

Transcript of teachings by Khen Rinpoche Geshe Chonyi

Lesson No: 2

Date: 21st June 2012

All page references in this lesson refer to Handout No. I: *An Introduction to Certain Buddhist Philosophical Concepts* unless otherwise stated.

Page 2

Table: Established Base and the phenomena mutually inclusive with it

Definienda	Definitions
1. Established Base	Established by a valid cognizer
2. Object of knowledge	Suitable as an object of an awareness
3. Existent	Observed by a valid cognizer
4. Phenomenon	That which holds its own entity
5. Object of comprehension	Object realized by a valid cognizer
6. Object	Object known by an awareness
7. Object of comprehension of an omniscient consciousness	Object realized by omniscient consciousness
8. Hidden phenomenon	Object realized in a hidden manner by a thought consciousness apprehending it

Most of the information in this handout were covered in the previous class. The above table shows the phenomena that are mutually inclusive with established base. We discussed most of them except for hidden phenomenon that is also mutually inclusive with established base, i.e., it has the same meaning as established base.

What is a **hidden phenomenon**? An inferential valid cogniser realises this hidden phenomenon through the medium of a generic image (or a mental image). It cannot realise a hidden phenomenon directly. Because a hidden phenomenon cannot be realised by an inferential valid cogniser without depending on the medium of a mental image, therefore it is hidden.

When we refer to a hidden phenomenon, we are also referring to an existent. A hidden phenomenon and an existent are mutually inclusive, i.e., a hidden phenomenon has the same meaning as an existent.

Page 3 (chart on next page)

The chart mentions that **manifest phenomenon** is mutually inclusive with functioning thing. What is a manifest phenomenon? A manifest phenomenon is an object that is directly realised by a direct valid cogniser. When a direct valid cogniser realises a manifest phenomenon, it does not have to do so in dependence on a mental image. Rather it perceives the object directly. Therefore such an object is called a manifest phenomenon.

Table: Functioning thing and the phenomena mutually inclusive with it

Definienda	Definitions
1. Functioning thing	That which is able to perform a function
2. Impermanent phenomenon	Momentary phenomenon
3. Product	Created phenomenon
4. Composed phenomenon	Disintegrating phenomenon
5. Cause	Producer
6. Effect	Object produced
7. Ultimate truth	Phenomenon which is ultimately able to perform a function
8. Specifically characterized phenomenon	A phenomena which is established by way of its own character without being merely imputed by a term or thought consciousness
9. Manifest phenomenon	Object explicitly realized by a direct valid cognizer

The chart also shows other phenomena that are mutually inclusive with functioning thing. They are impermanent phenomenon, product, composed phenomenon, cause, effect, ultimate truth, specifically characterised phenomenon, and manifest phenomenon. They all refer to the same thing.

Page 4 (chart on next page)

Functioning thing or impermanent phenomenon can be divided into:

1. Matter
2. Consciousness
3. Non-associated compositional factor

If the phenomenon in question is a functioning thing or impermanent phenomenon, it is necessarily matter, consciousness, or a non-associated compositional factor. These divisions are **exhaustive**. You will not find an impermanent phenomenon or a functioning thing that is not one of these three.

These three divisions of a functioning thing are **mutually exclusive**, which means that there isn't a common locus between any of them, i.e., you will not be able to point to any object that is *all* three of these divisions. If you are able to point to a phenomenon that is all three of them, then these three divisions will not be mutually exclusive.

Matter

What is matter? Its definition is that which is atomically established. Matter refers to a phenomenon whose existence is established by atoms. In this system, matter is mutually inclusive with form.

Matter has two divisions:

1. External matter
2. Internal matter

The difference between external matter and internal matter depends on whether that matter is included within the continuum of the person or not.

An **external matter** is matter that is atomically established and *not* included within the continuum of a person.

- Illustrations of external matter: earth, water, fire, wind.
- The external objects of form source, sound source, smell source, taste source, and tangible source are also external matter.

An **internal matter** is matter that is included within the continuum of a person.

- Illustrations of internal matter: an individual's contaminated physical aggregates.
- Internal matter is the five **sense powers**: eye sense power, ear sense power, nose sense power, tongue sense power, and body sense power. These are also called the uncommon empowering conditions. This will be explained later. These five are internal matter because they are form and are included within the continuum of a person.

Consciousness

As mentioned in the previous class, consciousness, awareness, and knower are mutually inclusive.

Consciousness has two divisions:

1. Sense consciousnesses
2. Mental consciousness

For the **sense consciousness**, there are five sense consciousnesses:

1. Eye consciousness
2. Ear consciousness
3. Nose consciousness
4. Tongue consciousness
5. Body consciousness

Together with the mental consciousness, there are six consciousnesses.

How a consciousness is generated

In general, in order for a consciousness to be generated, three conditions must be present:

1. the observed object condition
2. the uncommon empowering condition
3. the immediately preceding condition

For example, in order for an eye consciousness apprehending form to be generated, it needs the **observed object condition**, i.e., form. In the same way:

- In order for an ear consciousness to be generated, the observed object condition is sound.
- In order for a nose consciousness to be generated, the observed object condition is smell.

- In order for the tongue consciousness to be generated, the observed object condition is taste.
- In order for the body consciousness to be generated, the observed object condition is tangible object.

In order for the five sense consciousnesses to be generated, first there must be the observed object conditions. The objects of the five sense consciousnesses are external matter.

But just having the observed object condition is insufficient. In order for these sense consciousnesses to be generated, their **uncommon empowering conditions** must also be present. The uncommon empowering conditions are essentially the five internal matters:

1. Eye sense power
2. Ear sense power
3. Nose sense power
4. Tongue sense power
5. Body sense power

Sense consciousness	Observed object condition	Uncommon empowering condition
Eye consciousness	Form	Eye sense power
Ear consciousness	Sound	Ear sense power
Nose consciousness	Odour	Nose sense power
Tongue consciousness	Taste	Tongue sense power
Body consciousness	Tangible object	Body sense power

The production of an eye consciousness is dependent on the existence of its uncommon empowering condition, the eye sense power. Without the eye sense power, the eye consciousness cannot be generated.

The eye sense power is also called a clear form. In dependence on its uncommon empowering condition, the eye sense power, an eye consciousness apprehending form can then apprehend form. An eye sense consciousness can *only* apprehend form. Why? It can only apprehend form because it is dependent on its uncommon empowering condition and in this case it is an eye sense power. The eye consciousness cannot, for example, apprehend smell. The reason why an eye consciousness cannot apprehend smell is because of its uncommon empowering condition.

The eye consciousness apprehending form is generated in the aspect of form due to its observed object condition, form.

An eye consciousness apprehending form is also generated in the aspect of that which is clear and knowing.

An eye consciousness apprehending form is in the nature of clear and knowing, not because of its uncommon empowering condition but due to the third condition, the immediately preceding condition. That refers to the consciousness that immediately precedes the generation of such an eye consciousness.

The consciousness immediately preceding the generation of this consciousness is in the nature of clear and knowing. Due to that, when an eye consciousness arises, it is generated in the aspect of that which is clear and knowing.

From this, you can see that for any particular sense consciousness to be generated, a few conditions must come together, without which the sense consciousness will not arise. These three conditions must be present for any sense consciousness to arise:

1. the observed object condition
2. the uncommon empowering condition
3. the immediately preceding condition

Dependent-arising

For any functioning thing to come into existence, it must be preceded by its own cause. In that sense, we say functioning things are dependently originated or dependently arisen on the level of cause and effect. This is the coarsest level of the understanding of dependent-arising in the sense of dependence on causes and conditions.

Concordant causes

An impermanent phenomenon or functioning thing can be created or come into existence in dependence on its cause. In fact, it can only arise in dependence on its concordant cause.

As mentioned in the previous class, when you look at form and consciousness, from the moment they come into existence, they are established as having different entities, i.e., they are completely distinct entities from one another.

Unlike matter or form that is atomically established, consciousness has the nature of clarity and knowing in the aspect of non-obstructiveness. It is likened to vacuity or voidness.

If you were to ask, “Why is matter atomically established? Why does consciousness have the nature of clarity and knowing?” There is no special reason. They are like that by nature and are established as having those particular natures or entities.

Ignorance and its antidote

Form and consciousness arise in dependence on their concordant causes. When you understand the implication of this, only then will you be able to

begin to understand how there can be past and future lives. One can then think more deeply about happiness, suffering, and reincarnation.

Happiness can only arise in dependence on its concordant cause. Suffering can only arise in dependence on its own cause as well. When you understand the concept of causality, there is something for you to think about. All the sufferings and problems that we do not want arise from their own causes. They have to be the concordant causes of suffering.

When we analyse deeply, we can only conclude that the main culprits behind all these sufferings are our karma and afflictions. We have seen this in the previous module on the lam-rim.

Karma and afflictions are the principal causes of suffering. When you analyse this deeply, the very root of all the problems is the ignorance apprehending a self. The ignorance that is the apprehension of a self is not just a mere state of not knowing something. Rather this ignorance apprehending a self is a fundamental misapprehension of the self and reality.

What we have to establish is that this ignorance is fundamentally wrong. Whether ignorance can be removed or not depends on whether we can find its antidote. This antidote has to be the complete direct opposite to ignorance. In this case, the antidote is a wisdom consciousness. If there is a wisdom consciousness that can harm ignorance, we can increase the strength or power of this wisdom consciousness. The more we are able to increase the power of this wisdom consciousness, commensurate with the strength of this wisdom consciousness, the more we are able to harm ignorance, the root of suffering.

Fruits of valid cognition

The purpose here is to realise reality through valid cognition. First, we have to realise what exactly exists in reality. By realising reality as it is through a valid cogniser, we can remove all misapprehensions of reality, ignorance, and so forth. On the basis of this, we can then talk about becoming enlightened.

When we talk about the object of knowledge or object of comprehension, that is mutually inclusive with established base, the phenomenon that can be known and realised, that basis can be divided into the two truths and further divided into the four truths.

The object to be realised, the basis or the two truths: how can the two truths be realised as they are? The two truths are realised by their respective valid cognisers. Once they are realised, one continually familiarises with those realisations through valid cognition. This is how one can posit the possibility of achieving liberation from cyclic existence and full enlightenment. These are said to be the **fruits of valid cognition**.

Why? Because such states are the results of having accustomed oneself continuously with reality through valid cognition.

Clear and knowing

We usually talk about the six consciousnesses: the five sense consciousnesses and the mental consciousness. A mental consciousness is generated in dependence on its own uncommon empowering condition, the mental sense power. This is what distinguishes the mental consciousness from the sense consciousnesses.

One can divide consciousness into: (1) sense consciousnesses and (2) mental consciousness, or you can look at consciousness in terms of: (1) the mind and (2) the mental factors.

When you look at the definition of consciousness, it is: “That which is clear and knowing.”

There are different ways of explaining how the mind is clear or has the entity of clarity.

- It is clear in the sense that it is not atomically established, i.e., it is free from been atomically established (or made up of atoms).
- Another way of explaining “clear” is related to the fact that when any object is brought to the attention of the mind, it can appear to the mind.
- Some of you may have heard the statement, “The nature of the mind is clear light.” One way of explaining that is that the afflictions that are adventitious have not entered into the deepest recesses of the mind. That means the mind by nature is not afflicted.

It is not easy to pinpoint exactly and to be able to say the mind is like this or it is like that. We can say however that the mind has the entity of being clear and knowing. It has clarity and it knows.

Perhaps we can say “knowing” here refers to realising an object. Or is it referring to the fact that objects can appear to the mind?

We will discuss this further when we begin with the actual topic. We have not yet started with the topic. We are just covering the preliminaries now. That discussion will come later. This is only an introduction.

Non-associated compositional factor

Definition: A composed phenomenon which is neither matter nor consciousness

A. **Non-associated compositional factors which are persons** (or more exactly, all living beings)

B. **Non-associated compositional factors which are not persons** (e.g. time)

Any impermanent phenomenon or functioning thing that is neither matter nor consciousness is included among non-associated compositional factor.

Illustrations of a non-associated compositional factor that are persons: cow, horse, and so forth. In this context, “person” is not limited to only human beings but includes all living beings.

Basis of designation

The implication here when we say a horse or a cow is a non-associated compositional factor is that it means a horse or cow is neither form nor consciousness. When we look at a horse, instinctively we think its form or body is the horse, but that is only the horse’s form aggregate. It is not the horse. What our eye consciousness sees is the horse’s body, a form. That is the basis of designation in dependence upon which we label or impute “horse.” Therefore the horse’s body is not the horse. It is form.

In a similar way, when we say “I,” “I” is not the body or mind. The body and mind are the bases of designation in dependence upon which we impute “I” or “self.”

We will talk more about the nature of the “I,” what it is exactly and how it exists in the next module on tenets. Depending on the different philosophical systems, the Buddhist tenets, there is much debate and disagreement as to who we are, the nature of the “I.”

Most of the tenets encounter the fundamental difficulty of not being able to posit an “I” that is *not* one with the basis of designation. Most of them feel that there must be one thing that is the “I.” In the end, the majority of the tenets assert the mental consciousness to be the “I.”

However according to the Consequence Middle Way School that is the final view, the “I” is that which is merely imputed in dependence upon the aggregates, the basis of designation. The “I” does not exist from the side of the basis of designation. That is the fundamental difference.

There are also non-associated compositional factors that are not persons, e.g., time.

As a generality, a product or composed phenomenon is a non-associated compositional factor that is not a person.

Question: Why is a product or impermanent phenomena as a generality an illustration of a non-associated compositional factor?

Answer: When we talk about an impermanent phenomenon as a generality, it encompasses everything that is an impermanent phenomenon. Having said that, if I were to ask, “Is impermanent phenomena consciousness?” what would your answer be?

Khen Rinpoche: The question is not asking whether it is necessarily so.

Is impermanent phenomenon consciousness? Is it form?

Khen Rinpoche: Therefore there is only one answer left.

When you want to learn, you have to memorise these terms. You have to have a rough idea of the divisions of a functioning thing or impermanent phenomenon: matter, consciousness, and non-associated compositional factor. You have to remember them. You also have to memorise the phenomena that are mutually inclusive with functioning thing: impermanent phenomenon, product, composed phenomenon and so forth.

Likewise, there are also phenomena that are mutually inclusive with permanent phenomenon: non-produced phenomenon, uncomposed phenomenon, conventional truth, phenomenon that is a non-thing and generally characterised phenomenon (as shown in the chart below on page 5).

Table: Permanent phenomenon and the phenomena mutually inclusive with it

Definienda	Definitions
1. Permanent phenomenon	A common locus of a phenomenon and the non momentary
2. Non-produced phenomenon	Non-created phenomenon
3. Uncomposed phenomenon	Non-disintegrating phenomenon
4. Conventional truth	Phenomenon which is ultimately unable to perform a function
5. Phenomenon which is a non-thing	Phenomenon which is empty of the ability to perform a function
6. Generally characterized phenomenon	A phenomena which is merely imputed by a term or thought consciousness and is not established as a specifically characterized phenomenon

Mutually inclusive means that these are different ways of saying the same thing. Some of these words are new to you but you have no choice, you have to memorise them.

Page 6

Another way of dividing Object of Knowledge

Singular phenomenon – a phenomenon which is not diverse e.g. existent, person, etc.

One with pot – a phenomenon which is not diverse with pot, i.e. pot

Different phenomenon – phenomena which are diverse e.g. existent and object of knowledge, pot and pillar, etc.

Different from pot – a phenomenon which is diverse from pot

For any phenomenon that exists, when divided, it is either:

1. a singular phenomenon (or one)
2. a different phenomenon (or many)

If it exists, it is either single (or singular) or different. It is either one of these two.

- For example, when we say “object of knowledge,” it is **single**. It is **one**, not many because it is one with itself.
- When we say object of knowledge and established base, these two are **different**. They are not the same. They are not one. They are different.
 - Are “object of knowledge and established base one? No, they are different.
 - Are they different in meaning? No, they have the same meaning.

So, you must differentiate between being different and having a different meaning.

When the phenomenon in question has the same name and the same meaning, that means it is the same thing. It is one with itself. It is a singular phenomenon. It is one.

When the phenomena in question have different names and different meanings, they are diverse. They are different. They are not the same and are not one.

You must memorise what I have just said:

- A singular phenomenon: It is one with itself because it has the same name and same meaning.
- When you compare two objects, when they have different names or different meanings, they are different.
- But if the two objects are different, it does not necessarily mean that they have different meanings.

Page 6 – 7

THE COMPARISON OF PHENOMENA

The boundaries of pervasion or extension of a phenomenon is its range – what it pervades, what it includes, and what it excludes. By understanding clearly a phenomenon’s boundaries of pervasion one is able to ascertain the scope of that phenomenon. The essential tool in this investigation is the analytical comparison of phenomenon. By comparing two phenomena and establishing their relative boundaries of pervasion, the limits of each phenomenon in relation to the other, one comes to understand the points of similarity and dissimilarity between them.

The comparison of phenomena presupposes that those phenomena are **different** in the sense that they are not *exactly* the same from the point of view of *name* and *meaning*. Phenomena which are not different are one. A pot is the only thing which is one with pot, for it is exactly the same as a pot in name and meaning. The investigation of differences does not address the cases of phenomena which are exactly the same. There is no difference between a pot and a pot. **Any two phenomena must compare in one of the following ways:**

1. Mutually inclusive phenomena

Things which are mutually inclusive are different phenomena which have all eight approaches of pervasion. The Tibetan term for “mutually inclusive” literally means “the same meaning”. Mutually inclusive phenomena are different only in the sense of not having the same name, for their meanings – the objects which are included within the extension of each – are exactly the same. Also, any two mutually inclusive phenomena have all eight approaches of pervasion. That is, whatever is a p is necessarily a q (and vice versa), if a p exists, then a q exists (and vice versa).

That mutually inclusive phenomena have all eight approaches of pervasion entails that there is a **common locus**; that is, there is something which is those two mutually inclusive phenomena. A common locus is not something that exists halfway between the two and is neither. Rather, it is something which is both of them.

Mutually inclusive means having the same meaning, e.g., an impermanent phenomenon and a product. An impermanent phenomenon is mutually inclusive with a product. Although they have different names, essentially they have the same meaning. This means that:

1. If it is an impermanent phenomenon, it is necessarily a product.
2. If it is a product, it is necessarily an impermanent phenomenon.

The relationship exists in the form of “whatever is a p is necessarily a q (and vice versa)” and in terms of existing and not existing:

- If this exists that also exists
- If that exists, this also exists
- If this does not exist, that also does not exist

Page 7**Mutually exclusive phenomena**

Mutually exclusive phenomena are those which are different and a common locus of them is not possible. There is nothing that is both a p and a q.

With regard to a mutually exclusive phenomenon, the basis of comparison is that there must be two different objects. There cannot be a common locus between the two, i.e., you cannot point to something that is both. For example, comparing an impermanent phenomenon and a permanent phenomenon, these two are different. Not only are they different, you will not be able to find a phenomenon that is both impermanent *and* permanent. In that sense, they are mutually exclusive.

You should take note however that this does not mean that when two different objects are compared, they are *necessarily* mutually exclusive. For example, when you compare an object of knowledge and an impermanent phenomenon, they are different but are they mutually exclusive? An object of knowledge and an impermanent phenomenon *are* different, but they are *not* mutually exclusive because there is a common locus between them. That means there is a phenomenon that is both an object of knowledge and an impermanent phenomenon.

2. Three possibilities

If there are three possibilities between two phenomena, there must be a common locus of the two and there are two points of difference, at least one of which is something which is one of the two phenomena but not the other. The three possibilities are such that:

1. There is something which is both a p and a q.
2. There is something which is a p but not a q
3. There is something which is a q but not a p.

3. Four possibilities

If there are four possibilities between two phenomena, all the points of similarity and difference are exemplified. The four possibilities are such that:

1. There is something which is both a p and a q.
2. There is something which is a p but not a q.
3. There is something which is a q but not a p.
4. There is something which is neither a p nor a q.

When any two phenomena in comparison are mutually inclusive, it is unnecessary to talk about the three or four possibilities because those possibilities do not apply.

When any two phenomena in comparison are mutually exclusive, the four possibilities are eliminated. There may be an occasion where there can be three possibilities between them.

The purpose of investigating whether, in the comparison of two objects, there are three or four possibilities (or permutations) is a way of analysing reality so that we can gain a deeper and clearer understanding of exactly how things are.

Question from Khen Rinpoche: Compare an object of knowledge and an impermanent phenomenon. What is their relationship? Are they mutually exclusive or mutually inclusive? Are there three or four possibilities between them?

Are an object of knowledge and an impermanent phenomenon different?
Yes.

Are they mutually exclusive? No.

When I ask you, “Are an object of knowledge and an impermanent phenomenon different?” immediately you must know the reason for saying yes.

What is the reason that they are different? They have different names and different meanings.

Are they mutually exclusive? Why are they not mutually exclusive?

Khen Rinpoche: There is an object that can be both. That is why they are not mutually exclusive.

You say they are not mutually exclusive because you can point to an illustration that is both an object of knowledge and impermanent phenomenon. Give an illustration of something that is both.

How many permutations are there between an object of knowledge and an impermanent phenomenon? Three or four?

1. Is there something that is both an object of knowledge and an impermanent phenomenon? Yes.
2. Is there something that is an object of knowledge but is not an impermanent phenomenon? Yes.
3. Is there something that is an impermanent phenomenon but not an object of knowledge? No.
4. Is there something that is neither an object of knowledge nor an impermanent phenomenon? Yes.

There is something that is not an object of knowledge and not an impermanent phenomenon.

Khen Rinpoche: A sky flower? All right. .

Especially when it comes to comparing different objects and phenomena, this is a method for us to have a clearer idea of what exactly we are talking about. It makes a real difference when we analyse in this way.

For example: comparing matter and consciousness, how many possibilities or permutations are there?

1. Is there something that is both form and consciousness? No.
2. Is there something that is form but not consciousness? Yes. E.g., a microphone.
3. Is there something that is consciousness but not form? Yes.
4. Is there something that is neither form nor consciousness? Yes.

There isn't anything that is both matter and consciousness. I have already mentioned this very clearly just now when we were talking about the divisions of a functioning thing. Matter, consciousness, and non-associated compositional factor are mutually exclusive.

You have to study the handouts thoroughly. You have no choice but to memorise the terms. On that basis, you then try to look at the

relationship between two objects and compare whether they are mutually exclusive and if so, how many possibilities there are between them. It is not difficult. It is just a matter of getting used to it.

If you want to continue with these studies, you have to memorise the terms. There is no choice. It is difficult in the beginning but if you don't do it now, you will never learn anything as we move on, because you will always get stuck. You cannot even get pass the terms themselves so you can forget about learning their meanings. You have to memorise these terms from the onset so that you will not be stuck when we talk about them in the future.

Page 1

There are four Buddhist tenet systems in ascending order:

- The **Great Exposition School** / Vaibhashika
- The **Sutra School** / Sauntranika (divided into those following scripture and those following reasoning)
- The **Mind-only School** / Cittamatra
- The **Middle Way School** / Madhyamika (divided into the Autonomy Middle Way School and the Consequence Middle Way School)

The following presentation is from the viewpoint of the **Proponents of Sutra Following Reasoning**.

You also have to memorise the names of the four Buddhist tenets in both English and Sanskrit. We will look at them in detail as we move along. You must put in the effort to memorise whatever is in this handout. You will see the benefit when we start with the subject proper. Otherwise you will have difficulties later on.

Question: My question refers to the three possibilities:

1. There is something that is both a p and a q
2. There is something that is a p but not a q
3. There is something that is a q but not a p

In comparing matter and consciousness, you cannot have something that is both a p and a q. In this case, can we say, "There is something that is both a p and a q OR there is something that is neither a p nor a q"?

Answer: Yes.

Question: What is the mental sense power?

Answer: We will cover this later.

Question: A hidden phenomenon that is mutually inclusive with established base seems to be a subset of established base.

Answer: First thing to remember is that hidden phenomenon is mutually inclusive with established base. With regard to any illustration of an established base, that object has to be a hidden phenomenon. For example, a horse is an illustration of an established base and therefore it has to be a hidden phenomenon. Why is a horse a hidden phenomenon? That is for you to figure out.

Is a horse a manifest phenomenon? Yes.

A horse is both a hidden phenomenon and a manifest phenomenon:

- A horse is a hidden phenomenon because when it is realised by a thought consciousness realising it, that thought consciousness cannot realise it directly but can only do so through the medium of a mental image. Therefore a horse is a hidden phenomenon.
- But a horse is also a manifest phenomenon because it can be realised directly by a valid cogniser. Therefore a horse is also a manifest phenomenon.

Question: Do all objects have to be realised by a thought consciousness?

Answer: There isn't any phenomenon that is not realised by a thought consciousness. If it is a phenomenon, it is necessarily realised by a thought consciousness.

It will all become clearer as we move along. Please look at your handout.

Translated by Ven. Tenzin Gyurme

Transcribed by Phuah Soon Ek, Vivien Ng and Patricia Lee

Edited by Cecilia Tsong