is a code...we're enough not to take rebirth, we're enough not have to take rebirth, okay, getting rid of the most basic forms of ignorance were enough not have to take rebirth [student: you're saying it's samsaric?] Yeah, it's samsaric. Sorry. [laughs] well then at the very beginning of the path of seeing implied, well then at the very beginning of the path of seeing then you fill the rest – what would happen? [student: no more rebirth] You wouldn't have to take any more rebirth; you wouldn't have to do anything else because he did get rid of what? [student: of believing] Believing in his self existence. We got two lines covered right? Now we're on the third line. [student: what was the last part of this...?] Yeah okay, I was afraid you'd say that. You read to me what you have and I fill it... [student: if getting rid of any basic form of ignorance was enough not to take rebirth well then at the very beginning of the path of seeing ...] You would never have to take rebirth again. [student: and then you said something else] that's all. You would never have to take rebirth again. [student: if you had to.] And I like it because we're ending like I consider Dharmakirti's most important verse of all the hundreds of verses. I mean I don't mind if you put in that translation now, why? Understood- because he has not gotten rid of...he or she has not gotten rid of the inborn ignorance, form of ignorance. What...how would you describe {tse [unclear]}, the inborn form of ignorance. [student: it's the...] He sees things as self existent. [student: he sees things as self existent ...] doesn't have to be a belief; you cannot believe it, if you not an Arya now you don't believe it. If you an Arya now you do believe. It's just seeing things as self existent. And the last line says, but if you were to get rid of what? Get rid of what? [student: seeing things as self existent] Yeah good, that advance of ignorance, all right, that deep form of ignorance okay. I, I'll say it again. But if

you were to get rid of that deep form of ignorance and you all know that I mean, as you start to grasp to yourself in the last moments of this life, well then {si pa ga-la vu...} how could you ever take rebirth? Meaning a bad rebirth, a samsaric rebirth. Good place to stop. Kiley.

Oh, the next class is review, right? And did we set a date for your finals? One week later okay, cool. If you, by the way, if you feel you need more time for your final I don't care if you come and take it any other time. If you're be going somewhere and you want to do it another night, earlier, I don't care either. You're welcome to do that. the finals will be on this table, you find somebody with a key if you don't have a key and you want a key let me know. I'll give you a key. You're welcome to come in any time and use this room for good purposes. Just please remember to lock the door, okay. I'll give you a key and then you could come and take it any time you want. Or find somebody who has a...Kiley have a key? Kiley has a key, anybody else has a key? Yeah. You know you can copy Kiley's key or I'll give you key this afternoon...I'll go out and make some tomorrow and you're welcome to come and use this room; you're welcome to come [unclear] examination, leave it on the table. Then the new class is October 5<sup>th</sup> .... I'm sorry, 17<sup>th</sup>.

[students] Oh we have covered that already. That is in that because of this he was that and because of that he's this you see what I mean? Like proving that he's the...because he has compassion [unclear]

Prayer: Mandala Offering

Dedication

## Course 4 – The Proof of Future Lives

### Class Eleven – Course Review

October 3, 1994

Transcriber - Su Foo

Proofread – Linda Salmon

[cut] really should study all the quizzes, you know, I might get one or two, [laughter] I might study one and start arguing, you know how that goes, not on purpose. [Student: number what?] [Laughs laughter] [Unclear] learn all this stuff...your mind is like an illusion that's why I didn't have [unclear]. Okay, of course the question would probably be, name the words for correct or valid perception in Sanskrit and Tibetan. What is it in Tibetan? {tse-ma} and in Sanskrit? Pramana. And, and just you know, these are all the things that you know I wish you would always remember from this course. I mean this last course because these are...you know, somebody ask you what's pramana then what do you say? Not, not perception, hinayana perception is wrong. You should say valid perception. Of course all you know now is correct perception. When you get to Madhyamika Prasangika its more valid perception. They're difference between correct and valid we're thinking of both. But correct just means...almost all the perceptions you ever have in your life are {tse ma} okay? And basically {tse ma} is useful for only saying the right thing, you know; you shouldn't say anything unless you have a {tse ma} about it. That would be refreshing. Guess everyone in the world.... I know I don't it and I, and I meet people who do have that quality and I admire them. So I think its very good quality to develop. Only talk about when you have {tse ma} and if you don't have a {tse ma} about it you say 'I think' you know. I think Franklin said... Benjamin Franklin said...in his younger days used to be very opinionated and later he got older he decided he would attach 'I think' to everything and it saved him a lot of grief. Think...just imagine how many cases there are when you...it's pretty sure that you know but you don't really know and then you have to be careful. That's {tse ma}. {tse ma} is when you actually know the truth. You have actually seen it or perceived it and logically it's okay but it has to be airtight which is difficult. [Student: say I believe certain things to be the case. Based on what I am, in so far....] Yeah that's fine. [Student: Michael I would also like to matter of being truthful all the time as well] That's what {tse ma} means. Okay. What is Buddhist definition of existence? We'll go around. What's the definition of existence? [Student: that which [unclear] pramana] okay anything which is perceived by {tse ma} you see I know it exist because I, I saw it or I thought about with a {tse ma} everything else you don't know is pretty slim. You don't

know if a Buddha exist really unless you hae a {tse ma} right now. You don't know if Buddhahood exists; you don't know if a bodhisattva exist, really. [Unclear] they can and maybe if you study long time you could argue for it. A lot of difficulty.

Okay, Ellen [unclear] what does the Buddha say himself...what does the Buddha himself say it's the perfect of Buddhist logic, remember? [student: [unclear]] Yeah okay. So far so good. Should not what? Only he or she...[student: should not judge another] can another. Only a Buddha {Tibetan} unless you're Me or a person like Me, meaning you know you can read the other person's mind, don't...a normal person shouldn't judge another person because you will fall. You will fail. And after the break I'm going to tell you a little bit about that. that's the most...that's the first thing we learn in logic in the monastery, age fifteen normally, they teach that line, they never even know where it comes from. They have no idea what scripture it came from. They just memorize it and...[student: what does that got to do with logic anyway?] That's an excellent question, I'm glad somebody [unclear]. No, logic is the deductive process by which you will see the {tse ma}, by which you could judge another person. [student: but you can normally judge another person when you a Buddha [unclear]] Only a Buddha can have a {tse ma} about it, maybe...[student: only Buddha can have a {tse ma} Uh, you can read a person's mind before that. [student: are you saying a regular person can do this?] Well lets say that it looks to you...you know like...somebody might do an extraordinary thing for special reason and you always have to keep in the back of your mind that this person might be doing this for a special reason, you know, or, or something like that; something that looks strange to you or...what I'm saying is...[student: what has got to do [unclear]] that's understanding logic because logic is knowing that you don't know unless it's logical; unless there's the three parts of the proof... you know, he's, he's a bad person because I saw him to that, right?

What are the three parts of the [unclear] in the proof. He did that -true. If he did that it's a bad person - true. You know but did he do that for that reason or some...you see you have to have logic...you have to analyze the three parts to the idea. We didn't get into logic...that's whole another...we gonna study it someday. I'm afraid to make people dropout. [Student: so were just saying, I just say somebody do something, what I saw is normally done by bad people, that person could be a bad person but..] That's all right [student: but not necessarily] but I don't know for sure. [Student: I don't know for sure] and I don't know his motivation was maybe he's going to save somebody from hell you know, I don't know, could be a bodhisattva, you know I don't know. [Student: [unclear] what I saw was done by bad people usually doesn't mean this person is bad] Right. [Student: Michael why would a bodhisattva or a Buddha

choose something that is destructive like killing someone, hurting someone instead of using some kinder way because kinder things perpetuate kinder things] Normally, normally they would. They say that about the subject of violence in, in...even as a protection they say pretend the person is your own mother, pretend she went out of her mind temporary; pretend she picked up a knife and went at you...you know, you wouldn't try to kill her or break a leg or you know, you would try to disarm her or talk to her or stop her somehow, you would think of any other way than to hurt her. [Student: [unclear] with it that there's a Buddha killing that guy in the ship, why didn't he tie him up? Why did he have to kill him? He could've tied him up, he couldn't kill anybody] It's explained in such a way that he had to make choice at the moment; he saw with every kind of {tse ma} it's only way to stop him at that moment. Somebody said to His Holiness Dalai Lama in LA, if you're standing next to the guy and he had a button on the atomic bomb and he's going to let it off, do you kill him? And Dalai Lama let know [unclear] [laughter, laughs] something like that, okay. [Student: is the word hell of fall] and it's meant in the literal sense, you go down to hell and you will see why, I'm going to tell you a little story. [Student: I still don't understand the direct connection between logic and how using logic or not using logic will cause you to fall] What it means is don't, don't, don't believe assumptions; don't think... we have studied it {yi chu} assumptions or presumptions or explanations or approximations are not {tse ma} [student: so is he saying...] he's saying if you don't have {tse ma} don't, don't judge other people. [Student: don't use logic to judge other people?] No, you can if it is airtight logic – this is a bad person because I can read his mind. [Student: so the inference here is... so the inference here is if you have accurate logic it's okay to judge?] Oh yeah. That's what {Tibetan} if you have {tse ma} but, but do you ever have {tse ma} that's the point. Unless you're like the Buddha, unless you can read his mind. And that's the past implications that the very highest teaching of Buddhism and that's...to follow that code will be very good from now 'cos there's no reason not to; it's logical to do that now. [Student: so are you saying then if you could have airtight logic you should follow it to judge people but we can't have airtight logic so we should never judge people?] Normally that's the situation...unless you're like a Buddha. [Student: you could judge [unclear] alos] It doesn't mean follow them if they're evil; it doesn't mean don't resist them if they're evil. You're required to if they're evil but, but just realize that you don't know...you know you just, you just think to the best of your knowledge but you must resist and, and as you get better and if you follow your vows more carefully you must, you must resist. Okay.

Kiley, two levels of {tse ma} [student: oh dear] what are the two kinds of {tse ma}? What two ways to perceive them. [Student: oh with your eye?] No.



[Student: when you see...when you ..] One is obvious, like the wall. [Student: Yeah] that's what? That's direct. What's the other way? [student: indirect] Yeah indirect meaning..? [Student: by logical deduction.] Number two is totally good, valid, cool, you know, use it. You need it. So number one – direct perception, how many kinds are there? [Student: uh three] Well you could say your eyes, ears, nose, tongue, body and then your thoughts, your direct thought. Those are all direct perceptions, okay. When they're correct they are direct {tse mas} Now what if you use deduction? That's, that's only mental. You can't use deduction with your eyes and your ears and your nose, okay. Your eyes, your ears, your nose can never be indirect. They can never be deduction. Yeah logic and you use logic constantly. Every moment of the day you're using logic. You're not aware of it or you don't think of it as logic but all day long you make decisions based on logically fact. Even when you speak you're using... grammar is based on logic. Okay.

What two levels of reality do those two are they use for? [Student: the obvious] Yeah, evident reality and? [student: and hidden reality] Hidden or deeply hidden, goes into the second category. So all this reality is like, this color or the feel on your armor smell of my dog, something like that. That's evident, too evident and then hidden, hidden things okay are like...real subtle impermanence, emptiness, the workings of karma – those are hidden. Even what's behind my table is hidden from me right now. What's inside my table here is hidden from you; you don't know what's inside. You can't see and you can't deduce it perfectly, okay. You don't know what I got what I got under here. So that's...for you now that's hidden. All right. Yeah? [Student: working of karma as an example of deeply] Yeah, we're including hidden and deeply hidden together as something as that has to perceive as what? [Student: indirect] Indirect – that's right, logical. That's the whole point of this class actually. Spiritual thing you can't establish with your direct sense. I mean the real important spiritual principle you must establish with logic. You must think it over carefully and then come to a point where you understand, oh yeah there must be a past life; there must be a future life. [student: but what about likes for example when you believe that good things will bring good things and you're adopt that kind of... thought] Depends if it's done by belief or by logic. I think at the end of the karma class, especially the last two classes you will receive an explanation of karma, how it's stored in your mind...that's very uh acceptable, at least it's very exciting to me and I think then it will become a deduction for that you should have...you should have good because you understand the process by which seeds are stored in your mind every moment of your day and they must come out later. So when you get that explanation I think you will be following karma out of deduction and but right now it's just out that you're

attracted to Buddhism, you studied in your past life and you, you feel some... you feel that it's good or right you know, you don't really have any proof. And that's a dangerous situation to be in. Someone could talk you out of it. [Student: what happens if you adopt that kind of thing and you notice that in reality is true if you do good then you...] If it's based on your experience...I don't think...they say that establishing karma with your personal experience this life is very difficult because you can have very sweet disaster happening from your old karma. So it doesn't look.... you know what I mean? You can be good for years and then you have cancer, you know, people give up Buddhism because they think it's...that's not true...that doesn't prove anything, you know, you see what I mean? But you can be evil your whole life and still get rich and you see that. Well you see what appears to be that. [Student: [unclear] my question was the deeply hidden object can even produced by.... produced they have to be taken faith?] Yeah actually they, they are kind of...taken on faith is kind of deduction. That's a sub-category of deduction. [Student: right, can you make the distinction in the class then?] Okay. It's a sub-category of deduction. Okay. All right. Oh number...give the text of Master Dignaga's famous opening statement. [Student: I bow down to the one who turn correct, who helps all beings, the Teacher, the one who went to bliss and our Protector.] Yeah okay. It's not just the...I mean if you read that in the opening of some book from Wisdom or Snow Lion you just skip it. Sounds pretty boring. [Laughter] They all... all those Tibetan books start with that kind of thing. Now you know each word has a...it's a code word, you know, hopefully one day you'd be able to explain to somebody. The whole process by which you become Buddha is imbued in those words right? Very important. so you really should know it. If somebody says, 'what you studying?' And you say, 'I studied pramana.' "Well do you anything by Dignaga?" "Well I know these two lines, you know" and that's enough, that's, that's the most famous thing he ever said. So that's the only thing you know about Dignaga, that's a great one to know. All the Buddha...all the path to Buddhahood is revealed in those lines if you know how to read them. [Student: if we were recite this out of order it will be incorrect wouldn't it?] We studied that in the third class I think. There's very good order to and there's a reverse order to it. There's two ways to go and it's not [unclear] struggled with. All right.

Stillwell, you were here for this one. Give the definition of valid perception; by the way it's not anyone's fault that... I mean, I don't make fun anybody who do not, could not come to all these classes. I won't kick out anybody who, who...I mean if you attend a reasonable number of classes and you passed the finals, you pass. Just this time. Next time we'll go back to normal because I'm not working [unclear] okay. Can't go to India for [unclear]. All right. Definition of

'valid perception' [Stillwell: fresh, unmistakable perception] Yeah, very simple – fresh, unmistakable perception. [Stillwell: are you using valid perception as different than pramana here?] No, it's pramana. I, I vacillate between correct perception and valid perception. I think correct perception gives that correct perception to a normal person quick, more quickly. It's actually valid perception but we didn't go into that distinction in this class. We will in another class when we get to Prasangika. All right. Actually it should be valid but I don't want to get into it.

Wilma, describe the term...what does it mean to say {tse may kyebu} person of valid person; basically what's the basic meaning of that? [Student: he's a Buddha] Yeah and? No. And the other thing is, the other thing you should add is that He cannot lie; He's incapable of lying. Okay. He, he only has valid perception and He only speaks about what He really knows about and that's a Buddha. It's sometimes used for other kinds of great you know, spiritual masters who, only... I mean theoretically any Buddhist philosopher should only speak about what he knows...whether he has {tse ma} or not. It doesn't have to be a direct {tse ma} but he should have some kind of {tse ma} about stuff that he's talking about or he shouldn't talk about it or he shouldn't say I know. All right.

Amy, you did really good in this course, one of the best pupil, in this particular course, must have been a logician. I see if I can give you a question that you get wrong [student: you will] What are the three main methods for normal person to determine a Buddha is totally correct about the deep teaching He gave? Three methods to see that the Buddha is correct about ultimate truth. We had another question that is similar later. What was that? [student: doesn't contradict... reality] what you know to be true directly ...your directly perception. If the Buddha comes up and say this wall is red then you say, "no, not true. I can see it's not red." [Student: unless someone become color blind though] and I'm not crazy. Yeah number two. [Student: know that He's not inconsistent...a) it's not into subconscious [unclear] selfconscious] Yeah internally subconscious that's number three actually. Number two is what? Another one was...[student: isn't number two if it shocks you....] No, that's a different one, different set of three; two sets of three. The other one is coming. [Student: oh, sorry. I don't know.] Easy, you said, "direct perception" then [unclear] [student: direct and indirect] Good – that's all. Doesn't offend your...doesn't contradict what you know to be true directly. Doesn't contradict what you know to be true indirectly or by your own logic. You know if I say if I have an elephant back there, I have a real life size elephant behind here you know, that, that contradicts or offends your, your deductive logic because if there were an elephant here it should not fit into this little box. So it's not true. You can't confirm what I said. And the third one is,

that's probably most important, should be in term consistent. What He said at one point doesn't contradict what He said later. And there's suppose to be this point and you'll appreciate it someday where every single statement in Buddhist scripture is consistent...totally consistent with every other statement in Buddhist literature and you'll reach a point someday when you appreciate it, you know. Right now I'm sure there's some nagging ones that you think are contradictions. And that's okay. It proves you're thinking about it. But I think, as your study gets deeper you will come to a point where you're are comfortable with every single statement in Buddhist scripture. Okay.

Robyn, three ground rules for interpreting the Buddha. Like how do we know when the Buddha is speaking figuratively and not literally? [Student: well if what he says appears to contradict [unclear]] that's one of the tests – it offends your knowledge what you know to be true. That's actually number two [student: the first one is by [unclear] the attention behind] Yeah I mean what was He really trying to say when He said {suk to mo...} what he said “form is emptiness. The color is emptiness and emptiness is color” What did he really mean? Oh color has emptiness and emptiness is the quality of color. He didn't mean that color is emptiness. If color were emptiness you and I would be aryas, you know, right now. We could see it directly. So that's... yeah there must be something...He must be trying to say something. What was His true intention. That's the first one. Number two is – it offends your...what you know. And number three was? [Student: [unclear]] Number one is, is what was He really trying to say and number three is why, why did He choose to do it this way. In another...in one way is for shock value you know, He always states something, exaggerates something. He says “kill your father and kill your mother” You will never forget that . If I say, you know well please try to have renunciation. You forget that by that time you take your break. If I say kill your father and kill your mother, you, you'll always remember that I said that. Hopefully you'll remember that it means renunciation, doesn't mean to kill your father and mother. But, but there's a reason, you know, when the audience is going to sleep you...you exaggerate, you say something you know, outrageous to get just to get people to pay attention and to remember what you said. Those are the reasons why He might say that. He said all of the school, the four...the three and half schools that are not the highest Madhyamika School are all figurative. There are major points in them which are not true. There are many points which are true and which are shared by the highest Madhyamika. But all their other ideas about emptiness are wrong and He said them for a reason. In that case it was that people couldn't handle the higher explanation. He spoke it on a level that people could handle. That's another common reason for Him to use figurative descriptions 'cos people just weren't ready to hear the higher one.

They, they would freak out and I, I have seen it. I've seen people have that reaction. [student: Michael, is there a connection between the breakdown of interpretive and...] That's exactly that. that come from that. The reason I brought this up in this class because you will have a whole course devoted to that subject which is one of Tsongkapa's favorite subjects, he wrote the definitive work for it. The reason why I brought it up in this class because I want it to...we have just said that He never contradicts Himself and I knew people would say, "well it sounds this contradicts that" So I thought I'd better teach you the ground rule for when He wants to say that. And that's why I stuck it in here. It's not part of Dharmakirti's argument. [student: but how do you know that [unclear] covering all the ground. This way you cannot say He was contradicting Himself. Now if He says something that is something contradictory because He was trying to do something else. But if He says His always trying... because He means that. So no matter what He says He's always trying...] He's always covered, right? [student: Yeah He's always covered. [unclear]] I think you study...you study them deeply and then you'll appreciate the need for them and how they can help people at different levels. You, you will get to where...there might come a day when you're at work and somebody ask question about Buddhism and it dawns on you that if you tell them the correct answer it will never help them. So you...you decorate it a little. You know, you change it a little bit and then you just became a figurative speaker of Buddhism you know. There was a compelling need. If you had told him the truth, he, he would have said, "well this is crazy. Buddhism is silly" you know. [Student: couldn't the Middle Schools and lower schools say, "oh He only taught the higher school because people of that intelligence] Oh they do. Oh they do. Yeah, sure they do. [Student: So] That's all. But you...you study the higher school and then you can corroborate it yourself. You can come to a realization that it's correct by studying it carefully. That's the whole purpose to have classes, you know, that you could actually establish emptiness intellectually and then you can go and meditate and to see it, you know. And that's the whole purpose to have a class. If, if the subject is taught correctly and if the speaker of the subject is correct then, then you should be able to just come to class to learn it and go home and know it, you know. That's the idea of the class. Okay.

What does the person have to know in order to be all knowing. Omniscient, according to Buddhism. [student: something about pure side and [unclear]] Yeah, what you should take up and what you should give up. The things that you should take up and the things that you should give up. And the Four Noble Truths break down quite nicely between the two. How do they break down? [student: the suffering and the cause of suffering is what you should give up. And cessation of suffering and the path – should take up] Yeah, okay. So what's

he's saying is...Dharmakirti has that beautiful verse. He says, "it's not enough to create some big special ship that goes down the bottom of the ocean and takes pictures of all those little creatures there and that makes you omniscient. Or you get a telescope and you see all the stars out there and you name them all and you know where they will be going and who is going to hit who in thirty years, you know, that's no omniscient. That doesn't qualify" It is something.... it's to know what is suffering and to know how to get out of suffering. You know perfectly. This is something useful. This is something meaningful. You know if you're going to give me an omniscient person give me this kind of omniscient person. I don't care about a person who has seen every physical object there is. That doesn't...that doesn't for me makes him omniscient. That doesn't help anybody. [Stillwell: that would also be a subset of the other] Actually it would be. Actually it would be. But [unclear] [student: should give up suffering you said?] If you break, if you break out things that you should take up and things you should. ...what John is saying is of course the Buddha would know all those things by the way. I mean, if you want to know all those bacteria in the bottom of the ocean He could tell you but, but He wouldn't tell you that point. He would start telling you why they're going to die in thirty seconds and why you might be born with them and you know.... Frame it that way. Two of the Four Noble Truths are to be abandoned, are to be given up and that's suffering and its causes. Meaning suffering and bad thought. And then two of them are to be taken up, is the path and the cessation. The ending, permanent of all your bad karma. [student: okay. thank you.]

Mr Tom Kiley, what evidence do we have that the Buddha is unerring? I changed the homework questions slightly. Quiz question said, you know how do we know.... why is the Buddha unerring or something like that. And I think I prefer to frame it this way – what evidence does a normal have that the Buddha might be unerring? [Tom: because of the purpose of description that Buddha gives in the first aryan truth of suffering] Yeah. So I mean you can confirm that all your suffering comes from your bad thoughts. Right away, you can confirm that. You can't confirm the subtle workings of karma. You cannot confirm that there is a cessation, that there's a nirvana. That you can confirm that acting a certain way morally and with meditation and with wisdom that you might be able to reach that state. That takes time to confirm all those things but you can absolute quickly confirm that the Buddha of all the beings that ever live on this planet gave a excellent description of suffering and a very subtle description, you know all three kinds of suffering – suffering of suffering, you know, obvious suffering which all religious teachers have basically addressed; suffering of change which many religious teachers have addressed, you know that anything good turns sour and then suffering of...the pervasive suffering – suffering that

just by being alive, you suffer and you must suffer. He stated that very clearly and He explained why. And that's.... just that description of suffering, especially the third one, it's quite attractive, I think, to any thinking person. Any person who's been alive for a while has to know these few things, you know. [Student:] excuse me? [Student: [unclear]] It is the...it's actually some times described as the fact of your aging. It's the fact that...the five parts to you...your five heaps are inherently bound to collapse and to deteriorate and that's basically {Tibetan kyab pa kyi (cheky unclear)dugnyel}that's pervasive suffering; that's the meaning of pervasive suffering

[Student:[unclear]] Yeah, but, but no, not really. Not a thing exactly, it's a part that's related to you, you know.

Laura, oh wait we got Mrs Kiley. Oh I'm going to do the next one. The next one I messed up when I explained it to you – I gave two different explanations. What's the difference between normal compassion, great compassion and holy great compassion? Correcting the homework was very much a suffering for me [laughter] I realize that... I realize that I didn't explain it very well and I gave two different schools view point which are totally different. It's actually three mixed up there. So I reread it and re studied it and I remember debating but I don't remember what we did. So this is the answer I want on the quiz – this is the official line, okay. Normal compassion, regular old compassion means wishing that people close to you, your friends and relatives should not suffer. Wanting to see your friends and relatives get out of suffering, people like you like. Great compassion, mahakaruna {nyingje chenpo} that is the desire that all beings ... I stop wait – that comes in two flavor okay; and you have to write two different flavor okay. Two different kinds of great compassion. The kind which is ...had also by Hinayana practitioners, okay, that's the first kind is call the {Tibetan}. {Tibetan} means wishes that all beings could be free of suffering. That's the first kind of great of compassion; it wishes that all beings could be free of suffering. And Hinayana practitioners can have it. And now another sub category of great compassion is call the great compassion which wishes to protect those beings yourself. It's like taking responsibility to actually go and save those beings from that suffering. That's the {kyap de} and that's only by... Mahayana track people; technically they're not even bodhisattvas yet because it's equivalent to {hlaksam namdak} step number six in the seven steps, for you people who were in other course. It's just before you achieve bodhicitta. You get the real wish to take on that personal responsibility to, to do it yourself even if no one helps you; even if people obstructs you; even if people don't care what you do; even people talk bad about what you do; even though there're other Buddhas and bodhisattvas to do it you say, it's my job to do and I'm going to do it. And that's the last step just before you achieve bodhicitta. [John: it's going to

be a fine point but you know, so this is the motivation, you have this motivation, you get this motivation I'm personally free everyone from suffering but lets say you never on it, what's [unclear]? That's the distinction between {dom sem} and {je sem} we had three kinds of three bodhicitta [John: sugar care] One is like...no...one is...they're both real bodhicitta, but one is swearing to do it and the other is actually going out and doing it. There's that distinction. [student: aspiring and engaging] Yeah, it's aspiring and what's the other one? [Student: engaging] Engaging, yeah it's like that. [John: wouldn't aspiring be the same as the Hinayana?] No, because it already assumes the other [unclear]

Oh, holy great compassion okay which is called {tuk je chenpo} in Tibetan instead of {nyingje chenpo} they use the honorific word for mind instead of the normal word for mind – heart. So it means great honorific heart, rather than great heart. {tuk je chenpo} holy great compassion is distinguished from regular old great compassion by what, what do you think? [Student:] Yeah only Buddhas have it because only Buddhas have the ability to do what the last one we talked about wanted which is what? [Student: help them....] Help... wanted to be the one to save them. Okay. So only the Buddha has the ability to save them. [Student: What do you define here?] [John: you're saying the action...] it's the kind of great compassion only possess by a Buddha i.e. only by a person who actually has the ability to save people. So that's the key thing in holy great compassion. The being who has in his mind stream also has the ability to actually save people and a Buddha has that. [Student: seems we have a gap here because the previous one [unclear] great compassion lead us up to but not including becoming a bodhisattva right?] Well they describe it as being Mahayana okay. It's technically the step just before bodhisattva but it would include bodhicitta who are not Buddha, you know. [Student: where is bodhisattvas in there?] Ah, obvious in number two of the great compassion. They want to save...they want to be the one to save people but technically speaking you could have the wish to save people and not quite yet have reach bodhicitta. Technically speaking there're such people, don't worry about it. It's a Mahayana motivation. [Student: there are those other than Buddhas?] Right. Yeah you could say that. [Students] [Student: you can say His Holiness has [unclear] great compassion] You can say those, those other than Buddha who, who are Mahayana. Only Mahayana people have that. [Student: you just said...] the second kind of great compassion...[student: but I'm talking about the third] that one only Buddha has. [Student:] because they do have the ability to actually carry it out. [Student: but they both have [unclear] have it in their mind stream] Yeah sure. Buddhas have both and bodhisattvas have both kinds of great compassion [unclear] they want to see people out of suffering and they also be the one to get them out. [Student: the great compassion that...it's only which



where there's no engagement there] You could have the engagement but you don't have to the engagement. [Student: and you don't have the ability to [unclear]] You're engaging but you don't have the perfect ability to [unclear]. [John S: you're trying but you're messing the occasion] Well there's a big debate about it, I mean, some people say you're no good to anybody until you a Buddha[unclear] [laughter] No there're arguments like that in the scripture that until you can read a person's psyche, you know, his spiritual psyche perfectly, you don't really know what to do to help them. There's a big argument like that. [Student: [unclear]] Yeah. Yeah. [Student: so then I guess then finally the holy great compassion which is only had by a Buddha I mean....a Buddha would also be acting that out all the time as well, right...] By His nature. [Student: you can't be a Buddha and sit passively with this ability ] No. there's a famous verse by Tsongkapa it's.....{Tibetan} I can't remember...we recite it every Sunday {ma tak tong...} which means you know...{Tibetan} which means you, you all Buddha, you don't have...two mental functions you're incapable of – not knowing the trouble we're in and not caring about it and the reason I haven't been able to make contact with you directly is by own bad deed. There's a line like that in Tsongkapa description of the Buddha, you know. Which means yeah, He's always aware of your situation; he's always waiting around, He or She. He's always, you know, right around you, waiting to help you but you keep messing up and creating this karma that prevents them from helping you. [Student: while at the same time doing that and many, many other things] there's a debate about that in the Abhidharma. That's a whole subject. Okay next, basically yeah, on any...millions of planets one Buddha can act, yeah and does act.

Cold? [Student: it is cold] Too cold. Okay. I'll put it on a lower setting. Okay. [Student]

Ariel, you there? Okay. Three reasons why the Shravakas believe the mind dies and the body dies. [student: mind is part of the nature of the body and mind is the same quality of the body [unclear]] and then the mind is the result of the body and they should be in this order okay. the order is – that the mind is a quality of the body, the quality of the body and secondly the mind is part of the nature of the body and we're going to talk about the difference between them; and then thirdly the mind is the result of the body. [Student: [oh the mind's the result of the body] I think this is the order. Uh I'll explain it different and I do it this way which is nice I think. Don't forget the example for the three. Mind being the quality of the body was...the example was what? [Student: [of the nature] The quality was different. Yeah like the ability to intoxicate and alcohol. What do you call it like the intoxicability....the potential to intoxicate in alcohol and alcohol itself, the, the ability to make you drunk is the quality of alcohol; it's

like an innate quality of alcohol – it has it. If doesn't it doesn't qualify as alcohol. It has the quality to make you drunk. That's a quality. The second example was...part of the nature...the example was a drawing on a wall. Drawing on a wall, design on a wall is part of the nature of the wall. And I have to study it more. I did not study it perfectly. The Tibetan words there are not different. {Rang zhin} and { chun nyi} or something like that. They're not, they're not different words but I take it to be a dependence relationship –the way that a painting depends on a wall, okay, the way a drawing depends on the wall, okay, that it's on and I'll explain why. And then thirdly the mind is...is the result of the body and that's like what? [Student: lamp] Yeah the light and the lamp that it comes from. I mean you can't see but when you turn the light on it takes a few, you know, milliseconds for the light to get from the lamp to your eye. You have to assume that you can't see it right? So the light is really result of the light... lamp. By the time the light reaches your eye that moment of the lamp is already passed right. And that's the nature of cause and effect. Now I ask you and I'll start with Amy because she's looking up. Don't look down all the time this is better [laughter] Which of those three do, do we believe as westerners. I mean which one were you brought up to believe. [Student: all] What's that? [Student: all three] I think all three but how so? Like discuss maybe how do you think mind [student: oh the result if you get kicked if your brain is damaged, you die] Yeah I would say.... I would say, I would say if you ask most Americans...we have a Friday night class we have... Friday night classes' people just wander in, they don't know any Buddhism and you say, "where did the mind come from?" And they, they sit and said, "well you know your cells, your mummy and daddy stuck it together and that cell split and then until there's a nerve...until there's a line of nerve cells and then an impulse passes down the line of nerve cells and there's your first thought." And that I think what most of us grew...you know that's what they told us as we grew up. They told us that's how it works. That's how mind starts and in that case mind is what? Is the result of the body? I mean the body gets pretty well developed and the mind can come. That's what a lot of westerners...that's pretty much what I was told when I was a kid anyway. [Student: body can get undeveloped and mind will stop] Apparently. Okay, by the way, no proof, absolutely no proof of that [student: now what I'm saying the way was a mistake] Yeah, yeah. And then what about the nature one? [Student: what one?] Lets say the dependence one like the painting on the wall. By the way dependence is always simultaneous. This, this is supporting the other at the moment. They both exist at the same moment. The body is holding up the mind. When the body collapses the mind oops out. That's, that's pretty much what our vision of death is, I think. I think we...you know I believe it shifts over to painting on the wall when it gets to death because we believe that,

we believe the mind is resting on the body or on the brain cell or whatever and when the brain cells you know, pulled out like the table cloth then the thing falls down. And that's...that will be number two and number one I think describes how what we believe about life and living cells. Living, living tissue. We believe that life is an innate quality of, of living cell. You know, we believe that once there's a cell, you know, a living tissue there then those cells have life and that's the quality of those cells, you know, that's the very nature of the cell. Cell has life. It a cell of life, you know, I, I think that would cover the alcohol and the....you know that seems to be a very quality of living cell is life. [Student: is this the definition of the lower sentient is this that hasn't been defined that as sentient ?] Yeah. [Student: so we're defining both Buddhism and...?] Ah...it's a long story. But what I'm saying is that.... what I'm trying to say is that as I think about and it's not obviously not Dharmakirti is that we believe all three really. You know we believe everything except the right one which is what by the way? What is the relationship between body and mind? [student: mind cause the body] The mind cause the body [laughs] the mind cause and the body. The body and the mind continue and are caused by the mind, your past karma. We had that in the last two classes, right? Dharmakirti is like pulling a complete....he says not only it's not the three ways that you described Shrarvakas, the truth has the opposite. The reason you have a body right now, the reason you didn't die yet and the reason your mind is still flowing on it is because of, of former instances of mind. [student: you didn't take about what if the mind will be the brain, you know, I don't think I remember before thinking about it] That if you believe the mind is the brain you believe one of those two Shravakas arguments – either it's the mind...the brain is supporting the mind...[student: ...it is proving that's not it] Difficult. The main key we'll get to. What's the question now? In fact the next question. Whose turn is it? Laura, explain the meaning of material cause – {nyer-len gyi gyu} [student: it's the stuff that turns into the result and the example is the acorn turning into the oak tree; it's the prime cause as oppose to secondary factor] Yeah so material means I, I hate to keep using the word stuff and obviously you can't you use the word 'stuff' and scholarly complications [unclear] it happens use a nicer description of what's happens It's the stuff that turns into your mind and, and, and you know I leave you...I mean if all you remember from this whole class is that according to Dharmakirti and according to all Buddhas, you cannot make a mind from a rock, impossible. Different stuff, cannot happen, never will, never did. Just [student: why don't it just remain] I know what remain means [laughter, laughs] People are totally kind in the war[laughs] It really means relative right? [Student: [unclear] if you really get back to what it really means originally means, so it's the same stuff] Okay, yeah. It's, it's the material [unclear] yeah that's great, I love that, I mean

shouldn't the Shravaka come to say, "Dharmakirti come on, don't be a fool", you know, you have been arguing that it has to be the same stuff and now you're saying that mental stuff causes physical stuff you know. You're just making the same argument we did. [Student: so, so how...] We have to talk about it. When we talk about the Mind Only School, basically, it, it's not creating physical stuff. I mean in the highest levels of Buddhist philosophy, it's, it's a perception creating the [unclear] creating the physical stuff right? It's a perception, previous perception creating perception of physical matter, not physical matter. [Student: where is the physical matter?] You are your perception of you. Your body is your perception of your body, that's and that's Dharmakirti's only way out. [Student: [unclear]] It doesn't uh...oh, oh, that level then {nyen-len gyi gyu} the body is the element. Yeah. It's chemical. Body [unclear] from chemical, what do you want? {nyen-len gyi gyu} of the body is the element according to Dharmakirti too. He only said what? Mind was special, unique bases. If you read your notes, if you read the reading he says basis...he's very careful to use a different word. He says "unique basis" because they have arguing that the body is a unique basis of the mind; the body has a intimate relationship with the mind such that the mind comes from it. And Dharmakirti says no. And they're more stressing what goes on during life, you know, not where it came from so much. But what keeps it going. All right.

Helen, why can't the cause of your mind at birth be living physical matter? [student: because the mind [unclear] can't be living physical matter because before five senses were the sense powers [unclear] and what would happen lack of one or more [unclear] one not the other] Yeah I lost a few students from this question from the other class [laughs] okay. Difficult question. You must split the answer okay. You must split the answer Kedrup Je splits the answer. Dharmakirit splits the answer. Why, why doesn't your flesh, why doesn't your living tissue of your body cause your mind? Why is that not the case that the living tissue in your body causes your mind? And the first thing you have to understand is that all the living tissue in your body has to fit into one of those five sense powers. You don't think of that way but think about it for a minute and there's no part of the living tissue of your body which is not either your visual organ or your tactile organ or your taste organ or your feeling organ or your smelling organ. All the living tissue of your body has one of those functions [student:] [unclear] I mean it covers...you have to imagine yourself as these patches of tactile...of these patches of senses of self, that's what you are; that's what your living tissue is. There's an argument in Buddhist scripture therefore...what about the end of your finger nails and the end of your hair, not the root. You pull out your hair and it hurts. And they decide that it's not part of living tissue of your body. But when you get down to quick nail it is. Yes

Madam? You're going to tell me about some....[student: I don't know about where separate possible causes [unclear] we're on number uh...] by the way the arguments...if you want a quick exit then we should really go on. They, they do overlap. We're not meant to be...[student: your argument it's not the same stuff] that's the main idea [student: [unclear] give some example of that?] [Student: but why are we waste...you know what I'm saying?] Because it's another...that argument covers everything. All of those arguments are sub arguments of the big argument, which is just different stuff, that's true. [Student: but then by definition...] this is just making it more interesting [student: ... material cause, the whole thing is...] true, true, the moot point. [student: yeah] anyway remember where that reasoning came, it was reasoning by what? Kedrup Je's reasoning is what? Elimination. He has to cover all possibilities. He has to go down the tree of possibilities until there's only one way left to go; so don't forget why it's coming that way.

Okay, so why can't it be... you have to break the question into two, the answer into two. The first part of the answer is if these were all five senses, if it took all five senses for mind to occur, if the mind was a result of all five senses collected together then anyone who lost one of those senses will lose their mind, I mean, we got our minds, which is not the case. [Student: is that the case where if you lose one sense you lose twenty percent of your mind, theoretically?] Yeah [student: okay] and then on the other hand if any one of the sense powers, lets take the most powerful one, lets take the main one – visual sense power, your eye sense power. If it alone could create mind, then mind should have some kind of similarity to that sense power and the mind itself should be able to see with the same vividness that the eye faculty does and it can't. [student: you mean to imagine as...] Yeah when you imagine that Buddha, you know, you look at the thangka and when you close your eyes and imagine it, it should be every detail and every color, everything as vivid when you're staring at it with your eyeball and that's not the case. [Student: not the case right now but it can be developed, no?] Probably, eventually it could be. [Student: what I mean is that with all the practices] Only Buddha, Buddha can do it. [Student: you just jumped from the moment of breath to mind. We're talking about two different things] Uh, this is an argument for...you can say mind as birth. It's a question is mind at birth. [Student: so if it's just as vivid does the Buddha even have that distinction as looking as something and seeing [unclear]] That's a very nice question and [unclear] fact is that His senses are indistinguishable from his mind sense. In other words with his little finger, the Buddha sees the universe. That's something inconceivable. [Student: I mean if your mind is capable why would you even need the sense powers?] I [unclear]. The Buddha isn't actually...well; I'm not going to get into it. That's eighth chapter [unclear].

We got to go quick. Why can't the cause of the mind at birth be outside physical matter? I'm going to answer it okay. Split the question again. And use the same reasoning okay? Use the same reasoning, if it's all four elements together, in other words, if every kind of chemical has to be there, then any time one of the chemicals is missing then the mind shouldn't occur. And on the other hand, if any one of those chemicals could create the mind, then the mind should have some similarity to that chemical. It should stink if it were sulphur you know, it should 'irony' if it's iron. [Student: isn't true that if you have no water on earth you wouldn't really have a body] He's talking in a, in a substantial amount. I agree. According to Buddhist theory all atoms have to have all [unclear]. [Student: I don't understand] Remember he's talking to non Buddhist. It's hard. It means basically this. Basically it's very interesting. If, if all those chemicals together are what creates mind then, then to put it in normal English, you should be able to put those chemicals in a teaspoon and, and a mind should occur and those chemicals should disappear as a result. That's the meaning of a {nyen-len gyi gyu}. And the opposite is so ridiculous that Buddhist have trouble thinking of it. You know, to believe anything else it's hard for Buddhists.... you know I mean a person is a good Buddhist scholar, why, why would you ever think that you could put certain chemicals together in a spoon and then something totally foreign, as foreign as mind could come out and those elements go away, chemicals go away. Well, who, who ever think that out, you know, why would anybody think that? And then...oh he say, well you don't have to have all those chemicals every one of those chemicals, any one of those chemicals. Then he says, well every time those chemicals got together by accident you know, some truck comes along, falls over, over on the New Jersey turn pike and those chemicals mix together and they say all these minds should pop up you know, it was a big truck, truck or trailer. And then...and then you say, well it only takes.... what do you think it only takes one of those chemicals you know, and his acid enough you know does the body somehow resemble acid, I mean the mind. Come on. [student: and, and so why does the material cause has to have [unclear] that if it disappears?] It's the nature of all causes that's true. All causes disappear as the result comes out. [Student: as the?] When the result comes out the cause must be thereby destroyed. That's just something we didn't think about much. Even the soil around a tree. The part of the soil which nourished the tree has disappeared by the time the tree has [unclear] so that's why the soil gets lousy in India, after you plant corn and the things just threw up. It's happening to the Tibetans. Yeah? [Student: [unclear]] It's a long, long story. [Student: projecting cause?] There's five...there's many...there's Abhidharmakosha second chapter, we won't study it here. Many causes...kinds of causes and kinds of [unclear]. [Student: ... we were talking about other than,

than material causes, it seems to me, aren't are talking about something else when we talk about...] No, he's talking... he's talking the main, the main cause, the stuff that turn into mind. Okay, I shouldn't tell you [student: ... said something about suggesting] that comes much later, that comes later. And that's when Buddhas are giving their own argument. That's, that's has to do with the desire that triggers the karma. [student: right, prove number] Different thing. Yeah, we're involved with that. We're way back with truth number three. We're talking about outside physical matter. [Student: okay, I'm sorry I'm looking ahead, I thought you were ...] You're too far ahead. All right. This is a easy question, if cause of mind. if the stuff turns into mind happens to mind why does it have to be your mind and not someone's mind. And Dharmakirti said, "well then you know, children of piano geniuses will be able to play piano perfectly from the first moment." And you know that's so simple that lot of people project it too on their homework and don't, don't take it silly. It's, it's true. But it maybe take some time to cook it. All right. Should be similar [student: what is the question again, if mind's...] If you get down this Kedrup Je's charter of elimination until finally he figured out that the most convenient thing to believe is that mind created mind; mind flipped over into mind; mind of some moment before turn into your mind at the first moment of your life [student: right then?] if you reach that point then just to nail things down he says well would it be your mind or someone else's mind? You know could your mommy and daddy's mind flop over into your mind at the first moment of your life and some westerners believe that. That's part of our belief system. [student: but if you put it that way wouldn't the mind that was the cause disappear when it flops over?] It did. You died. [student: she means wouldn't your parents drop dead instead of...] The mind of the mind of the moment of giving birth is gone by the time the child is born. We're talking moments by moments. [student: ] turns into... and I'm talking about very specific minds. The first moment of your consciousness in this life. What came...what was the first...what was behind that black door the moment before? If we can establish one millisecond prior to that point of mind, our problems are over. What happens the millisecond before that? What turn into that mind? I mean ask yourself. That's the whole point of this class, I mean, go home and worry about it, you know. First moment of consciousness in your mommy's womb, very first instant of your mind, what came in the instant before? Okay.

[Student:[unclear]] it's called [unclear] definition of a direct cause. That thing which {Tibetan} means like flipping a pancake over. [Student: but...so why is the [unclear]] This is...comes fourth class, we'll talk about it, next class. By the way, this class does flow into next class and that's why that question is why. That's why we're doing [unclear]. That's the next natural thing you should be thinking

about. If that last moment stops and the present moment starts then how come there's any continuity. [Student: can you say as far as the parents mind flopping over to the child's mind can you use similar to the acorn and tree where the mature mind of the parents has something like a seed which then comes to fruition as it grows in a child and just like a tree gives a seed to the ground, the parents mind gives a seed of itself then the infant which grows into...] Dharmakirti's argument is that you don't get...Jesus said the same thing...you don't get lemon tree from apple seed, impossible. [Student: yes so parent's mind go into baby's mind] there's this wonderful correlation between you know, this expectation that you can have, you think...think how chaotic it will be if you have to grain store and buy seeds and now know what would come out of them. that would be...Dharmakirti says according to you guys this is the way life would be. You say something totally dissimilar can give a result – you say that the body can produce a mind or you say that a parent's mind can produce a child's produce mind. You're postulating a thing....you, you therefore believe that result can come from things which don't resemble them, so boy, you better not plant those corn seeds you never know what you might get. You might get watermelon popping out, you could get horses jumping out...[student: if you saying, if you're saying the child's mind is [students] ] [cut] that thing has to have come before. [student: cause by definition is something that comes from before] But you westerners are talking about...oh no, there're kinds of causes that don't come before according to Abhidharmakosha. [Student: well then you got to think of a different word than 'cause' because in English by definition cause comes before] yeah it's difficult. [student: what kind of things do not come before?] they postulate two – mind and mental function. Basically...what do you call it? Symbiotic cause – where one thing is helping one thing and the other thing is helping thing at the same time. [Student:[unclear]] Yes it is. I mean the other schools....[student: it's not a causal relationship] well if you took it away then the one would go away – and that's cause. Okay. The higher school don't accept that. [Student: so it has to come from something similar and it has to come...] something previous. [Student: not from the body] Not from what? [Student: not from the body alone] He didn't say that but he just... that's the underlying principle. That's the main idea. You know it had to come before, it had to come before the first moment of instant of consciousness in your mommy's tummy. Something came before and that something had to be similar there go you have a past life; ergo you have many future lives; you better be good, it's a long trip. You might as well clean it up now. All right. Explain why the mind, a normal person at the moment of death crosses over into another state of mind [unclear] what makes the cause of...[student: desire] Desire, okay. That's the argument. That's all he says. [student: say that again.



Because he has desire is the reason why?] and it took us three hours to explain what that means. And you people who cannot come to this class... you know the key; by the way the key is beautiful. The key is not just plain old desire, has to be mixed up with grasping to self-existent and that's a long story. We...we studied the three types desire that can trigger kind your karma. We studied the two types of karma and get through them; we studied how it [unclear] when you lie and we studied how to stop which is of paramount interest for all of us. All right, number twenty – uh ooh... [Laughs] three parts of Master Dharmakirti's main proof of future life. That's actually the same as the last one. Just a statement. [Leigh: oh consider the mind of a normal person at the moment of death, it will cross the line into a future mind because it possesses desire] that's all, that's his main proof of future life. Okay I'm almost finish and we're going to take a short break and come back and I'll tell you five minutes promise – I'll let you out by nine if you come back in five minutes.

All right, name and describe three types of the eighth link in the chain of dependence from the Wheel of Life. This is the ...what the eighth link...link number eight in that Wheel of Life – the guy...what was it? The monkey grabbing a fruit, [student: that's nine] that's ninth, I'm sorry. The guy pigging out. All right. [Student: [unclear]] Miss Wilma. [Student: what was the question again?] What are the...three kinds, that eighth link is called craving, what are the three kinds of craving? [Student: oh, desire craving; fear craving and craving for existence. And the first one is wanting to...desiring only not to lose attractive things; wanting to lose unattractive things and desiring for existence itself, here or at that moment of the self] Yeah. By the way he uses the word that I was struggling to translate that day. {do pa}. {do pa} means an unreasonable fear; an unfounded fear; a false fear. And I was trying [unclear] in English with that's translation. It doesn't mean the fear that you are finishing it means the false fear that you're finished, you see what I mean? There's a word {do pa} Tibetan means like paranoia. {do pa} is what you do at your office when you think people are talking about you and that's {do pa}. {do pa} is why you don't want to step under a ladder, you know, a superstition. It's all tied to a stupid fear; an untrue fear. [Student: unfounded] Unfounded fear. You're not...[student: [unclear] to existence in that sense that if you...if it were unfounded fear then you shouldn't be afraid because [unclear] go on and...] Yeah you see the {do pa} means....he grasp to existence meaning the five parts to himself because he thinks he's going to stop. Thinks...you know in English 'thinks' means 'but he's not really, we know right?' But you know that's why people scream when the airplane starts to go down. People...we all do, we all will you know, you think you're going to end. [Student: is something like well founded fear of ninety nine or a hundred people going directly to hell] we're

getting there but what did we say about that first two kinds of desire which I'm very adamant about. Is it wrong, is it the eighth link of dependant origination, you know, is it such a nasty, horrible, trigger in this series of rebirth to, to not want something that's undesirable and to want something that's desirable? [Student: it has to do with your attachment to that thing] Not so much attachment but it has to do with what? Your perception of what...of the self existence of the thing and that's...it's fine to want paradise, you, you...[student: you better] I hope so that's why you're suppose to be here, you know. The result of this class is eventually you know, you will get a very nice paradise, you know, no suffering and your desire to escape this lousy life before you get older and everything you've worked for falls apart and, and you die. I mean that's the whole point of this class. But you must perceive yourself in the right way and that's...the person that you don't want to suffer and the person that you want to reach paradise, you better be perceiving him or her the right way because if you're not you'll do the wrong deeds, you know. To get happy you will struggle and fight and hurt other people. And to avoid pain you will, you will hurt and that's absolutely the opposite of...it's the correct perception.

[student: a double question. one time when I had reason to think that I was going to die pretty soon but I had still a few minutes left and I...all my consciousness went inside my body because I was incapable of moving and I found this to be a very interesting experience and not fearful – part a. part b suppose we in this class subscribe, really believe that our consciousness is a continuum and that when this body dies we really are going to flop into something else, what about the first one and will the second one militate against a bad reaction.

Uh first question. You didn't get to level of death where hallucinations and the terror starts. [Student: okay] Your elements didn't collapse at that point. If they had you will be touch and go. And then second question which was...oh yeah, actually the study of future lives in the lam rim structure, where does it come? Why is it there? Why does Dharmakirti get his little place in the lam rim there? He only comes there, where they talk about past and future lives. Well it's to become a person, is to reach the level where you're concerned about what's going to happen after you die. No big Buddhism stuff. I mean no big paradise, no big nirvana stuff. You're suppose then...once you have a perception of yourself streaming one, you're suppose to worry that you don't turn out like Mr Bean chooses, you know, did you see that movie it was great, it's really good. [Laughter] No, the man and wife they're on a normal drive to the countryside, they get a car accident and then suddenly they're in this fantastic chaos of, of all this hell and stuff and in the next moment, in the next second they're in this horrible frightening chaotic word that has no reason or rhyme and

the people are burning and people are...the houses you know...and that's exactly what happen. So that's suppose to be...you know the study of future life is suppose to be that you start to....you're, you know, three breaths away from that happening at any given moment. Could happen. Could likely happen. It will happen one day. [Student: excuse me about that question. So if we genuinely subscribe to this how does that affect our response at the moment of death?] Long before that you have eliminate that kind of desire, which is, aimed at self-existence self because that will make you act right. Then you won't have that problem, you'll probably be in Paradise before that [unclear] yes Ma'am. [Student: I transferred together one [unclear] be happy when you get something, unhappy when you don't etc etc. And I'm trying to put together this thing [unclear] what you seem to be saying is that the quality unless I misunderstand you, it's not the quality of grasping or craving per se but it's the problem is the object] Absolutely [student: where I would assume that the kind...what you feel when you want to achieve Buddhahood or whatever or once you have seen emptiness directly and is of a different quality and you're not saying it's not, it's the object] I'm saying that if the object were correct, you would be there. [Student: so where does that happy and unhappy fit in?] It's a different...it's a different [student: but you're pointing attachment to something even the object...] what's wrong with attachment? What's wrong with being attached to nirvana [student: it's not even the object, it's the way you perceive the object to exist] well that's we haven't reached that but what I'm saying is I'm perfectly attached to reaching Vajrayogini paradise. I'm looking forward to it, you know, [laughs, laughter] [student: [unclear] go on a roller coaster because of your quality of your attachment] I hate that idea; I don't think, I reject that idea. I think that's a poorly formed contradiction of people who, who haven't thought very carefully about Buddhism. It's not that you're, you're not suppose to reach a state where you don't care anything and that's nirvana. No, you know, it's not like that. I mean then these alcoholics over here did it. [Student: I'm not talking about not caring, I'm just talking about that clutching quality, that unhappy, happy, that...] Yeah, no, that's, that's a phenomenon that... that's a concern but that's not what I'm talking about. I'm talking about a good, healthy, cognizant, clear minded desire to be out of suffering and reach everlasting pleasure. I have it and I'm happy for it and I don't think you will be here if you didn't have it. That's your goal. And that's in the back of everyone's mind when they study. And it gets clearer as you get older. [student: so you're saying there's no...there's no such thing as studying something...or having an object with the wrong emotions or the wrong reason because as long as it's correct] But what I'm saying is...I'll say it very clearly and very concisely. So long as you misperceive the object your desire or hatred you will have the wrong kind of

desire and wrong kind of hatred. [Student: we all do] Yes we do, because we have the wrong perception. What's the good perception? I mean temporary, intellectually, remember that object is blank, could have been pleasant, could have been bad and the reason it's bad and you want you get away from it or the reason it's pleasant and you want to get it, is that, that otherwise blank object you have created into something pleasant or unpleasant. And you're forced to do that by your bad...past karma. If you don't like it don't resist it, just change your karma. Stop acting bad, you know. And it will change but do it with knowledge. [Student: but then what's grasping then? I thought grasping was the personification of craving] It's a strengthening of craving [student: right] Grasping is craving brought to a new height. In the eighty and ninth links of the dependant origination.

Very quickly because we're not going get our snack properly, someone has brought a lot of nice snacks. Craving [laughter, laughs] I'm about to grasp [student: that's the perception of object as being sort after, change in some ways the nature of the craving or does the Buddha crave to be free from suffering in the exact same way we would crave to win the lottery?] No. [Student: okay.] No, I don't know. [Student: I know you'd like to say you don't know, and Rinpoche used to say that desire in itself is bad] I explained it the class [unclear] but it's a mistranslation. He's thinking of the word {der cha} instead of the word {der pa} and in English they're both the same word {Kyel do} and {kyam de} the words desire appear in the definition [unclear] great compassion. And the other word {der char} is always a bad word. In English they're both translated as desire. That's just translation problem. [Student: so I can't get enough of it, I gotta have to have it all the time it's also experience by a Buddha?] It's two different words in Tibetan that are translated into English, desire; desire you to get away from self existent bad object and desire to reach Buddhahood and understand [unclear] are totally different words in Tibetan and that's what Rinpoche gets hung up on that. Just a translation problem. Just say {der pa} and {der cha}. Anyway we'll go on. It's a similar emotion, lets put it that way. I mean it's the desire to get something nice. And that's fine. That's why you are here. You want to get to nirvana. [Student: so then the Buddha doesn't suffer because He, Shee just happens to be lucky enough to have a ever, present, continuing stream of these nice things] the Buddha has {der pa} to see... He has the desire to see all beings free of suffering. He would like to see that. He has desire to see all beings free of suffering. [Student: and He doesn't suffer because even though all beings are not free of suffering He doesn't really have desire for that] He doesn't have the kind of desire which misperceives the object and therefore causes bad karma and causes bad results. [Student: which is the same, exact desire that we have it's just the object is perceived incorrectly by us] I'd say

that. I would say that's the difference between [student: because I thought there was another quality.] 'cos I think...what I'm trying to say it's the whole key... what you're trying to do. Why you're here? You want to get free of suffering. There's a word for wanting to get free of suffering and the word wanting to help us sentient beings by the Buddha, is the same word, for a reason, the desire to get that object. Is the want, is the desire, it's a wish. That's why they're the same one. So think about it. Cook it.

Okay, last question. The key to why craving triggers your existing karma at the moment of death is how it focuses upon yourself. Describe the four levels of focusing upon yourself and explain which ones can trigger this karma. I'll, I'll answer this one, it's a little difficult. First one of the four, it's called ordinary conventional perception of yourself, thinking, Ariel thinking as Ariel as me; I thinking of myself as me and this is just unexamined perception of yourself and even the Buddha has this. So that should tell you whether or not it can trigger future life in samsara. Okay. No, everybody has it. The Buddha thinks of his robe as His. If somebody came to you know, Varanasi and took the Buddha's robe, the Buddha will think someone has stole my robes and that's direct quotation from the scripture. Okay. So that's okay, nothing wrong with that. Just unexamined me. And that's what lots of Buddhist you know, they teach you there's no me and you get confuse and you go home and worry about this wrong...think about Helen [unclear] you know, we spend a few years on that, you're just confuses. That's fine you are yourself, you have a {tse ma} about it, you have a pramana, nothing. [Student: so you say it triggers existing karma?] That does not [student: it does not] at the moment of death. That one everybody has that and that's no problem. [Student: [unclear] Oh yeah, are you not yourself? Are you not Robyn? [Student: yes but I'm not the Buddha and you said that only the Buddha can have a {tse ma}earlier] [Student: all the time] All the time. [student: all the time?] Yeah, yeah. [Student: all the time] only {tse ma}. [Student: so this is going to [unclear]] No 'cos the Buddha has it. If it triggers then the Buddha will have a samsaric rebirth, impossible. Okay, next one – you believe and also see a self-existent you. That describes any person who has not yet seen emptiness directly. [Student: how's that different from the first then, ordinary perception of yourself] The explanation is that, at this point you're more thinking about the nature of yourself. I said unexamined before, now I'm saying examined. But it's that you're consciously examining. So that's enough. So that describes a non-arya right? Number three is anyone who is an arya but not yet a Buddha [student: [unclear] this one triggers?] Oh yeah, it does trigger rebirth. Number three is a person who is an arya, he did see what? [Student: emptiness directly] Emptiness directly, okay. He's not yet a Buddha, he says himself as self-existent but he doesn't believe it. He knows he's crazy.

He knows his wrong but he can't stop it. He sees himself as self-existent but he doesn't believe his own eyes anymore. He doesn't believe himself anymore. [Student: he sees the self, as not self-existent but doesn't believe it?] No, yeah [laughs]...by the way I'm talking about when he comes...after he comes out of his great vision, okay, maybe you're confuse; post great vision, okay, after his great vision, until the point he becomes a Buddha he neither...he does not believe that he's self-existent because he knows he's not but he can't stop seeing it that way, except for times when he's in the direct perception in meditation of emptiness. All other time he still sees things as self...they still appear to him as self-existent but he doesn't believe it any more. He knows it's wrong. He knows his own perceptions are wrong. His perception of himself is...also going to trigger a rebirth that's why even after you see emptiness directly, until you become an arhat you must take rebirth. [Student: would the second one include intellectually understanding about emptiness or not necessarily?] Yeah you can have some very advanced intellectual understanding of emptiness and still...and still be at number two. And number four...[student: can you be at number two without [unclear]] you must not be an arya to be at number two. [Student: I'm asking a further question] Can you be non arya at number three? No. [Student: so and then intellectual understanding...] is not enough? Direct perception.

Okay number four – neither sees nor believes [student: neither sees?] Nor believes. [Student: oh in self-existent] in a self-existent me. That describes two kinds of beings – Buddhas all the time and who else? [student: arhats] well arhats are joined with Buddha. Who else? [Student: aryas while they're in....] Aryas while they're in their vision. While they're in the direct perception of emptiness they don't see us...they don't see themselves as self-existent and they don't believe it either. [Student: but I thought they're not able to tell...] They don't see that either [laughs] [student: so?] But it's not like a guy like Mike Tyson knocked out. That's a different kind of not seeing and not believing. [Student: so seeing and believing [unclear]] By the way as the courses go on hopefully you start to see interlinks, hypertext and by the end of the five years we will see everything links with [unclear] You'll start to get ideas [unclear] have a break for ten minutes, come back I just want to show you something for five minutes. [Student: can we do those five minutes and then we do the break after? People who want to stay for the break can do that.] Okay. [Student: no?]

Do you remember that the other class is translating something? [unclear]. It was a story...do you remember the story, it was from a sutra. It's call the sutra of the Origination of the Unoriginated or something like that. And Asanga...it was the favorite of Atisha. Atisha liked this sutra. And he quotes it in one of his works, in the Tengyur and he says, I don't know if you remember there was a

planet. It reads like science fiction. There's a planet, on this planet a Buddha appears, the Buddha teaches people all over and people actually turn on...the whole planet, everybody on the body become either an arya, an arhat, you know, they turn on to his teachings...there's another Buddha in another era, millions and millions of years ago, and the whole planet becomes a dharma planet. And everybody is going to dharma classes and everyone is becoming enlightened and meditating all the time – the whole planet. And, and then at some point the Buddha, you know, his time passes and He decides to withdraw that emanation and He appoints a certain monk to be his...did we get that far? He appoints a certain monk...he lives for ten million years or something and then He decides it's time to withdraw this emanation and He appoints a certain monk and He says, 'this monk is going to my regent'. This monk will be the first throne holder. So this monk is living in at a certain monastery and he has all these followers. And they start to go to the cities... they...you know a monastery has to be five hundred {gyan taks} fathoms from a town. You're not allowed to have a monastery closer to a town than that. So, and this monk he takes his followers everyday, instead of going for begging around the monastery, they actually go into town and they start teaching the people in the city which is unheard of. The monks are suppose to stay out the countryside and not mix with city people and, and this other monks start to get.... he sees one of the followers touch a lady or with a lady or something like that. So he assumes that this is why everyone is going to the city and he starts to have meetings to say, "no monks should go to the city, this is very bad" even though those monks are teaching people bodhichitta and people actually reaching bodhichitta and things like that. So he has a big meeting and they all decided that this monk and his followers shouldn't go into the city anymore [student: the regent monk?] Yeah, the second monk who is not the regent says that the regent is corrupt and he's going to the city and this is why he's going to cities and he...he does this long meeting. Out of respect, not wanting to cause a division in the sangha, the regent stays in the monastery. And then the city people don't get taught and no one is getting bodhichitta and things start to collapse. And then he says I, I can't stay away anymore. I'll move another monastery then I'll continue my work in the city teaching the people. So he moves out of the monastery and goes back. So the first...the second one? Right. The one that criticized him died and he goes to hell for like billions of lives, for having assumed this about the regent without knowing, you know, and he...then he...for millions of lives he loses his robes. He becomes a monk and he loses his robes [unclear]. And then for millions of lives he's born as a very stupid person who can't understand any dharma, you know, no matter how many times you explain it to him he can't get. That means tens of millions of lives this goes on because of the grave karma that he collected

by making an assumption without knowing. And then the Buddha in the last line of the sutra which I...you know it's here but I, I just described He says, "and don't think that the first monk was just a normal person. He's the Buddha {[unclear]} He become a Buddha like a few million years ago. He, He was the Buddha {[unclear]}. He later become the Buddha {[unclear]} and the monk who criticize him, who went to hell was me.' [Student: me who?] The Buddha [student: Shakyamuni?] Shakyamuni...[unclear] experience. Shakyamuni is saying, "I was that monk and I made that mistake and because of that I have that I had to live all those lives in hell.... don't think it's somebody else that you never heard of. It was me and I'm telling you from experience" And then he says {Tibetan} and that's the source of that and nobody in the monastery knows that. I mean...[student: why don't you tell?] [Laughter] this is the cool thing about the computers, you can ask that can go back to a hundred thousand things and more and look and that's where the Buddha says that - don't judge other people you will fall if you're not me. And that's the source of the quotation and He's talking about Himself and that's the neat...[student: [unclear] judge when you see...] You have to judge on the...you have to say according to what I can see it looks bad and I cannot follow that, I reject it and I resist it but you can't...you know you have to be careful to say, 'I know'. But of course if something looks bad...you know, this came up with something with certain teachers they drink or stuff and say...look I don't know. People ask me about this and that. I say, "I don't know. I really don't know. I can't do it. I know it's not right to do it and I won't do it myself. I... can I judge a person? No. Should you follow that person? That's up to you I can't tell you that. [Student: but Michael [unclear] having a thought or was it because he created the schism in the sangha] I think the thought...merely the thought. They don't stress the fact [unclear], he just moved later. It seems like [unclear] [student: so basically like the whole thing that we studied in this class if the Buddha was there [unclear] to be mindful or not, at that moment and have the best pramana that he was capable of having at time which was ...to say to himself, "gee it really looks bad" but instead of going making a [unclear] and saying it is bad, he states that it really looks bad and it could actually be bad or it could actually something very high, I can't tell the difference yet at my level. He presumably could have avoided all that] Yeah, yeah. It says by the way, just a statement, he is that, I know him to be that is the [unclear], without at {tse ma} This is what it is [student: sort of points to the relativity of all these rules, I mean...] Gyaltsab Je in his commentary says, you know, we do this all the time. He says, we should take it to heart. And it's beautiful, at the end he says, it's a beautiful at the end. He says...therefore a person... it's very beautiful. He says.... don't worry about other people. A Buddhist practitioner, his main object of his practice is not to go



around correcting everyone else in the world. His...the main job, the task which you know to be...with {tse ma} to be necessary if you're whom you seem to be it's to clean out your own mind. So he says therefore a really good Buddhist practitioner should go to his room, go to his home, do his practices for himself; clean up his mind and reach Buddhahood. And then he says a very interesting thing and in the scripture he says, and the person who does that is more...is higher than all the bodhisattvas on such a planet going and teaching people the ten virtues and getting them to follow them. The person who goes to his own room, in his own privacy and tries to work on himself is higher because he will reach Buddhahood. That person will, will clean up his mind and that person will reach Buddhahood and a Buddha is higher than all those Bodhisattvas, he said that. What I mean to say is...I mean if someone says, "why do Buddhist study logic?" You say, "well the main purpose is that we try to realize that we must learn from ourselves and not worry so much about other people" You have to be concern, you have to help, you have to contribute. You have to resist evil but the main...your main dharma career is in your own mind and in your own room. [Student: it sounds like emptiness] it's call, it's called eating the meat yourself. [Laughter] which is the lam rim and there's a man start...you know the story? The man is starving, his family is starving, he finds a big chunk of meat. He realizes that if he eats it he will have enough energy to go get more food but if he splits up with everybody they'll all die. So he eats it, the whole thing you know and then.... the main thrust you get, it's not...it's not obviously not saying, don't be compassionate, don't care...it's not saying that. He's saying work on yourself. You can't...you cannot know the level of the people around you. Maybe when you get to a very advanced state you might learn something different about the people around you but, but for now just worry about yours [cut]

Mandala offering  
Dedication

**Course IV: The Proof of Future Lives, RAW TRANSCRIPT**

PAGE

PAGE 242

Say {sen, sen} [repeat], {sen, sen} [repeat]. {Sen sen} means “how do you define something.” What’s the definition of definition? And it’s very important in Buddhism; we operate by definitions. You need it for clarity, you need it for accuracy, you need it to know what you’re talking about. I met a guy today, he wrote a book on {Prajnaparameter}, I didn’t want to embarrass him and ask him, “What’s the definition of {Prajnaparameter}. You know, what is it’s basic description, what is it? And it’s very precise, it’s the “perception of {shunyata} under the influence of {bodhichitta}.” But, I, I, very much doubt you can find ten people in New York who can tell you that and everyone talks about {Prajnaparameter} this is the beauty of definitions; you need the definition; you need to understand definitions. That’s the first subject in the {dura}; the {Dura} has about fifteen, twenty, I’m only giving you three, okay, the next one is