

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by ancientbuddh...@earthlink.net - 2008/11/17 19:26

KEYNES has said this bullshit: The Buddha taught that one should train himself that in the seen there is just the seen... Then there is no 'you' here or there or in between. There is NO such fucking passage,you ARE a goddamned idiot, congrats. like the common fuckhead, you confuse self with Self The Two Selves Or, the empirical self (namo-rupa, anatta), and the Spiritual (attan) Self Copyright 2007 Author: Webmaster attan.com *A MUST READ!! Against no-Soul theories of Anatta in PDF (187 KB)* The greatest fool in Buddhist doctrine was one who ?saw Self (atman) in (mere) self (anatta)? (?anattani ca attati?) , certainly one of the most common refrains in Buddhist sutta. Some of the greatest harbingers of the incapacity to differentiate the empirical (namo-rupic) self from The Self are most certainly the ?Buddhists? who never end in revelry of quoting Gotama to the effect that all ?phenomena are Selfless (anattoti)?. The empirical self is = anatta, , that very khandic (namo-rupic) self which modern ?Buddhism? alone acknowledges, but not that other Self which is the ?light and refuge? . What has Buddhism to say of the Self? That's not my Self (na me so atta); and the term non Self-ishness (anatta) are predicated of the world and all things (sabbe dhamma anatta); identical with the Brahmanical of those who are mortal, there is no Self/Soul , (anatma hi martyah) , . ?The Soul is the refuge that I have gone unto?. For anatta is not said of the Self/Soul but what it is not. There is never a ?doctrine of no-Soul?, but a doctrine of what the Soul (The Self) is not (form is anatta, feelings are anatta, etc.). It cannot be denied that what is anatta is indeed the mere and petty self for , and countless other passages, the mere self of psycho-physicality is = anatta = khandhas; that same self which the disciple is instructed to have his will (ctta) reject in the face of illumination and insight. Of the Metaphysician, the common-fool (puthujjana) who knows ?only of his self, is fated to most certainly die when his time comes?, but of that noble Aryan sage who has claimed the summit of wisdom and is ?freed the will/nous (cittavimuttati)?, he is a ?dead man walking?; meaning he has ?died to that mere self and lives in The Self?. Such a person in quest for same is commanded ?die before ye die!?, or that before physical death come and lest you still suffer the delusion of The Self to be this (foul) self of flesh and bone you have dispirited and disobjectified the will (Self-assimilation = Atman) in upon itself (samadhi, liberation). The common fool who ruminates over immortality envisages the survival of the personality (of person so-and-so; Bob, Sue); confusing the empirical self of ?flesh, urine, blood, bone, feces? with the Spirit (atman). This empirical self is in doubt by none, that very same self ?headed to the grave? and which ?goes in its own time?. The Metaphysician knows that any ?self? created in time must also perish in those same (?fires of?) time. Behold! That painted puppet this body, riddled with oozing sores, an erected façade. Diseased heap that fools fancy and swoon over?; of which Buddhism in no way quarrels with modern and corrupt ?Buddhism?, that of which this very self, the temporal phenomena of that person so-and-so is equally as much ?dukkha, anicca, and anatta?. The ?reflexive position? taken by illogical modern ?Buddhism? proclaims the Pali term Attan (Skt. Atman, Self) to be merely a reflexive term meaning ?oneself, himself, herself?, however the reflexive and empirical mere self is, regardless of translation, ?anatta? i.e. ?na me so atta? (not my Soul), or also ?eso khandhassa na me so atta? (these aggregates are no the Self, the Soul). As pertains the reflexive self, of who proclaim ?myself, himself, herself? we are referring to ?that person so-and-so (Larry, Sue, etc.)?, the empirical and psycho-physical (namo-rupa) self of blood and sinew which is ?doomed to fall into the grave at long last?, the very same self the poetic dead are said to cry out to the living ?what you are, we (the dead) once were,. what we are you shall be!?. Even more illogical is the double standard of commentarialist and sectarian ?Buddhists? who desire anatta to mean ?no-Soul? as well as atta to mean simply ?myself, himself, herself?; wherein illogically atta in the adjective anatta is, to their ignorant minds = Soul (?no-soul?), but atta in standalone = ?myself?. As illogical an end result, modern Buddhism has proclaimed atta = anatta! Its quite hard to fathom any position more senseless than this, however this is one of the countless reasons modern ?Buddhism? is illogical without end. However doctrinally and logically so, what IS anatta (the five psycho-physical aggregates of the mere self) are indeed ?myself?, in so meaning the mortal (mata) self composed of the bodily humors which is fated to death. That mere self is never implied nor meant when Buddhism speaks of immortality and the path leading to same (amatagamimagga) , of which ?the body cannot pass that gate to fare beyond,..only the Soul (The Self)? - Homer The great dictum of the Upanishads is ?That (Brahman) thou art? (tat tvam asi). ?That? is here, of course, the Atman or Spirit, Sanctus Spiritus, the Greek pneuma; this Atman is the spiritual essence, impartite whether transcendent or immanent; and however many and various directions to which it may extend or from which it may withdraw, it is the unmoved mover in both intransitive and transitive senses. It lends itself to all modalities of being but never itself becomes anyone or anything. That than which all else is vexation- That thou art. ?That?, in other words, is Brahman, or Godhead in the general sense of Logos or Being, considered as the universal source of all Being. That which is ?in? him as the finite (1) in the infinite (2- infinity, i.e. phenomena, namo-rupa), though not a ?part? of him. Referring back to of those who are mortal, there is no Self/Soul , the common fool doesn't 'have' an atman as such that we might agree with heretical modern ?Buddhism? which denies Selfhood in the absolute; for those same peoples who, in the grand bloom of ignorance, accept the foul self and deny the Great-Self, they are objectively (self-khandhas) assured that no underlying Subject (The Self) is immanent, or transcendent. Just as a man might have gold on his land, undiscovered and unknown, he has no gold, no wealth, even though it be his by measure of being present upon his very lands; so too those common fools (puthujjana), the ?Buddhists? who are certain and proud in their ignorance that this temporal personality, this self, is all there is. Theravada, in great illogic, goes one further to say that Gotama?s denial of nihilism (ucchedavada) was aimed at meaning that even the empirical self, since it itself was merely a composite and temporal construct, had no existence to be annihilated; thereby subverting the doctrinal ?heresy of nihilism? to be placed upon the view of

denying the empirical self rather than The Self, the Atman. Of course, to 'have an atman' implies possession, and certainly so the immanent Subject, The Self, is a possession by nothing and by nobody; in this too the wiseman agrees with the common materialist who ignorantly proclaims 'I don't have an atman/Soul?', most certainly that foul self does not 'have' The Self any more so than that object which is illuminated from afar 'has (of itself) light?'. 'There are two within us'; in the expression of 'self-control' implying that there is one that controls and the other (self) subject to control, for we know that 'nothing acts upon itself?'; for the one self 'becomes?', and the other self 'is?'. 'The 'fair' self (kalyanam attanam)?the 'foul' self (papam attanam)?; i.e. the 'great Self' (mahatta) and the 'petty' (appatumo) , or that 'self whose Lord is the Self?'. In that modern so-called Buddhism has denied The Self, it has constructed an illogical impossibility in thereby positing empirical purity of which the doctrine of Buddhism itself, not to mention logic alone most heartily protests, for there is no possibility of empirical purity within the teachings of Buddhism. It is of course true that the Buddha denied the existence of the mere empirical 'self' in the very meaning of 'my-self' (this person so-and-so, namo-rupa, an-atta), one might say in accordance with the command 'denegat seipsum, ; but this is not what modern so-called Buddhism means to say, or are understood by their readers to say; what they mean to say is that the Buddha denied the immortal (amata), the unborn (ajata) and Supreme-Self (mahatta?) of the Upanishads. And that is palpably false, for he frequently speaks of this Self, or Spirit (mahapurisha), and nowhere more clearly than in the too often repeated formula 'na me so atta?', 'This/these are not my Soul? (na me so atta?= anatta/anatman), excluding body (rupa) and the components of empirical consciousness (vinnana/ nama). What of this short-lived body which is clung to by means of craving? There is nothing in it to say 'I? or 'mine? or 'me?'. . What do you suppose, followers, if people were carrying off into the Jeta grove bunches of sticks, grasses, branches, and leaves and did
... read more »

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by Dave - 2008/11/17 19:26

The Buddha taught that one should train himself that in the seen there is just the seen... Then there is no 'you' here or there or in between. There is NO such fucking passage,you ARE a goddamned idiot, congrats. like the common fuckhead, you confuse self with Self The Two Selves Or, the empirical self (namo-rupa, anatta), and the Spiritual (attan) Self Copyright 2007 Author: Webmaster attan.com
READ!! Against no-Soul theories of Anatta in PDF (187 KB)* The greatest fool in Buddhist doctrine was one who 'saw Self (atman) in (mere) self (anatta)? (?anattani ca attati?) , certainly one of the most common refrains in Buddhist sutta. Some of the greatest harbingers of the incapacity to differentiate the empirical (namo-rupic) self from The Self are most certainly the 'Buddhists' who never end in revelry of quoting Gotama to the effect that all 'phenomena are Selfless (anattoti)'. The empirical self is = anatta, , that very khandic (namo-rupic) self which modern 'Buddhism' alone acknowledges, but not that other Self which is the 'light and refuge?'. What has Buddhism to say of the Self? That's not my Self (na me so atta); and the term non Self-ishness (anatta) are predicated of the world and all things (sabbe dhamma anatta); identical with the Brahmanical of those who are mortal, there is no Self/Soul , (anatma hi martyah),). 'The Soul is the refuge that I have gone unto?'. For anatta is not said of the Self/Soul but what it is not. There is never a 'doctrine of no-Soul?', but a doctrine of what the Soul (The Self) is not (form is anatta, feelings are anatta, etc.). It cannot be denied that what is anatta is indeed the mere and petty self for , and countless other passages, the mere self of psycho-physicality is = anatta = khandhas; that same self which the disciple is instructed to have his will (ctta) reject in the face of illumination and insight. Of the Metaphysician, the common-fool (puthujjana) who knows 'only of his self, is fated to most certainly die when his time comes?', but of that noble Aryan sage who has claimed the summit of wisdom and is 'freed the will/nous (cittavimuttati)?, he is a 'dead man walking?'; meaning he has 'died to that mere self and lives in The Self?. Such a person in quest for same is commanded 'die before ye die!?', or that before physical death come and lest you still suffer the delusion of The Self to be this (foul) self of flesh and bone you have dispirited and disobjectified the will (Self-assimilation = Atman) in upon itself (samadhi, liberation). The common fool who ruminates over immortality envisages the survival of the personality (of person so-and-so; Bob, Sue); confusing the empirical self of 'flesh, urine, blood, bone, feces?' with the Spirit (atman). This empirical self is in doubt by none, that very same self 'headed to the grave?' and which 'goes in its own time?'. The Metaphysician knows that any 'self?' created in time must also perish in those same ('fires of?) time. Behold! That painted puppet this body, riddled with oozing sores, an erected façade. Diseased heap that fools fancy and swoon over?; of which Buddhism in no way quarrels with modern and corrupt 'Buddhism?', that of which this very self, the temporal phenomena of that person so-and-so is equally as much 'dukkha, anicca, and anatta?'. The 'reflexive position?' taken by illogical modern 'Buddhism?' proclaims the Pali term Attan (Skt. Atman, Self) to be merely a reflexive term meaning 'oneself, himself, herself?', however the reflexive and empirical mere self is, regardless of translation, 'anatta?' i.e. 'na me so atta?' (not my Soul), or also 'eso khandhassa na me so atta?' (these aggregates are no the Self, the Soul). As pertains the reflexive self, of who proclaim 'myself, himself, herself?' we are referring to 'that person so-and-so (Larry, Sue, etc.)?', the empirical and psycho-physical (namo-rupa) self of blood and sinew which is 'doomed to fall into the grave at long last?', the very same self the poetic dead

are said to cry out to the living ?what you are, we (the dead) once were, what we are you shall be!?. Even more illogical is the double standard of commentarialist and sectarian ?Buddhists? who desire anatta to mean ?no-Soul? as well as atta to mean simply ?myself, himself, herself?; wherein illogically atta in the adjective anatta is, to their ignorant minds = Soul (?no-soul?), but atta in standalone = ?myself?. As illogical an end result, modern Buddhism has proclaimed atta = anatta! Its quite hard to fathom any position more senseless than this, however this is one of the countless reasons modern ?Buddhism? is illogical without end. However doctrinally and logically so, what IS anatta (the five psycho-physical aggregates of the mere self) are indeed ?myself?, in so meaning the mortal (mata) self composed of the bodily humors which is fated to death. That mere self is never implied nor meant when Buddhism speaks of immortality and the path leading to same (amatagamimagga), of which ?the body cannot pass that gate to fare beyond,..only the Soul (The Self)? - Homer The great dictum of the Upanishads is ?That (Brahman) thou art? (tat tvam asi). ?That? is here, of course, the Atman or Spirit, Sanctus Spiritus, the Greek pneuma; this Atman is the spiritual essence, impartite whether transcendent or immanent; and however many and various directions to which it may extend or from which it may withdraw, it is the unmoved mover in both intransitive and transitive senses. It lends itself to all modalities of being but never itself becomes anyone or anything. That than which all else is vexation- That thou art. ?That?, in other words, is Brahman, or Godhead in the general sense of Logos or Being, considered as the universal source of all Being. That which is ?in? him as the finite (1) in the infinite (2- infinity, i.e. phenomena, namo-rupa), though not a ?part? of him. Referring back to of those who are mortal, there is no Self/ Soul, the common fool doesn't 'have' an atman as such that we might agree with heretical modern ?Buddhism? which denies Selfhood in the absolute; for those same peoples who, in the grand bloom of ignorance, accept the foul self and deny the Great-Self, they are objectively (self-khandhas) assured that no underlying Subject (The Self) is immanent, or transcendent. Just as a man might have gold on his land, undiscovered and unknown, he has no gold, no wealth, even though it be his by measure of being present upon his very lands; so too those common fools (puthujjana), the ?Buddhists? who are certain and proud in their ignorance that this temporal personality, this self, is all there is. Theravada, in great illogic, goes one further to say that Gotama's denial of nihilism (ucchedavada) was aimed at meaning that even the empirical self, since it itself was merely a composite and temporal construct, had no existence to be annihilated; thereby subverting the doctrinal ?heresy of nihilism? to be placed upon the view of denying the empirical self rather than The Self, the Atman. Of course, to ?have an atman? implies possession, and certainly so the immanent Subject, The Self, is a possession by nothing and by nobody; in this too the wiseman agrees with the common materialist who ignorantly proclaims ?I don't have an atman/Soul?, most certainly that foul self does not ?have? The Self any more so than that object which is illuminated from afar ?has (of itself) light?. ?There are two within us? ; in the expression of ?self-control? implying that there is one that controls and the other (self) subject to control, for we know that ?nothing acts upon itself?; for the one self ?becomes?, and the other self ?is?. ?The ?fair? self (kalyanam attanam)?the ?foul? self (papam attanam)? ; i.e. the ?great Self? (mahatta) and the ?petty? (appatumo), or that ?self whose Lord is the Self?. In that modern so-called Buddhism has denied The Self, it has constructed an illogical impossibility in thereby positing empirical purity of which the doctrine of Buddhism itself, not to mention logic alone most heartily protests, for there is no possibility of empirical purity within the teachings of Buddhism. It is of course true that the Buddha denied the existence of the mere empirical ?self? in the very meaning of ?my-self? (this person so-and-so, namo-rupa, an-atta), one might say in accordance with the command ?denegat seipsum, ; but this is not what modern so-called Buddhism means to say, or are understood by their readers to say; what they mean to say is that the Buddha denied the immortal (amata), the unborn (ajata) and Supreme-Self (mahatta?) of the Upanishads. And that is palpably false, for he frequently speaks of this Self, or Spirit (mahapurisha), and nowhere more

... read more »

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by Dave - 2008/11/17 19:26

Can you point out how the following is incorrect? It's purported to be from the Sutta-Pitaka of the Buddhist Pali Canon. I'm just trying to understand why you take such joy in trashing people. Is it that you fear your ideas cannot stand on their own, that you must bring all who disagree with you down to your level? I know I shouldn't care, and it doesn't bother me at all, but I imagine people could learn from you. But your approach is so opposite from that which you try to teach, that it does raise my curiosity and I feel bad for you. ABSTAINING FROM HARSH LANGUAGE 3. He avoids harsh language, and abstains from it. He speaks such words as are gentle, soothing to the ear, loving, such words as go to the heart, and are courteous, friendly, and agreeable to many. In Majjhima-Nic ya No. 21, the Buddha says: ?Even, O monks, should robbers and murderers saw through your limbs and joints, whosoever should give way to anger thereat would not be following my advice. For thus ought you to train yourselves: ?Undisturbed shall our mind remain, no evil words shall escape our lips; friendly and full of sympathy shall we remain, with heart full of love, and free from any hidden malice; and that person shall we penetrate with loving thoughts, wide, deep, boundless, freed from anger and hatred?. Dave ADirgeToInsanity.blogspot.com

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by ancientbuddh...@earthlink.net - 2008/11/17 19:26

Dave ADirgeToInsanity.blogspot.com Dave, youre a goddamned MORALITY WHORE tell me what this passage means, son How is the Buddha rude? He insults the fools with wisdom and what is true - Udana How can it be said the Tathagata is mean? He speaks the truth to fools who cling to lies and ignorance - Samyutta 4 to insult a fool is the praise of wisdom - PLATO now, take your christian morality and shove it up your ass, the ORIGINAL POST is not about your pathetic morality-based CULT OF PIETISM i.e., shutthefuckup .

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by Dave - 2008/11/17 19:26

Ah, Plato. Is he in the DOCTRINE ? You seam to not want any discussion here except for the doctrine, so I assume The Buddha was a big fan of his, no? I prefer the teacher, as opposed to the student: Wisest is he who knows he does not know. Socrates There is nothing Christian about me, oh Father. And in response to shutthefuckup , are you incapable of having a conversation? I'm just a guy trying to learn, and honestly, you seem to know a great deal about the subject. If you lack so much confidence in your beliefs as to be unable to discuss them, just say so and I will move on.

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by dontfeedtr...@gmail.com - 2008/11/17 19:26

discussion here except for the doctrine, so I assume The Buddha was a big fan of his, no? I prefer the teacher, as opposed to the student: Wisest is he who knows he does not know. Socrates There is nothing Christian about me, oh Father. And in response to shutthefuckup , are you incapable of having a conversation? I'm just a guy trying to learn, and honestly, you seem to know a great deal about the subject. If you lack so much confidence in your beliefs as to be unable to discuss them, just say so and I will move on. Please don't feed this troll. Anybody with such a severe ego problem that they must correspond almost exclusively in obscenities is not helped by responding to him. The kindest thing one can do to that poor soul is to totally ignore his rantings. written Tourette's syndrome. Any response

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by Dave - 2008/11/17 19:26

Ah, Plato. Is he in the DOCTRINE ? You seam to not want any discussion here except for the doctrine, so I assume The Buddha was a big fan of his, no? I prefer the teacher, as opposed to the student: Wisest is he who knows he does not know. Socrates There is nothing Christian about me, oh Father. And in response to shutthefuckup , are you incapable of having a conversation? I'm just a guy trying to learn, and honestly, you seem to know a great deal about the subject. If you lack so much confidence in your beliefs as to be unable to discuss them, just say so and I will move on. Please don't feed this troll. Anybody with such a severe ego problem that they must correspond almost exclusively in obscenities is not helped by responding to him. The kindest thing one can do to that poor soul is to totally ignore his rantings. written Tourette's syndrome. Any response- Hide quoted text - - Show quoted text - That was my first thought, but I've never met a troll who actually had some knowledge of what he was talking about. Usually, they're just some teenage kid throwing out rediculas thoughts. Now like I said, I'm very new to Buddhism, so maybe I'm just being fooled, but he seems to have a lot of knowledge. He just has no idea how to share it. I don't understand his anger, and why he knows so much, but seems to understand so little. Maybe I should take future conversations with him out of this group, to a one on one basis. I truely am curious as to why he can't just share his

knowledge in a humane way. I apologize if I've caused extra hassle on the group. That certainly wasn't my intention. I'll submit all future posts to him directly. Take care.

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by ancientbuddh...@earthlink.net - 2008/11/17 19:26

Forget the plato quote, son, the original post was about differentiating the empirical self (namo rupa/ anatta/ na me so atta) from the SELF (spiritus sanctum, atman, citta, nous) that you DIVERGED from said point to direct it to petty morality , was your classical ERR.

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by ancientbuddh...@earthlink.net - 2008/11/17 19:26

tell ya what dave, as owner of the largest buddhist website on the NET, www.attan.com go take a look at same, if you THINK you can refute ONE METAPHYSICAL CLAIM (supported with doctrine) on the website..... then let me know, otherwise, silecia est aurea (silence is golden). by the way son, im called upon for PAID lectures on buddhism,if you think myself attacking fools here on the www has any bearing on my intellect, you commit ERR #2. ; son.

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by Keynes - 2008/11/17 19:26

Can you point out how the following is incorrect? It's purported to be from the Sutta-Pitaka of the Buddhist Pali Canon. I'm just trying to understand why you take such joy in trashing people. Is it that you fear your ideas cannot stand on their own, that you must bring all who disagree with you down to your level? I know I shouldn't care, and it doesn't bother me at all, but I imagine people could learn from you. But your approach is so opposite from that which you try to teach, that it does raise my curiosity and I feel bad for you. ABSTAINING FROM HARSH LANGUAGE 3. He avoids harsh language, and abstains from it. He speaks such words as are gentle, soothing to the ear, loving, such words as go to the heart, and are courteous, friendly, and agreeable to many. In Majjhima-Nic ya No. 21, the Buddha says: ?Even, O monks, should robbers and murderers saw through your limbs and joints, whosoever should give way to anger thereat would not be following my advice. For thus ought you to train yourselves: ?Undisturbed shall our mind remain, no evil words shall escape our lips; friendly and full of sympathy shall we remain, with heart full of love, and free from any hidden malice; and that person shall we penetrate with loving thoughts, wide, deep, boundless, freed from anger and hatred?. Dave ADirgeToInsanity.blogspot.com This sort of wisdom is scorned by practical people who assume that everyone should get their just desserts. They believe it is good sense to hate the haters and kill the killers. The wise say that forgiveness is the way. Jesus said, Love your enemies, and bless them that curse you. This sounds so foolish and unfair that few care to consider it. But it is the most practical of advice. Enemies may cut you limb from limb, but must you also grant them the power to destroy your happiness? Are the troubles of the world always to be taken as a personal insult? In that case, one is doomed to suffer continuously for slights real and imagined. One need not put his own happiness in the hands of strangers, when it is possible to keep his own house regardless of circumstance. Hatred is like drinking poison and painfully waiting for your enemies to die from it. Grief and anger are one's own responsibility to keep or to lose, unless one is determined to be a helpless slave to the world. (As he mistakenly sees it.) There is no cure for unhappiness but forgiveness and love. Nothing else works. What could be more practical than that? One must be merciful to obtain mercy (for himself by himself).

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by H. Moe - 2008/11/17 19:26

I apologize if I've caused extra hassle on the group. That certainly wasn't my intention. I'll submit all future posts to him directly. No apology needed for the group. The group can handle all the rubbish he upload, we just have sift through it. I am rather worry that you might get confuse by his knowledge . Did you heard about Devadatta ? Take care

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by ancientbuddh...@earthlink.net - 2008/11/17 19:26

He is not trying share his knowledge rather he is trying to tare buddhism. That is why he is not humane and full of anger. i ASSUME you meant TEAR,little son, buddhism was TORN apart in 400 C.E. ,.....some 1700+ years ago thats why theyre called buddhism's SCHISMSi.e. the creation of many fucked sects..... i have no anger for anyone who is either a truth seeker, or who has something intelligent to say of which you are niether, son

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by dontfeedtr...@gmail.com - 2008/11/17 19:26

who assume that everyone should get their just desserts. They believe it is good sense to hate the haters and kill the killers. The wise say that forgiveness is the way. Jesus said, Love your enemies, and bless them that curse you. This sounds so foolish and unfair that few care to consider it. But it is the most practical of advice. Enemies may cut you limb from limb, but must you also grant them the power to destroy your happiness? Are the troubles of the world always to be taken as a personal insult? In that case, one is doomed to suffer continuously for slights real and imagined. One need not put his own happiness in the hands of strangers, when it is possible to keep his own house regardless of circumstance. Hatred is like drinking poison and painfully waiting for your enemies to die from it. Grief and anger are one's own responsibility to keep or to lose, unless one is determined to be a helpless slave to the world. (As he mistakenly sees it.) There is no cure for unhappiness but forgiveness and love. Nothing else works. What could be more practical than that? One must be merciful to obtain mercy (for himself by himself). Another thing that works, especially in the case of a twisted mind that only seeks to offend and arouse anger in others is to just ignore him and to engage with others who are able to communicate like adults.

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by Tang Huyen - 2008/11/17 19:26

Another thing that works, especially in the case of a twisted mind that only seeks to offend and arouse anger in others is to just ignore him and to engage with others who are able to communicate like adults. Another way is to help such a person pile up on himself what he seeks to arouse in others, here anger, until the absurdity of the whole affair becomes obvious to him (it hurts too much), and he can then stop (if he is wise enough to see it that way). By the way, something like that is the method (dharma) of public case contemplation, in Chinese Chan by meditating on who is it who is mindful of the Buddha? , in that by that roundabout, one takes the core of one's delusion (the self), which usually is thin and slippery, and magnifies it all the way, even becomes it, also all the way, identifies with it (which is the contrary to the Buddhist teaching of non-identification), also all the way, until one sees that it is an illusion, and then one can drop it. And one can well see that it is an illusion because, from thin and slippery that it usually was (in which case it was hard to see as illusion), one grabs it, solidifies it, magnifies it, makes a big case of it, makes a big show of it, and then it becomes obvious as illusion. It is writ large, all the way, and then it becomes obvious as illusion. low, a good way to flush it out is to help it magnify itself, until it becomes a total obsession, an obsession that wholly possesses one, and then it gives itself away as illusion. The road of excess leads to the palace of wisdom . - Blake. Tang Huyen

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by Charles E Hardwidge - 2008/11/17 19:26

Another thing that works, especially in the case of a twisted mind that only seeks to offend and arouse anger in others is to just ignore him and to engage with others who are able to communicate like adults. Another way is to help such a person pile up on himself what he seeks to arouse in others, here anger, until the absurdity of the whole affair becomes obvious to him (it hurts too much), and he can then stop (if he is wise enough to see it that way). I've noted that right wing political campaigns tend to front things up and pepper comment with below the radar rudeness. It's an illusion of strength and low-key emotional manipulation. Now, it's correct to say that their ego can balloon to the point where they look ridiculous and turn people away, but feeding that is wrong and cruel - a mere mirroring of stupidity. Plus, it encourages wannabes. Brain scans shows how bullies have less well developed mental discipline and get a thrill out of causing other people pain. Feeding unaware sociopaths doesn't look to me like a winning strategy. <http://www.reuters.com/article/scienceNews/idUSTRE4A616020081107>

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by Tang Huyen - 2008/11/17 19:26

Now, it's correct to say that their ego can balloon to the point where they look ridiculous and turn people away, but feeding that is wrong and cruel - a mere mirroring of stupidity. Plus, it encourages wannabes. Brain scans shows how bullies have less well developed mental discipline and get a thrill out of causing other people pain. Feeding unaware sociopaths doesn't look to me like a winning strategy. <http://www.reuters.com/article/scienceNews/idUSTRE4A616020081107> It is well-known that our brain-mind is structured in favour of certain things in a lopsided way. Power, fame, drugs, etc. have a way of washing us away, and once it happens, we lose balance and perspective, we lose control, we surrender control over ourselves to it, be it abstract like power or concrete like drugs. It is well-known that druggies only look forward to the next hit and are desperate enough to do anything for it. That is their horizon, their entire horizon. Nothing else matters until they get the next hit. Freedom doesn't exist in them, only the slavery to the next hit. To a lesser extent, which is still quite dangerous, the bullies on these boards crave power and recognition, and will do anything to get them. They can claim full enlightenment or whatever to grab attention, and stop at nothing to get it. However we are all responsible for ourselves, even when we seem deranged or unhinged, and we are accountable for our deeds, especially if we lay claim to full enlightenment or whatever. Then there are the spiritual hits (aka Zen hits), which are in every way as addictive as drugs. We can get one, and stand in awe in front of it (or in memory of it) for the rest of our lives, even if it never comes back, as it tends to. We reverently treat it as the acme of our lives, and use it as the measuring stick to measure the rest of our lives, which of course comes out at the bottom in front of such a high norm. We forget that Buddhism is about letting go and not hanging on, even as we hang on hard to such distant and faint memories. Today the Boston Globe has an article about a young doctor, a former anesthesiologist at a famous Boston hospital. He was found dead in a storage closet of the same hospital, which had kicked him out over a year ago. http://www.boston.com/news/local/articles/2008/11/09/something_anything_to_stop_the_pain/?page=full <<Drugs and syringes were scattered all around his body. There was a half-filled vial of propofol, a sedative used to put patients to sleep during surgery, and a syringe filled with midazolam, a powerful drug similar to Valium. There were empty vials of morphine, hydromorphone, and Demerol - addictive opiates capable of providing tremendous highs. And then there was one nearly empty vial of vecuronium - an intravenous muscle relaxant that, when taken at such a high dose, would shut down the body's respiratory system in roughly three minutes, leading to certain death. I had never heard of most such specific drugs before reading the article, though like everybody I had heard about addictive opiates capable of providing tremendous highs. They can easily overwhelm our feedback circuitry and take over if we even begin to take them a single time. They grab control over their users, even if the latter are fully aware of their danger, as doctors are. All their knowledge can't stop their addiction. In spiritual circles, all the knowledge about spirituality can't do anything to those who don't want to put it to practice, especially if their only brush with anything spiritual in experience is a single hit that occurred a long time ago (usually in teenage) and that never came back. Its addictive power never diminishes over that time. Tang Huyen

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by Lee Rudolph - 2008/11/17 19:26

Then there are the spiritual hits (aka Zen hits), which are in every way as addictive as drugs. We can get one, and stand in awe in front of it (or in memory of it) for the rest of our lives, even if it never comes back, as it tends to. We reverently treat it as the acme of our lives, and use it as the measuring stick to measure the rest of our lives, which of course comes out at the bottom in front of such a high norm. We forget that Buddhism is about letting go and not hanging on, even as we hang on hard to such distant and faint memories. Live life to its emptiest. Lee Rudolph

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth, attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by ^@%>---*=# - 2008/11/17 19:26

Another thing that works, especially in the case of a twisted mind that only seeks to offend and arouse anger in others is to just ignore him and to engage with others who are able to communicate like adults. Another way is to help such a person pile up on himself what he seeks to arouse in others, here anger, until the absurdity of the whole affair becomes obvious to him (it hurts too much), and he can then stop (if he is wise enough to see it that way). I've noted that right wing political campaigns tend to front things up and pepper comment with below the radar rudeness. It's an illusion of strength and low-key emotional manipulation. Now, it's correct to say that their ego can balloon to the point where they look ridiculous and turn people away, but feeding that is wrong and cruel - a mere mirroring of stupidity. Plus, it encourages wannabes. Brain scans shows how bullies have less well developed mental discipline and get a thrill out of causing other people pain. Feeding unaware sociopaths doesn't look to me like a winning strategy. <http://www.reuters.com/article/scienceNews/idUSTRE4A616020081107>

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth, attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by Don Harvey Ignacia del Encanto - 2008/11/17 19:26

Then there are the spiritual hits (aka Zen hits), which are in every way as addictive as drugs. We can get one, and stand in awe in front of it (or in memory of it) for the rest of our lives, even if it never comes back, as it tends to. We reverently treat it as the acme of our lives, and use it as the measuring stick to measure the rest of our lives, which of course comes out at the bottom in front of such a high norm. We forget that Buddhism is about letting go and not hanging on, even as we hang on hard to such distant and faint memories. Live life to its emptiest. Good to the last drop... Hey, long time no screed!

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth, attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by Dave - 2008/11/17 19:26

Thank you Keynes and H.Moe. That makes a lot of sense. Now that I understand his motives, I'll do as you suggest and just skip over his posts. I'll continue to look for yours though. Take care.

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth, attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by herbzet - 2008/11/17 19:26

Brain scans shows how bullies have less well developed mental discipline and get a thrill out of causing other people pain. Feeding unaware sociopaths doesn't look to me like a winning strategy. <http://www.reuters.com/article/scienceNews/idUSTRE4A616020081107> I myself have been reluctant to use the term sociopath in this instance (although the term inevitably suggests itself) due to not really being in a position to make such a judgement. I might also mention that, in general, bullies, even those who are motivated by the enjoyment of the pain they inflict, cannot be automatically classed as sociopaths (more clinically called psychopaths) because there are a large variety of mechanisms that can lie behind sadistic behavior. I think people would really be surprised to find out

how much pathology is present in their daily lives, all around them, in supposedly productive, well-adjusted members of society. Actual clinical cases of psychopathy alone have been estimated to run as high as four percent (one in twenty-five) in the general population

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by halfawake - 2008/11/17 19:26

I might also mention that, in general, bullies, even those who are motivated by the enjoyment of the pain they inflict, cannot be automatically classed as sociopaths (more clinically called psychopaths) because there are a large variety of mechanisms that can lie behind sadistic behavior. I think people would really be surprised to find out how much pathology is present in their daily lives, all around them, in supposedly productive, well-adjusted members of society. Actual clinical cases of psychopathy alone have been estimated to run as high as four percent (one in twenty-five) in the general population

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by Charles E Hardwidge - 2008/11/17 19:26

Brain scans shows how bullies have less well developed mental discipline and get a thrill out of causing other people pain. Feeding unaware sociopaths doesn't look to me like a winning strategy. <http://www.reuters.com/article/scienceNews/idUSTRE4A616020081107> I myself have been reluctant to use the term sociopath in this instance (although the term inevitably suggests itself) due to not really being in a position to make such a judgement. I might also mention that, in general, bullies, even those who are motivated by the enjoyment of the pain they inflict, cannot be automatically classed as sociopaths (more clinically called psychopaths) because there are a large variety of mechanisms that can lie behind sadistic behavior. I think people would really be surprised to find out how much pathology is present in their daily lives, all around them, in supposedly productive, well-adjusted members of society. Actual clinical cases of psychopathy alone have been estimated to run as high as four percent (one in twenty-five) in the general population

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by herbzet - 2008/11/17 19:26

Brain scans shows how bullies have less well developed mental discipline and get a thrill out of causing other people pain. Feeding unaware sociopaths doesn't look to me like a winning strategy. <http://www.reuters.com/article/scienceNews/idUSTRE4A616020081107> I myself have been reluctant to use the term sociopath in this instance (although the term inevitably suggests itself) due to not really being in a position to make such a judgement. I might also mention that, in general, bullies, even those who are motivated by the enjoyment of the pain they inflict, cannot be automatically classed as sociopaths (more clinically called psychopaths) because there are a large variety of mechanisms that can lie behind sadistic behavior. I think people would really be surprised to find out how much pathology is present in their daily lives, all around them, in supposedly productive, well-adjusted members of society. Actual clinical cases of psychopathy alone have been estimated to run as high as four percent (one in twenty-five) in the general population

=====

buddhism Keynes opens his mouth , attempts to quote buddhism, but shits in his own mouth with lies and personal opinions.....typical dumb asshole strikes again

Posted by Charles E Hardwidge - 2008/11/17 19:26

Now, it's correct to say that their ego can balloon to the point where they look ridiculous and turn people away, but

feeding that is wrong and cruel - a mere mirroring of stupidity. Plus, it encourages wannabes. Brain scans shows how bullies have less well developed mental discipline and get a thrill out of causing other people pain. Feeding unaware sociopaths doesn't look to me like a winning strategy. <http://www.reuters.com/article/scienceNews/idUSTRE4A616020081107> It is well-known that our brain-mind is structured in favour of certain things in a lopsided way. Power, fame, drugs, etc. have a way of washing us away, and once it happens, we lose balance and perspective, we lose control, we surrender control over ourselves to it, be it abstract like power or concrete like drugs. It is well-known that druggies only look forward to the next hit and are desperate enough to do anything for it. That is their horizon, their entire horizon. Nothing else matters until they get the next hit. Freedom doesn't exist in them, only the slavery to the next hit. To a lesser extent, which is still quite dangerous, the bullies on these boards crave power and recognition, and will do anything to get them. They can claim full enlightenment or whatever to grab attention, and stop at nothing to get it. However we are all responsible for ourselves, even when we seem deranged or unhinged, and we are accountable for our deeds, especially if we lay claim to full enlightenment or whatever. Then there are the spiritual hits (aka Zen hits), which are in every way as addictive as drugs. We can get one, and stand in awe in front of it (or in memory of it) for the rest of our lives, even if it never comes back, as it tends to. We reverently treat it as the acme of our lives, and use it as the measuring stick to measure the rest of our lives, which of course comes out at the bottom in front of such a high norm. We forget that Buddhism is about letting go and not hanging on, even as we hang on hard to such distant and faint memories. Today the Boston Globe has an article about a young doctor, a former anesthesiologist at a famous Boston hospital. He was found dead in a storage closet of the same hospital, which had kicked him out over a year ago. http://www.boston.com/news/local/articles/2008/11/09/something_anything_to_stop_the_pain/?page=full <<Drugs and syringes were scattered all around his body. There was a half-filled vial of propofol, a sedative used to put patients to sleep during surgery, and a syringe filled with midazolam, a powerful drug similar to Valium. There were empty vials of morphine, hydromorphone, and Demerol - addictive opiates capable of providing tremendous highs. And then there was one nearly empty vial of vecuronium - an intravenous muscle relaxant that, when taken at such a high dose, would shut down the body's respiratory system in roughly three minutes, leading to certain death. I had never heard of most such specific drugs before reading the article, though like everybody I had heard about addictive opiates capable of providing tremendous highs. They can easily overwhelm our feedback circuitry and take over if we even begin to take them a single time. They grab control over their users, even if the latter are fully aware of their danger, as doctors are. All their knowledge can't stop their addiction. In spiritual circles, all the knowledge about spirituality can't do anything to those who don't want to put it to practice, especially if their only brush with anything spiritual in experience is a single hit that occurred a long time ago (usually in teenage) and that never came back. Its addictive power never diminishes over that time. Tang Huyen I've found the media, science, and life in general tend to repeat so both articles have a certain redundancy to them. We all know about bullies behaviour and addicted doctors. It may just be me but I get fed up reading the practiced cynicism and disaster in the media. I've just bought myself a digital camera. I've wanted on for ages but never got around to it until now. I've also got some books on photography and portraits. I figure, it will open up a few doors and get me off my ass. This seems a better response to things that getting bulldozed by how some blowhard wants to shape the world or winding up with my ass hanging out of the oven. Perhaps, it's an exercise tuning out and just wanting to experience things more like the were/could/should be but there's worse things.

=====