

category. Also, if nothing appears to a liberated person due to the parting of the principal and all its transformations, is Ishvara, the supervisor of all appearances, non-liberated?

If the person is a partless entity, it cannot be consciousness. If the person is permanent, how could it be bound and freed?

It follows that one cannot be freed from cyclic existence merely through cognizing that the person and happiness, pain, and so forth are different. For, even untrained children realize a separation of themselves from their faculties and from happiness, pain, and so forth. Conceiving themselves as the seeker, they seek happiness and faculties which are superior to those of the present. Furthermore, they conceive of themselves in former and later moments as one but realize that happiness and pain arise and cease.

It is not possible to be liberated from cyclic existence through meditating on one's faculties as suffering and through seeking to become separate from them. For, such a mind of disgust for suffering is accompanied by hatred. Also, at that time one still has desire, even if suppressed. To achieve liberation from cyclic existence it is necessary to destroy the misconception of objective existence that gives rise to desire, hatred, and suffering.

CHARVAKAS

The Charvakas (Hedonists) are so called because they advocate satisfaction with only what is pleasant (*charu*, *mdzespa*) here in this life.¹⁹⁸ They are called Proponents of Annihilation because they propound that at death, or after a number of lives, the continuum of the self ceases. They are called Nihilists because they propound that rebirth does not exist and that moral cause and effect do not exist. They are called Barhaspatyas because they follow the god Brhaspati. They are called the Gone-Afar (*Ayata*, *rgyang phanpa*) because they have gone apart from the right view. They are called Daivagurus after their teacher Devaguru; that is, Brhaspati, and Juk-dop-jen-bas (*Juk-stobs-can-pa*) after their teacher Juk-dop, a student of the renowned sage Lokachakshu

and a contemporary of the logician Dharmakirti.¹⁹⁹ They are called Proponents of Inherence and Proponents of Nature because they consider that many things, such as the sharpness of thorns and the descent of a waterfall, appear naturally, without depending on causes.

They are nihilists not because of believing in nothing or that life is totally worthless, but because they believe only in what they can perceive directly, discarding inference as a means of valid knowledge. Seeing that charity does not necessarily bring wealth as the clergy claim, they propound that this life and its attributes of life-span, wealth, and so forth are not results of merits and demerits in former lives. They are moral nihilists. Since they rely on direct perception as their sole source of knowledge, they deny causation where it cannot be seen, such as even in the coloring of flowers and the roundness of peas. However, they affirm causation that can be seen, such as the molding of a vase from clay.

The Nihilists are divided into Meditators and Dialecticians. The Meditators attain clairvoyance through which they perceive former and future births for thirty, sixty, or ninety eons according to their mental level.²⁰⁰ Unlike Buddhists, they assume that the cycle of rebirth has a beginning because their clairvoyance is limited and they do not perceive a beginningless cycle of births. With their clairvoyance they follow themselves and others from lifetime to lifetime noticing no immediate relationship of cause and effect with respect to the experience of pleasure and pain.

The Dialecticians see the same lack of causal relationship in the stages of a single human's life and thus deny moral law along with rebirth. Wishing to save the world from uselessly wasting its riches on clergy and uselessly participating in efforts aimed at improving a future life, they advocate no cause and effect in the moral sense. It is also said that the sage Lokachakshu desired to lie with his daughter and so explained to her the absence of moral law.

For a Nihilist, consciousness is a fermentation of the elements, much like inebriation produced from alcohol. Mind is not

considered to be a phenomenon of a different nature from matter. Matter in all systems is composed of particles, but mind in most systems is not. The Buddhists, based on a view of an essential difference between mind and matter, expound a theory that mind and body have their own separate substantial causes—the mind's main cause being a former mind. Thereby, a beginningless cycle of existence is established because a mind must always have a mind preceding it as its substantial cause. The Nihilists reject this notion saying that mind has a physical nature just as the capacity to cause inebriation is of the same nature as beer. The mind is an effect of the body just as light is an effect of a lamp. The mind is a quality of the body just as a mural is a quality of a wall.

Nihilists say that the scope of the person is limited to the scope of the senses. This counters the Buddhist notion of a subtle type of impermanent self that transmigrates and the non-Buddhist notion of a permanent self beyond sense perception. Nirvana is then the annihilation of mind and body with the return of the body to the four elements and the dispersion of the senses into space. 'Live happily until death. After death you have no location or place. When the body has become ashes, how can it live again? Therefore, former and later [lives] do not exist.'

A Dialectician Nihilist asserts that a mind on the point of death has no conjunction with a later mind just because it is a mind on the point of death. Even though he does not believe that there are Foe Destroyers, he cites the example of the final moment of the mind of a Foe Destroyer which, according to the Buddhist Vaibhashikas, ceases upon death. For a Vaibhashika, the continuum of mind and body of a Foe Destroyer ceases when he dies whereas the Mahayana schools say that this is impossible, declaring that in this respect the Vaibhashikas are like Nihilists.

Nihilists assert that because the mind is produced from the elements, there are no Foe Destroyers who have eradicated the afflictions of desire, hatred, and ignorance. Therefore, they do not accept an omniscient Buddha or Supreme Community.

Similarly, there is no excellent Doctrine because there is no abandonment of afflictions and no path that abandons them.

The Dialecticians add that there are no Foe Destroyers because beings are permanent, stable, perpetual, and unchanging as long as they exist and thus do not become good or bad through the power of causes. The Meditators, when they attain any of the equipoises of the four concentrations or of the four formless absorptions, think that they are Foe Destroyers. Near the time of their death, they fall from their meditative stabilization, see their rebirth in a lower condition, and conclude, 'There is no Foe Destroyer, and there is no path of a Foe Destroyer.'

BUDDHIST REFUTATION OF NIHILISM

The mind right after conception has a preceding mind just because it is a mind. For, cause and effect must be of a harmonious nature. Even one whose mental powers are not clear and whose senses are torpid immediately after birth searches to eat food and searches to drink the milk of the breast without being taught. This is by the force of previous conditioning in other lives.

Consciousness is not produced from inanimate causes because the substantial causes of the inanimate and of consciousness are definitely separate. The natures of the two are different; the one is an aggregation of particles and the other is not.

Nihilists say that the mind is produced from the mindless elements because the mind is a product, just as inebriation is produced from beer and fire is produced from a magnifying glass and those two are products. However, because inebriation is an attribute of a mind and not a mind, the example is not proper. Because causes must accord in type with their effects, the reason cited is in fact contradictory; it proves that the mind is not produced from the mindless elements.

The Nihilists say that a mind at the point of death has no conjunction to another life because it is a mind at the point of death, like the final mind of a Foe Destroyer. The reason is

inconclusive because there are cases of memory of former lives and because babies have different styles of behavior. Furthermore, that the Vaibhashikas claim that the mind of a Foe Destroyer ceases at death does not make it so. The continuum of the mind never ceases, and the Vaibhashikas merely fall to the depth of the Nihilists in claiming so, as do some wrong interpreters of Prasangika who say that in meditative equipoise on emptiness there is no mind (confusing the fusion of subject and object at the time of direct cognition of emptiness with disappearance of the mind).

Body is not the main cause of mind because if it were, a dead body would absurdly be conscious. Also, the mind does not depend on the body in the sense of being its substantial effect because the increase and diminishment of wisdom and so forth do not depend on the increase and diminishment of the body. This is not to deny that mind and body affect each other; rather, *all* states and changes of mind do not depend on the body. Also, mind does not depend on body in the sense of its having a physical nature because if it did, a person's mental qualities would be perceived by a sense consciousness that perceives the body. Because the Nihilists say that the body is permanent as long as it lasts, the mind also would always have to have the same disposition.

The Nihilists are wrong in claiming that there is no omniscient consciousness. The development of clear and direct perception by a conditioned mind is the proof through which omniscience is established. Much as an object of desire repeatedly taken to mind can appear vividly before a lustful person, emptiness can be seen directly and not just through the medium of images or concepts. Once this is shown, then the gradations of the path and final omniscience are easily established.

The limitless development of love and wisdom is established by proving the existence of former and future lives. For, since love and wisdom are qualities of mind, they develop naturally together with a consciousness that becomes conditioned to the ways of love and wisdom. A feature of consciousness is that the

same effort required to begin a continuum of love or wisdom is not required for each of the successive moments, much like the natural continuance of fire once it has been started. Since there are future lives, there is sufficient time for the full development of wisdom and love.

Because thorns and so forth are produced from their own seeds and because the sharpness of thorns and so forth are produced from those same seeds, the sharpness of thorns is not a suitable example of the causeless production of suffering. The ascertainment that thorns arise sometimes in some places proves that they are produced in dependence on their own objects of dependence, and these objects of dependence are accepted as their causes. A cause is that which aids its own effect; that which does not aid is not an object depended upon for production. If things were causelessly produced without depending on others, things would either always exist, or never exist, or everything would be produced from everything.

The Nihilists say that there are no former and later births, no omniscience, and no effects of charity, etc., because they have not seen them directly. Does this mean that all persons have not seen them directly or that just the Nihilists have not seen them directly? Also, do they directly see them to be non-existent or do they realize them to be non-existent through inference? That all persons have not seen them is doubtful; how, without omniscience, can anyone know what all have and have not seen? If only the Nihilists have not seen them, it is answered that it is mistaken that the non-existent is co-extensive with what the Nihilists have not seen.

If the Nihilists say that a direct perceiver sees former and later births, omniscience, and so forth as non-existent, the answer is that non-existence of other lives and so forth could not be an object of direct perception because, according to the Nihilists, other lives are non-existent entities. How can the non-existent be seen directly? If their non-existence is established by way of inference, then by accepting such an inference the fault is entailed of first denying the validity of inference and then of using inference to establish a point. For, the proponents of Nihilism say that only

direct perception is valid. The non-existence of former and later births and so forth not only cannot be established by valid inference, but also an attempt to do such would demolish their own position that inference is not valid.