

3

BUDDHISM ; ITS RELATION TO INDUSTRIAL CIVILIZATION

by Ichiro HORI

Tohoku University

I

I WOULD like to suggest an attitude towards the relations of Buddhism and industrial civilization from the historical viewpoint of Japanese Buddhism. Some scholars may doubt of relationship between Buddhism and industrial civilization, because the latter seems remote from the original theology of Buddhism. In order to attain enlightenment and peace of mind, Buddha Gotama taught us complete retirement from this secular world and complete freedom from the hustle of ordinary life. He taught us the impermanence (*anitya*), the non-substantiability or non-ego (*anâtman*) of all things and all beings, the emptiness (*śūnyatâ*) of the real nature of thing, and the recognition only of the law of the chain of causality ; the suchness or thusness (*tathatâ*) of the universal nature, since all things are set in motion and flow. The Buddha declared that things, as compounds, are always in the processes of Production, Stagnation, Deterioration, and Extinction, and are therefore impermanent.

Neither is the self permanent, because it is but an aggregate (*skandha*) of elements. This does not mean the denial of the empirical self, but a refutation of the permanent, abiding personal identity. These doctrines do not suggest nihilism; they were intended to reveal the true nature of existence, which to the Buddha was dynamic Becoming instead of static Being or Non-being.

✕ Gotama preached the Noble Eightfold Path (*ârya-mârga*), i.e., right views, right intention, right speech, right action, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness, and right concentration, in order to remove the original suffering which might be considered the original nature of existence. These should be reduced to a three-fold learning law: Discipline or Morality, Meditation, and Wisdom.

From what Buddhist theology can the relationship between Buddhism and industrial civilization be introduced? First, it is necessary to define industrial civilization. Following Max Weber, Fanfani, Talcott Parsons and others, modern industrial civilization is characterized by the great importance of the economy in the social system and of economic value in the value system. Economic values mean those value which above all characterize the process of the rationalization of means. In the process of rationalizing means, the ends of action are for the moment taken for granted. The only problem is

how to achieve a given end with the greatest degree of efficiency and the least expenditure of energy. So that these values are referred to as universalism and performance. Necessary to the process of the rationalization of means should be freedom from traditionalistic restrictions.

If this analysis is correct, we may say that Buddhism from its beginnings had the pretension of the spiritual and religious basis of industrial civilization, because I believe that one of the major characteristics of the Buddha's preachings should be considered to be the rationalizing of thinking and attitudes for a view of life and the world against the traditionalistic ones. Gotama rejected the caste system in India and declared the equality of all human beings ; he also denied the existence of a god or gods as well as of the ego or the substance of things. In a sense, he was not only a religious rationalist but also a social reformer. He led people to a rationalizing of behaviour by freeing them from the world of magic or traditionalistic religions.

II

In the processes of its development and diffusion, however, Buddhism has been transformed variously, being amalgamated or mingled with aboriginal religions or beliefs such as Shamanism and the agricultural and

nomadic magico-religious elements in the various areas where Buddhism was diffused. Buddhism in Japan borrowed much of Confucian ethics and it has been rather thoroughly Japanized. In addition, Buddhism has mingled with Shinto, Japanized Taoism, Yin-yang magic and agricultural rites as well as with popular magico-religious beliefs and practices.

At the time of the official recognition of Buddhism in Japan by Prince Regent Shotoku in 593·A.D., the nation was undergoing a great spiritual cultural upheaval. China had risen to political and cultural eminence in the Far East under the Sui and T'ang dynasties. Great numbers of immigrants were pouring into Japan from China and Korea bringing the learning and skills as well as religion from the Asiatic main-land. The great extent of this influx is indicated by an official record, which reveals that at the end of the Nara Period (about the ninth century A.D.) 30.7% of the leading families were naturalized Chinese and Koreans. The ancient theocratic clan system based on shamanistic and charismatic leadership was breaking down under the new forces that were assailing the nation, and the people were ready to look to an alien religion for their spiritual foundation.

Prince Shotoku (574-621), statesman and religious thinker, played a significant role in shaping Japanese Buddhism. In fact, his influence extended far beyond

the span of his own life. Under him Buddhism developed into a religion of the aristocracy with strong lay leadership. At the same time, Shotoku's emphasis on the Lotus Sutra (*Saddharma-pundarika-sûtra*) promoted a social consciousness that encompassed all classes. The Lotus Sûtra's promise of salvation for all mankind was in sharp contrast with the pre-Buddhistic and shamanistic folk-beliefs which, with their two classes of gods corresponding to the two social classes of ancient Japanese society offered life in the hereafter to the ruling and shamanistic families which constituted the Imperial and noble families. This social concern was expressed in the building of temple which served as centers of philanthropic and cultural activities. Twenty four years after Shotoku's death, the Taika Reformation (645) put into effect some of his principles. The establishment of a unified empire meant that one emperor completely ruled the whole nation by a principle modeled after the T'ang Empire system which was actualized for the first time in the history of Japan. This reformation was driven forward and prepared secretly by several Buddhist monks together with some government professors, both of whom had been dispatched by Prince Shotoku to Sui and T'ang China for study.

The principles of the Taika Reformation were the prohibition of the private ownership of land and people,

which had been the foundation of the ancient clan system, and the enforcement of the distribution of farmland, which took the place of the former system. At the beginning of this reformation a messenger was sent to the big temple near the capital to summon together the Buddhist priests and nuns and address them on behalf of the Emperor. By this imperial edict, Buddhism was able to get official recognition as a state religion. The religious policy of the Taika Government was to guard and promote Buddhism on the one hand, and to put it under the sovereign on the other hand. Buddhism completely submitted to state control and to the request to serve for public security, prosperity, and the welfare of the nation.

III

Thus, at the beginning, Japanese Buddhism was envisaged and adopted by the political leaders as a spiritual principle of the ancient empire system, and also as the spiritual foundation of the great family system of that time. Ancestor worship was one of the most significant functions of Buddhism from the earliest times to the present. Buddhist magic comingled with Shintoistic, shamanistic and Yin-yang magic, which were also flourishing. In early days, almost all Buddhist temples belonged either to the state, or to the Imperial family, or

to some powerful family or clan. Thus, formal Buddhism was maintained on an official and aristocratic level. At the personal level, Buddhism in these early days was largely a matter of spells and charms and devotions to especially favored Buddhas and Bodhisattvas. Though the ingratiation with the polity and the magical character were predominant in the history of Japanese Buddhism, there were undoubtedly from the first a certain number of Buddhist monks and lay believers who understood Buddhist metaphysics and practiced the spirit of Buddhist rationalization. There were, it is true, several actual and psychological conflicts between the new rationalizing spirit and aboriginal traditionalism. The following is an instance of this.

As early as 644 A.D., the "*Nihongi*" says that a man of the neighbourhood of the River Fuji in the East Country named Ohfube-no-Ohshi urged his fellow villagers to worship an insect, saying:—"This is the God of the Everlasting World. Those who worship this God will have long life and riches." At length the wizards and witches, pretending to be inspired by the Gods, said:—"Those who worship the God of the Everlasting World will, if poor, become rich, and, if old, will become young again." So more and more they persuaded the people to cast out the valuables of their households, and to set out by the roadside sake, vegetables, and the six domestic

animals. They also made them cry out—"The new riches have come!" Both in the country and in the metropolis people took the insect of the Everlasting World and, placing it in a pure place, with song and dance invoked happiness. They threw away their treasures, but to no purpose whatever. The lose and waste was extreme. Hereupon, there was Hata-no-Kawakatsu of Kadono, founder of the Koryû Temple in Kyôto, who was an ardent and pious believer in Buddhism. He was worth that the people should be so deluded and so slew Ohfube-no-Ohshi. The wizards and witches were intimidated, and ceased to persuade people to this worship. The People of that time composed a song:—

Udzumasa⁽¹⁾

Has executed

The God of Everlasting World

Who we were told

Was the very God of Gods.⁽²⁾

We can find many examples of this same kind in historical documents and in legendary tales.

IV

From this point of view, it is noteworthy that there

(1) Udzumasa was a name of place where the Hata Family had occupied and resided. This was sometimes used as the name of the Hata Family, transferring the meaning.

(2). Refer to W.G. Aston: "*Nihongi*" Vol. II, p. 188-189. 1956, London.

arose in the ninth to eleventh centuries, a movement among laymen centering around such charismatic figures as Gyogi (670?-749) and others who had inherited the religious traditions from Prince Shotoku and Hata-no-Kawakatsu. Their aim was to establish a real religious life and to spread the Buddha's gospel and his road to salvation among the common people. Gyogi endeavored to popularize Buddhism for the common people by his easily understandable teachings and by his public services done as Bodhisattva deeds, such as the foundation of a charity hospital, a charity dispensary, an orphanage, and an old people's home, following the example of Prince Shotoku. He also excavated canals for navigation and for irrigation, built irrigation ponds, constructed bridges and harbors in the Inland Sea near Osaka and Kobe, established free clinics, free lodging houses, and so on. All of these institutions and projects were managed by his disciples who lived in small seminaries named *dôjô*, of which there were more than 50. This they did wholly outside the orthodox system of the Buddhist priesthood. They opposed the ecclesiastical systems of state and clan Buddhism, which were already beginning to fall into secularism, and insisted on individual piety, and discipline in the common life.

Thus, the lay movement denied not only the *samgha* system in its orthodox form, but also the *vinaya*, sub-

stituted by the new ethics borrowed from the Confucianism. Those who became priests were encouraged to marry and have families. This so-called "house-hold" religion has persisted to the present time in most of Japan.⁽¹⁾

The twelfth and thirteenth centuries, known as the Kamakura Period (1186-1333), were a great turning point in Japanese Buddhism. During this time a strong trend to free the religion from magic took hold, though the predominant political value system was still maintained. The integration of the tradition and spirit of the lay movement with the orthodoxy of Buddhism also took place. This is shown most remarkably in the three new great sects which arose in these centuries, Zen, Nichiren, and Jodo or Pure Land sects. These sects came to occupy more than 80% of the temples and adherents of present day Japanese Buddhism.

V

From the viewpoint of the relationship between Buddhist ethics and industrial civilization, I should like to introduce some examples from the Jodo-Shin sect founded by Shinran Shonin (1173-1262), although the Zen sects and the

(1) Concerning the lay movements in Japanese Buddhism, see Ichiro Hori: "The Concept of *Hijiri* (Holy-man)" in the *Numen* (International Review for the History of Religions), Vol. V, Fasc. 2, April, 1958, pp. 128-160. (The latter half will be published in 1959)

Nichiren sect also put stress on work and the labor of daily life in order to return thanks for the great benefits of the Emperor or Lord, teachers, parents and one's fellow creatures or society, as well as of Buddha.

Shinran insisted on faith in Amitabha Buddha (*Amida-butsu* in Japanese) which alone might be efficacious, so that all ceremonies, charms, worship of other Buddhas, Bodhisattvas as well as of Shinto deities are in vain. He denied the formal temple-and-priest-system of his time, following his teacher Genku's principle (he was the founder of the Jodo sect) and the tradition of the lay movement in former times. He never lived in a temple, but in a hut or small hermitage. According to Reischauer's expression, he "stressed household religion as more important than temple religion. Though reared as a Tendai (*T'ien-t'ai*) monk himself, he gave up the monk's way of life, married, reared a family, and in other way lived like a normal citizen or farmer of Japan."⁽¹⁾ Shinran said that there was no difference among those who were dragging out an existence with hunting game or fowling on field and mountain, and those who were getting along in trade or tilling the soil. Man might do anything, if moved by his *karma*.

(1). E. J. Jurji, comp.: *The Great Religions of the Modern World*, Princeton, 1946, p. 134.

Robert N. Bellah⁽¹⁾ has attempted show the ways in which the rationalizing tendencies in Japanese religion contributed to economic and political rationalization in Japan, especially in the Tokugawa Period (1600-1868) which immediately preceded and in many ways laid the ground for modern Japan. He indicated the rather direct influence of religious motivation in the economic sphere from the development of the Shin sect which was suggested by Kanji Naito's essay entitled "*Shúkyô to Keizai Rinri*".⁽²⁾ Bellah stressed the attitude and preachings of Rennyo Shônin (1415-1499), often called the second founder of the Shin sect because of his great influence on its development, and the theological advances after him. He pointed out that Rennyo opposed the practice of austerities and meditation, while insisting on the practice of the Confucian virtues in daily life and obedience to state authorities, while at the same time one's inner life was to be wholly given up to Amitabha Buddha. Rennyo opposed any worship of Shinto deities. He made impor-

(1), Robert N. Bellah: *Tokugawa Religion, The Values of Pre-Industrial Japan*, 1957, Glencoe. Especially pp. 68-69, 117-119, 122. 126.

(2). Kanji Naito (Professor of Sociology at the Kyushu University): "Shukyo to Keizai Rinri" (Religion and the Economic Ethic, Jodo Shin-shu and the Ohmi Merchants) in *Shakai-gaku* (Journal of Sociology), Vol. VIII, pp. 243-286, Tokyo, 1941.

tant advances with respect to the religious ethical regulation of everyday life. As Bellah states, Rennyo's remark that, "If we engage in business, we must realize that it is in the service of Buddhism," indicates the view of the occupational life as integrated with the religious life. Rennyo also stressed one's obligation of bestowing blessings on the people, and inner-worldly asceticism. Though Rennyo raised the ethical demand to a very important place in Shin thought, it remains something separate from the religious demand.

Bellah suggests that by middle Tokugawa times, salvation and ethical action came to be indissolubly linked in Shin theology. Ethical action had become the very sign of salvation. Ethical behaviour in the world was both a return to Amitabha Buddha for blessings received and a sign of one's inner faith. Diligent work in one's occupation came to have the central places among the ethical duties so required. A Shin priest taught his believers to make diligence the flesh and patience the bone. Not only is work in the world stressed, but an ascetic attitude toward consumption is also felt.

For Buddhists, greed was one of the cardinal sins, and greed had been closely linked to the merchant's quest for profit. However, Bellah points out that the Shin teachers reconciled their raising labor in the calling, including that of the merchant, to a sacred obligation with the doctrine

of *jiri-rita*, profiting both self and others. Naito cites an example of this⁽¹⁾ :

“In merchandising we receive remuneration for supplying the consumer with manufactured goods. The artisans receive their remuneration by producing the goods and supplying them to the consumer. What the world calls this remuneration is profit. But the basis of receiving this profit depends on the profiting of others. By profiting others they receive the right to profit themselves. This is the virtue of the harmony of *jiri-rita*. The spirit of profiting others is the Bodhisattva spirit. Having a Bodhisattva spirit and saving all beings, this is called Bodhisattva deeds. Thus Bodhisattva deeds are just the deeds of merchants and artisans. In general the secret of merchant's and artisan's business lies in obtaining confidence through Bodhisattva deeds.”

Naito and Bellah show the influence of the doctrines and ethical injunctions taught widely by the Shin sect in the Tokugawa Period on actual behavior. The merchants of Ohmi Province (Shiga Prefecture near Kyoto), for example, were strong believers by the Shin sect as indicated by the great concentration of Shin temples in the primary merchant towns, the large number of merchants of the temple registers, and the frequent pious statements in the biographies of some of these merchants. Though many of them, Bellah explains, started as pedlars traveling far through mountainous districts of central Japan, they often came to amass large fortunes and established

(1). Naito: Op. cit.: 285.

branch shops in the principal cities of Japan. They spent their years austere pursuing their calling or devoting themselves to Buddhist matters. A biography of the typical Ohmi merchant describes that “with honesty as a basis, he worked without minding labor that was hard to endure, and was answered with heavenly rewards. Since we are descendants and have received his blessings, we must be strongly warned against extravagance and, immersed in a sense of deep gratitude, we must not for a moment neglect family business.” Though he did not read books he was devoted to the way of doing good. He was happy only with the business of the house. Becoming old he handed the house on to his eldest son, studied Buddhism and took the tonsure. In addition to this he should be called a blessed man who served the Buddha morning and night and spent his leisure time reverently.

VI

Though of course there were various elements that influenced the development of Japan's industrialization, I believe, with Naito and Bellah, that the Shin sect has been the closest Japanese analogue to Western Protestantism, and its ethic most similar to the Protestant Ethic described by Max Weber in his *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*.

2

BUDDHISM AND THE STATE

Dr. Seiichiro Ono

Professor Emeritus of Tokyo University

The world situation of today reminds us of that of the Buddha's time, when two great powers, Magadha and Kosala, competed with each other, their satellite states around them.

The world at present stands on the equilibrium of the Powers, which have been composed apparently of nations or races, and substantially of civic communities since the beginning of the sixteenth century. It is a world that cannot avoid war, in spite of its aspiration for peace. Today, war cannot be confined within the boundaries of two or three countries as it could be in former days, it necessarily develops into a world war. Of late the world war is not fought between politically organized states but between racially composed nations. In the late war, international law ignored and a tremendous number of non-belligerents were slaughtered by air-raids. If another war comes, all mankind will be menaced by atom and hydrogen bombs.

Notwithstanding this possibility, every nation is

busy preparing for another war, fearing that the cold war might become a hot war, and the military expansion caused by this fear increases again the possibility of war.

This contradiction is the destiny of man. According to Buddhism, however, destiny can be changed by eradicating the ignorance and craving which cause malicious deeds, not by depending on any supernatural power or miracle. How does this teaching apply to the present situation of the world?

A state in modern times is a karmaic existence having in its essence a national or racial ego. It contradicts itself, on the one hand, with the consciousness of the individual ego, and on the other, with cosmopolitanism and humanism.

Plato emphasized the ethical importance of a polis or a City State. But Hellenism, which was developed thereafter, was characterized with ethical individualism and political cosmopolitanism. Roman Law, based on this philosophy, paved the way to Christianity, which, although it retained some racial elements of Judaism, was a religious achievement of cosmopolitanism. The Roman Catholic Church as it was conceived in the medieval age was somewhat a World State, and every state on earth needed its authority to exist.

The development of urban economy, together with the Renaissance and the Reformation, contributed to establishing sovereignty against the Church, on the part of racial, national and civil state. A State with its own sovereignty thus formed was a community based on the Roman *Imperium* in regard to the principle of sovereignty, and on the Roman civil law and natural law in regard to the regulation of civil life.

According to the advocates of natural law, the agreement of individuals must be presumed in order to rationalize the power of a State. The theory of social contract originated from this conception of natural law. Socialism, communism, democracy, and liberalism, all of which are flourishing in modern times, are the offspring of this individualistic idea.

The Sakyas, of which Buddha Sakyamuni was a member, had a principality, called Kapilavastu, on the northern plateau commanding the Ganges Valley about twenty-five centuries ago. To the west of their country there was a bigger state, Kosala. The most powerful state of the time was Magadha on the right bank of the lower Ganges.

Gautama Siddhartha's renunciation of his royal life at the time of such an international tension must have been motivated by his desire to get rid of a political situation unfavourable to Kapilavastu, a petty

state. Renunciation of his family life meant liberation from his State. He wished to seek, a way out of suffering, the suffering not only of an individual, a family or a State, but of all human beings. In this respect we can say the Buddhism transcends the State at the outset. In a word, it is supermundane. The emancipation which Buddhism aims at transcends worldliness, negating all worldly principle, not excluding that of ethics.

That Buddhism is supermundane does not necessarily mean that Buddhism does not concern itself with worldly ethics. Because it aims at emancipating all mankind from suffering, Buddhism is humanistic; it has social concerns from the beginning. Compassion in the Buddhist sense (Karuna) does not confine itself to limited circles such as a family or a State, but embraces all human beings equally.

Buddha is given some epithets. The World-honoured One means one who is honoured by the people of the world. The Deserver of Oblations means one who deserves to be given oblations by men. Again, the Knower of the World denotes one who knows the world. As is expressed in these epithets, Buddha is spoken of in connection with the world, not as a recluse, or a meditator who is deeply engrossed in his subjective matter and nothing else.

The Buddha was far from a world-deserting recluse when he preached, as is shown in the *Digha-nikaya*, that a State never lose its power if its citizens have regular meetings for political discussions, cooperate with each other, respect laws, honour elders, safeguard public morals, worship ancestors, and protect sages. The precepts or commandments were laid down to regulate the life of monks and nuns, on one hand, and to give advice to laymen on morals, on the other. The two major divisions of Buddhism, Mahayana, and Hinayana, have arisen mainly from this dualism of the purpose of the commandments. The fact that Mahayana Buddhism, which is more philosophical and speculative is more concerned about society in the field of practical ethics, shows that it is a development of the ethics of the Buddhist laity contained primarily in the mind of the Buddha. This trend of Mahayana Buddhism led to the birth of a nationalistic Buddhism in later years.

The empire of the Buddhist King Asoka gives us some valuable suggestions as to what kind of State we Buddhists should have. His edicts emphasized the importance of Compassion to all beings, and of the efforts to bring them peace and prosperity. The virtue of generosity, which he showed towards the followers of other religions, was regarded as the most

Buddhist. The idea of "Ninno" or the "benevolent king", very frequently appearing in Mahayana sutras, must have originated from the example of King Asoka.

Buddhism does not have recourse to politics for the realization of its ideal. The ideal must be attained to not by political power but by wisdom and practice. The Buddha witnessed the downfall of his native State. The King of Kosala, who was on his expedition to Kapilavastu with his army, found the Buddha standing under a dying tree. The invader asked him. "Why are you standing under the dying tree, while you see many living trees elsewhere? The Buddha answered, "It is cooler here under the tree of my relatives." This answer of his involves many problems concerning religion and the State: Is religion too weak to check the downfall of a mother country? Or should a religion not concern itself with political affairs?

In its early stage, Buddhism stood aloof from the State and political affairs, but when it spread to northern countries it changed much. The view that the ideal of Buddhism will be realized by the power of the State has become one of the characteristics of Japanese Buddhism. Prince Shotoku the Regent lectured on the *Saddharmapundarika*, the *Vimalakir-*

tinirdesa, and the *Srimalasimhanda* as the source of national ethics. The Seventeen-chapter Constitution he promulgated aimed at establishing Buddhism as the fundamental principle of national integrity. The phrase "Respect the Three Treasures most reverently" in the Constitution expresses his ideal most clearly. Dogen, who brought the Soto Zen from China, never compromised with the government authorities when they were against his ideal for the peace of the country. Shinran criticized the nation, "All the people of Japan, the Emperor and his subjects inclusive, do not follow the right teachings." He prayed, "May the world be peaceful and the Buddha Dharma prevail." He taught that everyone should call the name of the Buddha Amitabha for the sake of his country and her people. Nichiren, commonly regarded as most nationalistic, did not support the then existing State, but severely criticized it in order to bring about the realization of an ideal state.

The teaching of *Ahimsa* or Non-killing may be fundamentally contradictory to the power of State, which must resort, when necessary to war. We cannot live out of a State, but, since we are Buddhists, we must behave ourselves as Buddhists. Then how? Prince Shotoku says, "Respect the Three Treasures

most reverently. The Three Treasures: the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Sangha, are what all beings should take refuge in, what all nations should be affiliated to." Various as the teachings of the Buddha are, the essential is that we should revere and take refuge in the Three Treasures. The respect for the Three Treasures are based on the faith to the Buddha, because the Dharma is what the Buddha taught, and the Sangha a community of believers in the Buddha. To believe in the Buddha means to respect anything righteous. It means freedom from adhering to anything ego-centric. There should be no ego not only in an individual but also in a social class, a nation or a race.

To get rid of an ego in any sense is very difficult, but we must do our best to do so. We Japanese Buddhists, therefore, should advocate the new Constitution of Japan which renounces war. One who follows the right truth will be blessed, but a Buddhist should have nothing to regret of even if he is not blessed when he keeps the right truth. The following passage in Asanga's *Mahayana-samugraha* will well express the Buddhist view on the problem of peace :

"Perseverence will cause one's own peace of mind as well as that of others. When one is not stained

by the sin of anger, one can get his own peace of mind. When one does not reproach others, one can secure peace for others.

Should a person perform good, he should do it again and again; he should find pleasure therein: for blissful is the accumulation of good.

Dhammapada, 118.

BUDDHISM AS A SYSTEM OF SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

By Shinzo Ohno, Doctor of Economics,

Professor, Meiji University.

I. Problems for Social Buddhism

Today, nowhere in the world is the need for ‘Social Buddhism’—Buddhism as a system of social philosophy—so urgent as in Japan. Perhaps this may also be true of other countries of Asia. It is not sufficient, however, merely to expound what the political, economic and social ideals of Buddhism are; rather, it is important to propound, in the light of Buddhist principles, what the right relationship between politics, economy, and technique in the present-day society should be. Consequently, the important problems are: What are the basic principles of contemporary Buddhist social philosophy? What system of political, economic and social doctrines has contemporary Buddhism? And, what policy or platform does it propose?

II. Nature of Social Buddhism

I am inclined to believe that the social, political and economic confusion and unrest recurring in postwar Japan has been due to liberalism’s lack of morals, Communism’s antagonism to morals, and humanism’s low morals. In

my opinion, although the capitalist system of economy had produced many social evils in the past, it has contributed, during the last fifty to seventy years, at least in advanced industrial nations, to the promotion of political democracy and democratic institutions as well as to the advancement of economic and social policies in these states. In many countries, however, capitalism, ameliorated as it is, is still far removed from the Buddhist ideal of society.

On the other hand, I believe that socialism will no longer render constructive service, nor will it make any further advance, unless it should shake off its materialistic conception of class struggle. This is obvious: while it is impossible to attain the socialist ideals without the religious and moral self-consciousness of individuals, contemporary social thinkers are characterized by the lack of such consciousness.

Before Buddhism reached Japan, it had come from India through Central Asian countries and China. The character and structure of social philosophy based on the fundamental principles and teachings of Buddhism had been 'naturalized' in each of these countries or communities. The nature of Social Buddhism may be more fully understood when we examine the systems of doctrines concerning religious, political, economic and social problems subsequently developed and practiced in the countries.

III. Buddhists' Fundamental Attitude Toward Political and Economic Problems

Roughly speaking, early Buddhism was, ideologically a new system of thought opposed to the authoritarian dogmas of Brahmanism and Hinduism. At the same time, it was a criticism made from an elevated viewpoint against the materialistic, sensual, and mechanistic view of life, as held by some of the then prevailing six heretic philosophical schools. In fact, Sakya Muni, the Buddha, based his teachings on common sense and daily experience, upheld human dignity and stressed the importance of developing individual character, while he rejected all extremities in thought and action. Early Buddhism, viewed as an ideology or a system of social, political and economic ideas, was opposed to the authoritarian and utilitarian Machiavellistic conception of society of the state. At the same time, it rejected the sensual and materialistic naturalist conception of the state or society. Instead, it propounded a religious and moralistic universalism.

A further analysis of Buddhist social philosophy indicates that it is based on the following eighteen principles.

1. Each man is capable of attaining moral and practical wisdom through right thinking or understanding, called enlightenment.
2. The Critical evaluation of all things should be based on the experience of everyday life.

3. Buddhism maintains that life is relative and is a process of flow.
4. The Buddhist moral conception is rational, empirical and realistic, based on the understanding and attainment of self-renunciation.
5. Buddhist maintains a creative view of life that man is capable of free creation at his own responsibility. It holds the view that society is in the process of change through the creative activities of man.
6. It maintains the practical Middle Way, transcending the conflict of subjective and objective views.
7. It upholds a conception of free man and common society.
8. It embraces a broad humanitarian sentiment, respecting humanity and human motives.
9. It embraces an idea of equity or a conception of righteousness based on the reciprocity of right and duty, accompanied by a deep sense of benevolence.
10. It embraces a conception of economic interdependence based on mutual co-operation.
11. It advocates functional social solidarity of a co-operation model.
12. It lays stress on the establishment of communities (Sanghas or the like) and family organization as opposed to profit-seeking associations and partisan organizations.

13. It embraces a conception of a charitable social activities. Stress is laid on the social policy, based on the spirit of boundless benevolence, and the conception of pantheistic social solidarity.
14. It advocates social equality, a truly revolutionary conception: it rejects the man-made social classes based on wealth, blood, race, etc.
15. It advocates a true internationalism, not a vague cosmopolitanism. It maintains that right law (Dharma) should reign among various nations of the world.
16. It maintains an active and positive stand, not a passive and negative one, for the establishment and maintenance of lasting international peace.
17. It believes in steady social progress. It advocates the adoption of policies to meet progress in human society. It holds an all-embracing attitude, without favoring either side when more than two opposing views are present.
18. Emphasis is placed on the part to be played by awakened and devoted leaders in the progress of society. At the same time, stress is laid on the maintenance of an attitude not deviating from the actual realities of life.

V. Social Buddhism's Stand

In short, it may be said that Social Buddhism is a system of thought which has, as its ultimate aim, the

realization of free individuals by means of self-enlightenment and self-cultivation. It differs from authoritarian and utilitarian Machiavellist ideology. At the same time, it differs from materialistic and naturalistic or class-conscious individualism. Social Buddhism is a system of Buddhist social philosophy, a third view of man and society.

4

PEACE

by

Rev. Shyuki Yoshimura

Leslie S. Kawamura

I. Introduction

ONE can say with assurance that there is no religious conference today, wherever it be held, in which the word "Peace" is not used. Can we find in the history of mankind so frequent a use of the word, so ardent a desire for its realization, and so deep discussions held on the problem? Yet, in spite of the serious concern over the problem, "Peace" like the pigeons that fly away from under your foot with the least disturbance, seems to slip away leaving only empty voices crying out for "Peace!" Thus, the word "Peace" so much used is losing its hold on the hearts of man. The term which was once used with respect is becoming distasteful. In fact, since the word has been misinterpreted many times, people are beginning to harbor hostile feelings towards it. This is the state of affairs in our present-day world. What can we possibly do to resolve such a situation?

I wish to explain my ideas upon this subject under three headings.

1. The Buddhist concept of peace and its method of realization.
2. Buddhism and Industrial Civilization.
3. The Significance of Buddhism in the thought-current of the world.

The fact that I have made three major divisions does not mean that these are three independent outlooks, for we cannot begin to discuss one without the discussion of another. With this in mind let us begin our discussion of Peace.

II. Buddhist Concept of Peace and Its Method of Realization

The concept of Peace can be divided into two. First, Peace within an individual and secondly, Peace within groups and between groups. The meaning of the word "individual" is easily understood by all; however, the word "group" may bring about some problems. This concept will become clear as the subject is developed and thus does not have to be discussed at this point.

Concerning individual peace, the individual's practice to gain Nirvana is a case at point. Such is the concept of Peace which the Southern Buddhists hold as true. In such cases vinaya or rules of discipline become the central core of attainment. In such a state the individual reflects and mediates upon himself in order to perfect himself.

By Peace within groups, I mean anything outside of oneself. The antagonism which results from a person to person intercourse is diametrically opposed to Peace. Not only is the harmony of person-to-person intercourse encompassed within this "group Peace" concept, but we can rise from the concept to that of groups, clans, corporations, societies and nations.

In discussing individual Peace we are dealing more with spiritual Peace, but in the case of groups, we have to deal with a "political" idea. At this point it is necessary to make a distinction between that of "politics" and "systems" By "politics," I mean a power factor which may bring about either peace or war. By a "system" I mean a group such as Democracy or Communism. For example, the fact that a Democratic system, that is, America, has an atomic bomb, and a Communistic system, that is Russia, also has an atomic bomb gives no reason for antagonism to rise. It is only when we consider political ties between these two nations and within themselves that we have to deal with the question of Peace. Shakamuni Buddha rejected all forms of caste so that such political problems would not arise. It is this aspect of Peace, that is, the aspect which deals with political thoughts that we wish to consider here. The same idea of a dual concept will be dealt with again our second topic of discussion. **Buddhism and Industrial Civilization.**

Let us take some examples of the “political” concept which eventually led back to the “individual” concept of peace. At the time of Shakamuni Buddha, India was composed of two major powers, Magadha and Kosala, with more than ten lesser states lying between them. The hostile relations which existed between the two powers are depicted in the Sutras. The Buddha, in behalf of the suffering people who were leading orderly and peaceful lives, intervened between the two parties and admonished their kings.

Asoka, the Buddhist Emperor, in the year 278 A.D. c. in his quest for greater power, waged war against Kalinga of southern India. Upon realizing the cruelties of the war in which numerous persons were killed, he repented deeply. Hearing the teaching of the Buddha, he became an ardent follower of the Dharma, and declared that the conquest through the Dharma is supreme.

In each of these instances the idea of political power led them to war. War was not the result of having a “system” but was the result of having a “politic.”

The question of choosing between war and peace becomes a real one when we withdraw ourselves from the everyday routine. Having my home in Hiroshima, I have personally experienced the tragic result of the war. How can those who glorify the act of killing have the right to punish those who commit murder? To advocate peace

in a world conscious of politics is not an easy matter. The reason for our taking up the problem here is that we are conscious of the fact that war is steadily closing in on mankind.

The fact that the Governing few are claiming superiority over the governed mass is clear. World peace can be advocated only when there is a mutual understanding of equality between the ruler and the ruled. This holds true not only within a nation but also among nations. We can apply this principle to our presently existing United Nations, in that they ought to accept the smaller Asian nations into the General Assembly and to the fact that there could be an united Asia. The fact that such a thing cannot be realized is due to our fear of "politics and its power." Such fear can and must be overcome as we shall see in the final section of this paper.

III. Buddhism and Industrial Civilization

With the coming of Sputniks and other modern jet-powered rockets, the distance between earth and moon has been shortened. News events taking place in Tokyo are relayed to London within seconds. The traveling time between these cities has been cut down to almost half. Mechanization has been making great strides in our modern world. However, have we as human beings been progressing just as rapidly? Have we as Buddhists made efforts

to correct our own way of thinking?

Buddhism is concerned with our outlook on daily life. Buddhism, if it be true, is not a question of industrialization vs. individual labor, nor is it a question of Mahayana vs. Hinayana. In Hinayana Buddhism, as in individual labor, the person himself is of concern. That person is the priest or clergy who is looked upon as the only "Buddhist." The clergy have learned through experience the teachings of the Buddha and thus, through this learning relay the dharma to the ordinary people.

In Mahayana Buddhism, the lay people as well as the priest are of great importance. In Mahayana, therefore, as in industrialization, the harmony of each working part is essential. If this proposition be true, then Buddhism as a religion will not be found only among the clergy but also among men whose life's path is illuminated by the Dharma. Buddhism seen in this light transcends the concept of racial differences and is independent of any particular history. It is in touch with the hearts of men. The teaching of the Buddha is analogous to the medicine given to the sick. Medicine in itself is neither good nor bad but depends upon those who administer it and those who receive it. It is the responsibility of the clergy to choose the medicine best suited for the illness. It is the responsibility of the layman to receive the medicine when it is needed. The analogy may now be carried over to Bud-

dhism and Industrialization.

A Buddhism which rejects industrialization is a Dharma without adherents. A Priest who rejects industrialization is a Priest without followers. Followers who reject industrialization are a group without purpose. Therefore we can see that Buddhism must exist in an air of Industry.

It is only when harmony of clergy and congregation arises that Buddhism becomes truly Buddhism. If Buddhism were for either the priest or the lay people, then it would not be Buddhism in the true sense of the word. Therefore, since Buddhism is not static, any nation, even an industrialized nation can be a Buddhist nation. It is when industry as industry can be in harmony with religion as religion that world peace can be found. A nation which places more emphasis on industry only or more on religion only, will not succeed in becoming a peaceful nation.

IV. Significance of Buddhism in the Thought Current of the World

I have tried to show that through Buddhism, World Peace can be attained, by harmonizing nation with nation and religion with industry. In order to cultivate this harmony, we must depend upon man's will to act and choose. The will to act arises from man himself and hence, to have the correct will is to have the correct view of him-

self. It is here that the Four Noble Truths and The Eight Noble Path of Buddhism leads one to see life as it should be. Political power and industrialization themselves will never bring about peace, unless we have a will to guide them correctly. Religion, Politics, and Industry can go hand-in-hand depending upon the workings of man's will. In order to have the correct will, we ought to look and reflect more upon our own selves as transient beings. Strange is our stay on earth. Each of us are here for only a short visit without really knowing why.

BUDDHISM AND THE UNIVERSAL HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

by Kumataro Kawada

Professor at Tokyo University

I. PRELIMINARY

The age in which universal history was European history has passed away. Likewise, the history of philosophy is nowadays not merely that of the European philosophy, but it must be universal history which should not neglect the philosophies of Asia. Buddhist philosophy is of much importance among those of Asia. What characteristics has it among the main currents of the universal history of philosophy? Secondly, philosophy has by its nature to do with the problem how to live. What meaning has Buddhist philosophy, because of its characteristics, for human life in the present and in the future age of technics?

II. BUDDHIST PHILOSOPHY AS METETHICA

I will treat first of the characteristics of Buddhist philosophy, and from the point of view of ontology which is the fundamental science of philosophy.

A. European Philosophy

European philosophy is manifold, but it has a sort of unity and may be taken as a unitary one. But it is in reality discrepant two, if we scrutinize its ultimate principles: one is Greek philosophy and that which comes from and reverts to it; the other is Christian philosophy. By the philosophy which comes from and reverts to Greek philosophy I mean a European philosophy which coexists with the Christian philosophy and rejects it by reverting to the principles of the Greek philosophy. Thus I must first of all make clear the differences between Greek philosophy and that of Christianity.

a) Greek philosophy is of the ancient age, and Christian philosophy is that of the Christians from the Middle Age down to the present day. Thus it is evident that the one differs from the other in time, place and creator. But this difference is accidental, if it is considered from the principles of philosophy, because the latter has been able to be a philosophy by inheriting much from the former, i.e. the latter has come into existence by combining the philosophia with the evangelion. What, then, is the essential difference? It consists, among other things, in the fundamental law of becoming. It is true that the

Greek philosophers are at odds with each other as to the validity of their own principles, but they support this unanimously, that nothing comes out of nothing, i.e. *ex nihilo nihil*.

b) The Christian philosophers make their highest principle out of their own God, who is the Creator of all things and who creates all things out of nothing. His creation is *creatio ex nihilo*, the law which may be formulated "*ex nihilo cuncta*," according to Thomas Aquinas. These two laws of becoming are contradictory and deny each other. Therefore the two philosophies must be different from each other, notwithstanding the superficial similarity and seeming historical continuity.

And some European philosophers distinguish the genealogy of Plato, Augustine and Kant from that of Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas and Hegel. They are content with doing so and do not see the hidden discontinuity which the two genealogies have each in themselves. So they say that philosophy is, generally speaking, the science of being and they are unaware of the ambiguity of the term "being." The pre-Socratics enquired into unborn and immortal nature and found it to be water, air, fire, etc. Socrates studied them and found out that these elements were merely co-operating causes (*synaitia*, *concausa*), and

he made a true cause out of the *eidos* or *idea*. Herewith were established the two principles of matter and form. Therefore the fons et origo of the antagonism between materialism and idealism is to be found nowhere except in the ancient Greek philosophy. And for the Greek philosophers both matter and the form are, as Aristotle puts it, the being in the sense of *to on* (neut.) and the unborn and immortal nature (*physis*). And nature, which is *to on*, becomes or generates according to the law of “*ex nihilo nihil*.” And now it is clear that their philosophy is *ontologia*, *physica* or *metaphysica*. And *metaphysica* is *theologica*, and sometimes *physica* contains in itself *metaphysica*, i.e. *theologica*. In both cases, the “*theos*” is nature and *to on*, as meant by the Greek philosophers. Indeed in the beginning Christianity repudiated this philosophy, but afterwards it adopted it and developed its own philosophy. And in so doing the Christian philosophers accepted both the form which is *causa* and the matter which is *concausa* and rejected the philosophy, the principle of which is matter only. However, because the two principles accepted are, as they are accepted, unborn and immortal, they are not compatible with the Christian God, who is and should be the highest principle and creative cause. Therefore Augustine

declared that the ideas are immanent in the mens or intelligentia of his God. Interpreting and systematising him, Thomas Aquinas declared that not only the ideas are immanent in the mens of God, but also the idea of matter is in it, using which as exemplar God created even the first matter (materia prima) out of nothing (SCG., I. 17.). Therefore their God is quite different from His creatures and transcends them completely. Indeed God is sometimes intended by “natura”, but this natura is in reality trans-natura. Their God is called also “being” (ens). And this Being is, strictly speaking, ho ôn qui est, “I AM” (Exodus 3. 14.). He is not the natural being which is to on, but the supernatural being who is triune. Therefore, when ontologia means the science of this Being, it must be hyperont-o-logia. Thus we have come to know that in regard to “being” to on must be distinguished from ho ôn, and ontologia from hyperontologia. The Christian philosophy which makes its fundamental science out of the hyperontologia is theologia essentially; it is christian theodicy.

Lastly, the ultimate truths of the two philosophies are those of objectivity, though the one is natural truth and the other supernatural truth.

B. Upanishad Philosophy

Of what nature is the Buddhist philosophy, when it is compared with European philosophy as above analysed? It is a part of Indian philosophy, however important it may be. And it is an outcome of the movements of free-thinking with regard to the tradition of Upanishad philosophy. Therefore, in order to answer the question, we must know beforehand the nature of Upanishad philosophy.

This philosophy has, as its starting point, the problem of human existence, *samsāraḥ*, as known clearly from the 13 Upanishads, which are our main sources. It inquired into the beginning or principle of human existence and tried to find it in not-being. *asat* or being, *sat* (ex. gr. BU. I. 2. 1; TU. II. 6. 1.). And after hard study, it gave preference to being, one without second, as the principle of human existence (Ch U. VI. 2. 1.). And this being, *sat*, should be translated into the Greek “to on.” But the *sat* is *brahman* objectively and *ātman* subjectively. And Śāṇḍilya asserted the identity of the two. Not only because it is so, but also because the *sat* is called *Rudra* (SU. III. 2.) and *puruṣa*, it should be translated into the Greek “ho ôn.” Moreover, the *sat* has become *satī*, *hē ousa*, in later ages, mediated by *Umā* in the *Kenopanishad* and the *devātmaśakti* in the *Svetāśvataropanishad*. But this point should be put

out of consideration here. So far, we have found as the principle of Upanishad philosophy, sat which may be translated both to on and ho ôn.

It is true that sat should be translated by to on, but it is neither the matter nor the form of the Greek philosophy, because it is both the efficient and the material cause (BS. I. 4. 23-28 ; II. 3. 33.). Therefore from the beginning Upanishad philosophy had not the antagonism between materialism and idealism. Accordingly professor Walter Ruben is wrong when he interpretes the Indian philosophy from the Upanishads down to present age in the light of the antagonism.

And again indeed sat should be translated into the Greek "he ôn," but there is a great difference, when sat is compared with ho ôn of the Christian philosophy. a) While ho ôn is merely transcendent, the sat is both transcendent and immanent as the Upanishads declare it repeatedly (ex. gr. Katha, II. 2. 9-15.). b) While ho ôn has created all things not out of his substance, but out of nothing, sat has created all things out of one fourth of his own being. Therefore the Upanishadic philosophy prefers the law of becoming of "ex nihilo nihil," and it has this point in common with the Greek philosophy. The Buddhist philosophy also does not accept the law of "ex nihilo

cuncta.” c) And so the Christian philosophy might rebuke the Upanishad philosophy for pan-the-ism. And actually some Upanishads call sat “deva” (SU. V. 3.). And “theos” and “deva” are closely related from the standpoint of philology. However the Upanishad deva is not a misconception of the Christian theos, but it is sui generis. Therefore, if the term pantheism means rebuke from the side of the Christian philosophy, the philosophy of sat should not be called pantheism. This is also true of Buddhist philosophy. d) In later ages sat has become satī, i. e. hē ousa. No parallel of this fact can be found in the Christian philosophy.

Thus indeed Upanishad philosophy has some points similar to European philosophy, but it is sui generis and cannot be totally assimilated to the latter.

C. Buddhist Philosophy

Now at last we can see the Buddhist philosophy face to face. It is free-thought, as above stated, in regard to the tradition of Upanishad philosophy. So far, it is of the nature of criticism. And so, if the two are compared from the point of view of ontology: a) while the Upanishad philosophy poses the substantive sat as its first principle, the Buddhist philosophy opposes “na sanna cāsanna sadasat,” i.e. “not

being, not not-being, not being-not-being.” Therefor the latter poses as its first principle neither something like to on of the Greek philosophy nor something like ho ôn of the Christian philosophy. In other words it does not postulate any first principle in the sense of arkhê or ādi, and declares ādyanutpādaḥ, no genesis from the first principle. b) While the one poses brahman and ātman as substance, the other opposes nairātmya-dvaya, two non-ego. c) If the position of Buddhist philosophy is expressed in positive terms, it consists in the pratītyasamutpādaḥ, i.e. the middle way between being and not-being. And the pratītyasmutpādaḥ is the law of mind (cittadharmatā) which has two directions of movement, of pravrttiḥ and nivrittiḥ, i.e. flow and ebb. And the mind itself is pratītyasamutpannam, that which has originated dependently and is identical with the law (MN : Mahā-tanhā-khaya). d) Therefor it is true that Buddhist philosophy has started from human existence as samsāraḥ, just in the same manner as the Upanishad philosophy, but it has solved the problem by the law of pratītyasamutpādaḥ, while the latter has solved it by the substantive sat. And it declares the pratītyasamutpādaḥ to be the law from time immemorial, paurāna-sthiti-dharmatā and exhorts to realize it by oneself (praty-ātmavedya). Here-in lies all the Buddhist philosophy,

that the *pratītyasamutpādaḥ* is the ancient law and that one should make others realize it after one has realized it with one's own *prajñā*. e) And the realization of the law with one's own *prajñā* amounts to this, that one becomes the law itself from the standpoint of the *dukkhanirodhasatyam*, the truth of the destruction of suffering, and lives it. And this is the *sāntiḥ*; this is peace. And this is the realization of the final aim of human existence. f) Thus, in this point Buddhist philosophy has a way of thinking common to Upanishad philosophy, because the realization of the law with one's own *prajñā* is nothing else than the “*aham brahmāsmi*” (BU. I. 4. 10.), which starts from “*tat tvam asi*” (ChU. VI. 8. 7.). And the road which leads to the goal is the way of discipline, *sikṣāmārga*, which is none other than “*neti, neti*” (BU. I. 4. 10.).

From the above it follows that the essential characteristics of Buddhist philosophy consist in the fact that it is metethica. And it has this in common with Upanishad philosophy. Metethica is neither physica, nor metaphysica, nor theologia, nor metalogica which European philosophy founded and developed. It is unique and unparalleled in the universal history of philosophy. However, as to metethica, Buddhist philosophy advanced one step farther than Upanishad

philosophy, because the former emphasizes the aprati-sthita-nirvāṇam, reposed activity abiding neither in saṃsāraḥ nor in nirvāṇam because of great friendship and compassion, while the latter emphasizes the anā-vrttiḥ, no return; and secondly, because the latter makes the objective truth of brahman subjective by ātman and this unity of brahman and ātman has in it a crucial problem to be solved notwithstanding the Śāṇḍilyan declaration, while the former has propounded from the beginning the truth of subjectivity of pratītyasamutpādaḥ. Even though there are such differences, Buddhist philosophy, together with the Upanishad philosophy, is metethica which European philosophy has not, and herewith makes a unique contribution to the universal history of philosophy, and makes it richer.

III. CONCLUDING REMARKS

At the commencement I said that philosophy has by its nature to do with the problem how to live. Accordingly, Greek philosophy has founded its own ethics, the principle of which is to live congruently with nature. But nature here has in itself an irreconcilable antagonism between matter and form. Instead of this there arose the ethics of the love of God or of a good will of Christian philosophy.

But it is of the nature of idealism and is opposed to materialism. Moreover it is intolerant because of its jealous God. Therefore both of them are prone to struggle. And it follows that their peace is an impermanent peace of those who are by nature at strife with one another, as the proverb goes: homo homini lupus. Contrary to it, both the Upanishadic s̄antiḥ and the Buddhist nirvāṇam conceive human nature as peaceful and view the struggle an impermanent condition which derives its origin from ignorance, avidyā. We Asians, should keep burning this light of the wisdom of peace in the midst of our age of technics. The progress of technics should not be used for threatening, conquering, destroying, etc. It should be ways and means to the aprati-sthitānirvāṇam, because peaceful is nirvāṇam, śāntam nirvāṇam, and because it is truth that wins and not falsehood, satyam eva jayate nānṛtam. (Finis)

6

BUDDHISM AND EXISTENTIALISM

Koshiro Tamaki

Buddhism is very old, existentialism is very new.

There are many different thoughts among the various exponents of existentialism, for example, philosophical thinkers like Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, philosophers like Heidegger and Jaspers, and writers like Sartre and Marcel.

But there is one common character, that is to say an existential standpoint among them, to pursue the essence of human nature and the ultimate reality through existential way of thinking. Therefore when we look back upon the Western history of philosophy from the standpoint of existentialism, as Jaspers has once said, we can find the essence of human nature and the ultimate reality everywhere in Western history, for instance, in Herakleitos, Parmenides, Sokrates, Platon Plotinos, Augustinus, Eckhart, Descartes, Berkeley, Hume, Kant, Schelling, Hegel, Bergson and so on. They, however, do not always consciously pursue ultimate reality and systematize it by the existential method. If we should direct the existential illumination in the same way to Oriental

philosophy, we could likewise find existentialism for example, in the Upanisads, Vedānta, Sāmkhya, Vaiśeṣika, Jaina, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism and so on.

We would like to contrast Buddhism with existentialism. What features are there (in common) between Buddhism and existentialism? I will treat of this problem from three points of view, (1) the philosophical sphere—human beings, (2) the philosophical attitude—subjectivity, and (3) the philosophical content—nothingness and causality.

(1) Philosophical sphere—human beings

Buddhism is considered to deal with human beings, not as a part but as a whole, in other words it deals not only with human life, but also human death. This world of life and death is called *samsāra*. It is the twelve chains of causality of primitive Buddhism that makes clear the actual existence of human being. The twelve chains begin with ignorance (*avijjā*, *avidyā*) and end with..... love, attachment, being, life, old age and death. According to this opinion all our life suffers the pain of ignorance.....love, attachment, being, life, old age and death. Therefore it is said that all is suffering. It is not that death appears after life, but our actual life is every moment afflicted

by the pain of death. In other words life and death should be grasped as one without being confronted with each other.

Existentialism has, of course, human being as its philosophical object, too. It does not face being through the established logic, and it is ready to catch the infinite logos by throwing the self into the bottomless abyss of being. This abyss of being is to be regarded as death. Death is not the end of life, but it is before one's eyes. It is important for pursuing the real aspect of human being not only to catch life, but also to understand life in death and death in life. Heidegger and Kierkegaard pulled the problem of death into the thinking of being, and Jaspers wanted to catch the truth penetrating death. Therefore existentialists too try to catch human being in the totality of life and death.

(2) Philosophical attitude—subjectivity

The subject of Buddhism is not being in general, but self-being, and not samsāra (life and death) in general, but self-samsāra. Buddha says to his disciples :

“ Depend upon yourself, never upon an other,
Depend upon the truth, never upon the other.”

According to this doctrine, to depend upon the self

philosophy, we could likewise find existentialism for example, in the Upanisads, Vedānta, Sāmkhya, Vaiśeṣika, Jaina, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism and so on.

We would like to contrast Buddhism with existentialism. What features are there (in common) between Buddhism and existentialism? I will treat of this problem from three points of view, (1) the philosophical sphere—human beings, (2) the philosophical attitude—subjectivity, and (3) the philosophical content—nothingness and causality.

(1) Philosophical sphere—human beings

Buddhism is considered to deal with human beings, not as a part but as a whole, in other words it deals not only with human life, but also human death. This world of life and death is called *samsāra*. It is the twelve chains of causality of primitive Buddhism that makes clear the actual existence of human being. The twelve chains begin with ignorance (*avijjā*, *avidyā*) and end with..... love, attachment, being, life, old age and death. According to this opinion all our life suffers the pain of ignorance.....love, attachment, being, life, old age and death. Therefore it is said that all is suffering. It is not that death appears after life, but our actual life is every moment afflicted

by the pain of death. In other words life and death should be grasped as one without being confronted with each other.

Existentialism has, of course, human being as its philosophical object, too. It does not face being through the established logic, and it is ready to catch the infinite logos by throwing the self into the bottomless abyss of being. This abyss of being is to be regarded as death. Death is not the end of life, but it is before one's eyes. It is important for pursuing the real aspect of human being not only to catch life, but also to understand life in death and death in life. Heidegger and Kierkegaard pulled the problem of death into the thinking of being, and Jaspers wanted to catch the truth penetrating death. Therefore existentialists too try to catch human being in the totality of life and death.

(2) Philosophical attitude—subjectivity

The subject of Buddhism is not being in general, but self-being, and not samsāra (life and death) in general, but self-samsāra. Buddha says to his disciples :

“ Depend upon yourself, never upon an other,
Depend upon the truth, never upon the other.”

According to this doctrine, to depend upon the self

means at the same time to depend upon the truth. Namely the self is the ground of opening the truth.

This opinion of Buddha will be considered to have developed remarkably in Mahāyānism. The philosophy of *sūnya* (nothingness) established by Nāgārjuna is what unfolded thoroughly the true wisdom of suchness in Buddha, and it intends to conquer all the attachments rooted in the human mind and after all to experience *śūnya* of the self and world. Therefore the *śūnya*-philosophy aims at the radical elimination of the objective view in human intelligence and at making clear the true aspect of things beyond the correlative idea.

The doctrine of Consciousness-Only (*Vijñāptimātra*) goes back to the idea of basic attachment and attains the background of ultimate self-consciousness. Accordingly it has for its object the origin of subjectivity. It is named store-consciousness (*ālayavijñāna*).

In *Mahāyāna-sraddhotpāda-śāstra* the subject and object of cognition are confronted with each other, depending on the action of the fundamental ignorance. This shows not only the problem in philosophical epistemology, but also the fundamental attachment in the basic consciousness of human being. The pure mind or mind itself freed from all the attachments is *tathāgata* womb or Buddhahood.

Thus Buddhism is considered the solution of the problem of the self and aims at attaining to ultimate enlightenment by it.

Kierkegaard says: 'The problem of human life is to become subjective. The more I become subjective, the more the certainty of death is drawing near dialectically to my personality. It is the true deed to treat of my own death not death in general.' So he opens the way to the subjective grasping of human being.

Heidegger too catches human being as 'the being to death (Sein zum Tode), and says: As soon as a man is born, he is enough old to die'. Therefore his philosophical attitude is very subjective. This tendency is indeed clear in conversion from the representative thinking' (vorstellendes Denken) to 'the identical thinking' (andenkendes Denken) which he recently emphasizes.

The philosophical view of Jaspers is likewise subjective along the line of Platon, Kant and Kierkegaard, as he says. The idea of 'the Includer' (das Umgreifende) is one of his most important systems, and it displays the intention of getting free from the objectivity of thinking infinitely. He says: What the philosophical man insights reasonably (vernünftig) is better than the forceful recognition of mind (Ver-

stand), and it is to be grasped from the origin of self'

So in existentialists the manner of thinking is equally subjective, in spite of the differences of thought content.

(3) Philosophical content—nothingness and causality

As stated above, we can see the identity of Buddhism and existentialism with regard to (1) the philosophical sphere and (2) the philosophical attitude. But these viewpoints must be regarded, as the introduction to (3) the philosophical content. Now I will examine the two characters of nothingness and causality as the philosophical content.

(a) Nothingness

What is the character of Buddhism contrasted with European thought? It is generally *sūnya*, that is to say, emptiness or nothingness. In European philosophy too there are some ideas of nothingness, for instance, in the philosophy of Eckhart, Böhme, Hegel, Heidegger and so on, and above all the idea of nothingness in Heidegger-philosophy seems to have some likeness to *sūnya* in Buddhism.

He has developed the idea of nothingness in 'Sein und Zeit' or 'Was ist Metaphysik', especially in the

latter the conception is of great interest. His idea may be unique in the tradition of European thought. The nothingness which he asserts is not the not-being which means the complete negation of being, but rather the ground of that negation, namely what will meet with being itself. Therefore according to his opinion the true nothingness is the true being.

In what case can we experience such a nothingness? He says: 'In the fundamental feeling of anxiety we can rarely experience it. This anxiety is not the fear of something, but it belongs to being itself. In anxiety we feel the retreat of the entire being, in other words the anxiety expresses the nothingness. He says: There is originally nothing in the anxiety, i. e., the nothingness itself appears. This is the fundamental appearance of the actual being, namely of the nothingness.

According to him the essence of nothingness is the ceaseless function of it, and so it is always denying the self. Thus the nothingness appears in the being itself, so that the actual being is kept in nothingness. Therefore the actual being transcends the entire being in being kept in it. In other words we can assert that the being is nothingness in the transcendence.

This opinion of Heidegger is similar to śūnya in Buddhism, and at least both are identified in a pro-

position that the fundamental being is the fundamental nothingness. In Buddhism śūnya is always understood in conformity with being. Consequently in it too we can admit that being is nothingness, and vice versa.

But comparing śūnya with the nothingness of Heidegger, the latter seems to have traces of nihilism, because it is realized indeed in the anxiety, and we feel the retreat of the entire being. On the contrary, śūnya has nothing to do with such a nihilism. The meaning of śūnya is very ambiguous. Sometimes it points to the object that should be denied like the being, sometimes it means the function of denying the attachment in human being, sometimes it expresses being itself in the extremity of denying, and sometimes it is neither negation nor affirmation, but the suchness of essential nature. So śūnya expresses the various meanings according to the recognition of dharma, and the most important thing is, after all to experience śūnya and store the limitless power for the cutting off of delusions and the development of the truth.

Moreover śūnya is closely related with dependent origination or causality, that is to say, pratītyasamutpāda. It is asserted that the accomplishment of śūnya depends upon pratītyasamutpāda, in other words,

sūnya appears indeed in pratītyasamutpāda.

(b) *Causality*

There hardly exists the idea of pratītyasamutpāda in Western thought. In Heidegger-philosophy likewise we cannot find such a idea. But Jaspers seems to conceive of something like it. To cite some instances, Jaspers gives a definition of philosophy as follows: 'Philosophy means to bring everything into complete relation without isolating anything', and he gives 'the Includer' (das Umgreifende) as the dynamic knitting together of relations; Moreover he explains being as the mutual penetration of grounds prior to logic. These ideas may be considered to resemble pratītyasamutpāda, and they are very attractive in European thought. But comparing these ideas with pratītyasamutpāda in close connection with sūnya, there is a great difference.

There are many kinds of pratītyasamutpadas in Buddhism, for example, the causality of the twelve chains, causality of the store-consciousness, causality of the tathāgata womb, causality of the world of law and so on. Of them the causality of the world of law is one of the extremely developed pratītyasamutpadas. This idea is asserted in Hua-yen-philosophy. The main thought of this pratītyasamutpada is the

infinite mutual relationship of everything in the universe; the smallest thing is never shut out from this relationship. One thing reflects all the universe and reflects the one thing. Furthermore each reflected thing in the one reflects all the universe, too, and so the mutual reflection is endless and inexhaustible.

It is most important that this *pratītyasamutpada* is never separated from the One Mind, namely the infinite mutual relationship is altogether reduced to it, which is after all the Self itself. Therefore this *pratītyasamutpada* is not only the logical view of the world, but rather the content of contemplation, and so it is accompanied by concentration of mind, because the essence of true wisdom depends necessarily upon meditation.

It is 'the meditation called the seal of the sea' that characterizes such a idea. What is this meditation? The content of Huan-yen-ching is the expression of the spiritual awakening of Buddha, and it is said 'dharma appeared at one time in the meditation called seal of the sea'. The seal of the sea is a metaphor, and it is compared to all the images reflected in a quiet sea, and means all the affairs of the actual world, that is to say, everything which we see, hear, imagine and experience displays all the images reflected in a quiet sea, and so everything is

the image appeared in a meditation of the Buddha Universe. In other words, all which we experience has no substantial reality, and it is groundless and śūnya. Accordingly the causality of the world of law is not only logical, but it is deeply rooted in the self-consciousness of practical meditation.

So there are some great differences between śūnya or pratītyasamutpada in Buddhism and nothingness or causality in Heidegger and Jaspers. But it should be noticed that Buddhism may be inspired with the fresh power and gain a new system. For that purpose it is necessary to restore the subjectivity of Buddhistic meditation and thought. In other words we must aim at our new enlightenment in modern times.

The End.

7

THE ROLE OF BUDDHISM IN MODERN CIVILIZATION

—FOUNDATION OF SOCIAL ACTIVITIES—

By

Prof. Genjun H. Sasaki

The role of Buddhism in the past

The role of Buddhism in modern civilization is an extensive subject which may be described historically, theoretically and practically. An adequate historical discription of the Buddhist role would require a comprehensive survey of Buddhism in its various aspects. The following remarks will attempt to present only some of the most important aspects of the subject.

Historically speaking, Buddhist culture contributed to the development of Asian literature, handicrafts, arts, way of living and even technology. The role of Buddhist art was essential for the Buddhist mission and highly serviceable to the enrichment of Asian life.

The Buddhist role in Asian economic affairs, in turn, was also not less in that Buddhist monasticism was once a major economic factor in Japan with respect to property and technology. In the ancient

period Buddhist conceptions of political authority formulated an inner part of the development of political and social thought. In India, the Buddhist Samgha preserved certain principles of hierarchy, national security, public welfare, and national law. Generally, Asian governments have patronised Buddhist activities. For example, in Japan Prince Shōtoku (573–621 A.D.) made Buddhism the religion of the Court, and he also issued a code and organized the national administration on the basis of Buddhist teachings. What King Asoka did for Buddhism in India, and what Constantine did for Christianity in the Roman Empire, was done by prince Shōtoku for Buddhism in Japan. At times, however, Asian governments have interpreted certain Buddhist doctrines and utilized the Buddhist community for political ends: to carry on their own social control, cultural power, and leading method of diplomacy. In short, the history of Buddhism shows us that Buddhism has been interdependent with the development of Asian politics, and that Buddhism flourished and grew up with interest and admiration all over Asian countries until this time, when Buddhism has to bear up against rapidly changing society, and in which Buddhist communities are impoverished, unable to meet with new kinds of financial problems imposed upon them by

ever-changing modern society, and handicapped by the lack of governmental and official support.

Characteristics of the history of the development of Buddhism

The characteristic features of the history of the Buddhist mission would be of two kinds: royal patronage on the practical side, and universalism on the theoretical.

Buddhism expanded all over Asian countries through the ages with royal and governmental support. In Burma, Ceylon, Cambodia, and Thailand, Buddhism has been a pacifying and civilizing power in the administration of political authority. In Mongolia and Tibet and occasionally in Cambodia, Buddhism became even the official religion in both theory and practice. Royal patronage, however, has not always been granted to Buddhist communities without persecution. For instance, in Japan Buddhist elements in political affairs have at times been taken away and Buddhist exponents persecuted. Nevertheless, Buddhist expansion was greatly due to royal support, under which Buddhist monks and laymen could lead Buddhist lives and also contribute to the cultural development of their own countries. The royal and political support formulated undoubtedly a strong point to aid in bring-

ing about the expansion of Buddhism, while it was also a weak point in lessening independence. Thus, Buddhists have been dependent on royal support, and indulged in theoretical discussions with their own communities, and endeavoured less to adapt themselves to new methods and current needs, though they still required better provision for the propagation of Buddhism in the scientific world and the correlation of Buddhist and non-Buddhist subjects in practical life.

Buddhist conception as universalism

Buddhism has spread over various countries because of its universalism, a tenet of Buddhism, which has been well-known and appreciated by different nations and classes, low and high.

From the point of view of the philosophy of religion Buddhism has a special interest, because it does not stand with Kant's assertion that belief in God, in the immortality of the soul, and in the freedom of the will are three essential parts of the dogmatics of religions of a high order. In this respect Buddhism takes a stand quite different from that of Christianity.

Buddhism accepts neither the existence of a permanent entity unchanged, nor that of a creator and ruler of the universe. This is a logical consequence of its

fundamental philosophical formulation. It cannot acknowledge the idea of unchangeable substances. According to Buddhism, there is no matter which in itself is eternal though it may change its original forms again and again. In that way there cannot be an individual soul of life. The only permanent entity, it does not deny the continuity of individual life in both the present and the future. In this case the continuity of individual life means neither a material thing like a monad nor a spiritual one like soul. It means simply the the being (sattva) as a continuity (saṃtati), which is devoid of any kind of real existence as a 'res' (dravya). Of more importance is the assertion that Buddhism denies the existence of a creator and ruler of the world. For religious minds, especially in the Occident religion means the belief in the existence of God. For this reason European theologians usually hold that Buddhism is a philosophical system, and not religion. We may well say that Buddhism is a philosophical system, but should not be a religion in the Occidental conception, which presupposes first of all the existence of God. It is simply because Buddhism does not accept the existence of real entity in any form. In religion, which is based upon the conception of the existence of God, there can be no freedom

and no open-mindedness at all. It is because a man believing in God is said to be religious, but not the man who does not believe in God as such. Therefore, it is impossible for Christianity to penetrate into the world of alien religious thought. The Christian and non-Christian religions are placed together and both branded as sacrilegious human attempts at self-deification in contrast to the Biblical revelation of God. Christian theology, however, may ignore the existence of other religions.

The narrow-mindedness and the isolation of Christianity from other religions have come to destroy anything different from its own belief. Neither Buddhism nor Hinduism has slaughtered anything at all. The Inquisition can only be regarded as the total eclipse of Christianity, and the putting to death of heretics makes it impossible for us to honour the actual Church as the body of the living Christ. With the stain of this disgrace upon it, how can Christianity claim to be absolute compared with the less tainted non-Christian religions? All these cruelties and invasions with weapons into Asian countries have taken place from the theory as such, namely a belief in the existence of One Christian God, which is to be accepted only in Christianity.

Buddhism, however, has the negation of the discri-

minative analysis as its nature. It means the negation of a real entity existing unchanged. Subsequently, Buddhism denies the power which results from discriminative analysis. Thus, the superiority of Buddhism to Christianity lies in its possession of the most comprehensive idea of universalism.

Universalism formulates a strong point for Buddhist expansion on the theoretical side, as well as a weak point on the practical one. The theoretical side of universalism has hitherto been too much emphasized. We come across hundreds of times such self-glorifying and fanatic expressions in the Buddhist publications of today. Let me take one example. Buddhists usually say: "Buddha was a universalist. He never shut out any section of humanity; His message was not to be confined to any race or people; it was for all. His teaching was universal; embraced the whole of humanity, the whole of life. It included the animals." Occasionally, the emphasis on universalism leads to the fanaticism, Buddhist or Christian. Fanaticism, however, isolates religions whatever from other social fields and the society of human being. Nevertheless, Buddhism as a religion must stand in the midst of the great stream of the social development. It did not fall down from heaven to the earth as a 'superworldly' system, but was born in a long

historical process. We can not draw an artificial line between a 'worldly' life and a 'superworldly' one. Although Buddhism has theoretically dealt with the practical subject of human beings, nevertheless, practically it has taken little notice of the knowledge to approach to the social life and to reveal itself in the history of human being.

The revelation of Buddha in history, the formulation of Buddhist interpretations of history and the establishment of Buddhist ideals of social progress have to be taken seriously into consideration. In this connection Buddhist activities are not enough to meet with the demands of human society. Are Buddhist views being consulted in human affairs? The revelation of Buddha in history is theoretically well founded, but currently in need of strengthening if Buddhism is to help guide social life. The Buddhist has hitherto devoted himself only to the individual experience of Enlightenment. Reliable knowledge, however, would be not only on accumulative experience for the individual, but also the collective experience for society. One must not indulge merely in enlightening one's own self; one should endeavor to enlighten the society.

From the experiences of my life in India I would say that most of the religious speeches are the glori-

fication of Hindu Gods or Buddha, as an ancestor of the home country. In Japan, in turn, Buddhists are mostly concerned the theoretical side of Buddhism. All these considerations indicate that the Enlightenment of the individual is much more emphasized in view of the universalism of Buddhism than that of society, and that the subject of discussion concerns mostly concerns the relation between the absolute and the relative, namely God and man; but not the relation between man and man. This means that the Buddhist mission has so far been negligent of emphasizing the relationship between man and man, i. e. 'humanity' in the true sense of the word, which formulates the tenet of the Christian theology as it is.

Buddhist conception of revelation in history

It is said that the superiority of Christianity to all other religions lies in its possession of the most comprehensive idea of revelation. Christian theology formulates in one great synthesis the original divine revelation in creation, the outward revelation of God in history and the inner revelation in the life of the spirit, and lastly the final all—embracing revelation of God at the end of history. Among these three modes of revelation the divine revelation in creation

and its comprehensive idea are of most importance and most interesting in view of the realization of the universalism of Christianity. In its universality and catholicity the Christian Church has the power to adapt itself to every national character and to realize an idea of fellowship, so that all the religious traditions of mankind may be absorbed.

From the experiences of my life in Europe I would say that the religious lives of the Christian are full of the enjoyment of religion rather than the serious consideration of the annoyances of life. Christian churches, whether Catholic or Protestant, are open to all men and women, old and young, as if churches were places of amusement and even a talking salon for social meeting. Those people who come to church, seem to enjoy more the social life of human being and the hearing of voices of the men rather than the discussions on the religious problems. One of my German students once told me as a joke that they came to the church to hear the sound of the organ rather than the voice of God !

This may be only one of the aspects of the Christian church. It goes without saying that in churches the tenets of religion should seriously be taken into consideration and earnestly discussed among Christians. However, we must not overlook the fundamental

reason for the enjoyment of the human life even in the churches. I think that religion should not always confine itself to the serious discussion of theory, theology and pains of life. In Asia countries, most of the time at religious meetings is usually spent in discussions on the pains of life and the life after death etc, simply to worry, torment and torture themselves rather than enjoy the grace of God !

Such is the state of religion in social life in Europe and Asia. All these distinctions between Oriental and Occidental religious lives will become clear if one assumes that the West has tended to identify religious truth with the social life of human beings ; whereas the Orient has restricted the religious truth to the salvation of the individual alone, but not of society.

To take leave of these differences between the Oriental and Occidental mental positions we have to draw attention to the realization of the universalism of Buddhism in practical life, neglected as far as this is humanly possible.

The part emphasis on the universalism of Buddhism will result in one's becoming fanatic and excessively enthusiastic on religious subjects, and being negligent of realizing the theory of universalism, which is based upon the revelation of Buddha in history.

The theoretic component of the universalism of Buddhism and the practical component of the revelation of Buddha in history are both ultimate and in part least irreducible, the one being the correlate of the other.

What, then, is the Buddhist conception of revelation in history? What place should the conception of revelation take in Buddhist philosophy? I would like to point to the theory of Trikāya (three aspects of actions of Buddha), which consists of Dharmakāya, and Nirmāṇakāya and Sambhogakāya.

According to Mahāyāna doctrine, Dharmakāya denotes the body of Buddha, which is produced by dharmas, the highest of which is the prajñāpāramitā, i.e.; the knowledge which helps one to realize the dharma-sūnyatā (the voidness). Nirmāṇakāya means the body of Buddha, which is unmindful of good or bad forms of existence; it takes form as a human being or a god as necessity requires. Lastly, Sambhogakāya denotes the subtle body, which the Buddhas adopted for preaching their doctrines to Bodhisattvas. Buddhas may have their individual Sambhogakāyas (or Nirmāṇakāya) but they have all one Dharmakāya. Dharmakāya is subject to the realm of the absolute, while the other two kāyas, Nirmāṇakāya and Sambhogakāya, belong to the realm of the relative. Dharmakāya fills all space. It is also the

basis of the Sambhogakâyas.

None of the other great religions has an idea of revelation so deep or so broad as Buddhism. It is only Buddha as Sambhogakâya that embraces every nation, class and personality, both in the world and beyond it. Buddha as Sambhogakâya, however, is never a mystical body like God or Christ in Christianity, but the man who acts and functions in contact with human society, putting into practice the truth of Buddhism.

All these considerations indicate that the revelation of Buddha in history does not come down from heaven, but comes up from the social life of human beings. It does not come from Above, but from Below.

It is the duty of all the Buddhist followers to realize the principle of revelation in history by following the truth of Buddhism in social life. The Buddhist world never needed this lesson as much as it needs it today, when it regards itself as more civilised than ever before.

8

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF BUDDHIST IN CURRENT WORLD THOUGHTS

Reiho Masunaga

Prof. Komazawa University

WE are very happy to celebrate the 2500th Buddha Jayanti in Japan this year. On this occasion we must return to the fundamental spirit of the Buddha, and vitalize this spirit and propagate it in this our world. The Buddha's brilliant personality, profound thought, and thorough practice are models for Buddhists through-out the world. Although there are differences between Southern and Northern Buddhism, they both stem from the teachings of the Buddha Sākyamuni. They must deepen their mutual understanding and recognize the strong points of each, and work together. They must develop a world movement of Buddhism as a whole.

As I see it, the strong points of Southern Buddhism are : (1) a belief in one Buddha (2) a strict observance of the precepts (3) a respect for priesthood. The strong points of Northern Buddhism are : (1) profundity of thought (2) the emphasis on altruism (3) the vitalizing of Buddhist spirit in everyday life. The Buddhism of the future must synthesize the profound thought of Northern Bud-

dhism with the thorough practice of Southern Buddhism. In this way we must establish a new Buddhism of international reach. In the future Mahāyāna Buddhism in Japan must not discriminate against the Buddhism of Southeast Asia by calling it Hīnayāna.

We must instead respect it as Theravāda, supporting its strong points of strict observance of precepts and belief in one Buddha. We must have enough tolerance to cooperate on a logical basis. Buddha's peaceful and constructive personality and cultivated contributions are not weakened even today.

The Buddhist nirvana means the perfecting of personality by Great Wisdom, and expressing the Great Compassion that embraces all. In the Buddha's personality we see the self-identity of Great Wisdom and Great Compassion. Great Wisdom and great compassion are two necessary elements in the present age.

The significance of Buddhism in current world thoughts is as follows.

(1) The Middle Way of Buddhism has the role of solving the dualistic confrontation in this world. The Middle Way is definitely not simple moderation; it is a true way that must be expressed dynamically in practical action. By the concept of the Middle Way we must synthesize the conflict of materialism and idealism in a higher dimension and elevate the idea of ahimsā, practice

based on the Middle Way will surely bring peace and happiness to mankind.

(2) The unitive thought of Buddhism should play an important role in breaking the impasse now plaguing our mechanical civilisation. The development of the scientific intellect has helped to establish a huge mechanical civilisation. Man has now created the age of mass-communication automation, and organized systems, but he has become enslaved by machines and has lost his subjectivity. If Buddhism can help man find his true self and elevate the thought of self-identity, it will enable man to escape from his slavery to machines. The world view that makes the one identical with the many will return man from his apparent separateness to his original form.

(3) The wisdom of Buddhism based on compassion, has the important role of correcting the direction of modern science. Buddhism does not have any rigid dogma ; it also does not teach superstitions. Buddhism is the only world religion that can embrace the scientific spirit. The culture of the future must have a base of a religious spirit that envelops science. For religion does not have science is blind, and science does not have religion is crippled. Modern science is enslaved by its own products and critical impasse. In the future Buddhism must indicate the direction for scientific knowledge. There have been no scientists who have become martyrs. This is because Bud-

dhism embraces science. The necessary thing now is a religious wisdom that will guide scientific knowledge. The national character of Buddhism appeals more and more to us.

(4) The Buddhist idea of no-abode nirvana offers a sound basis for guiding human life. Because of Great Wisdom, Buddhism is not satisfied with the activity of the delusive world. Because of Great Compassion, it does not cling to the ideal of an enlightened world. It instead urges actions based on vital freedom. Toynbee has noted the processes of withdrawal and return in human existence. Withdrawal means looking inward and finding one's true self. Return means going once again back into society and working for others. Buddhism teaches the enlightenment of self and the enlightenment of others. The "Individuation" process of C. G. Jung emphasizes the former. The "Creative Altruism" of Sorokin emphasizes the latter. In Toynbee these two processes are considered to be separate. But in Buddhism they are inseparable.

The "Merit-transference" of Shinran and "the self-identity of training and enlightenment" of Dōgen indicate the unity of withdrawal and return. Existencialism puts too much emphasis on nihilism and lacks positive work that should come after Grenzsituation.

(5) The altruistic spirit of Buddhism makes for a religion of peace. This has been demonstrated historically,

for Buddhism has always preferred peace to war. It has never oppressed the heretical, nor has it ever started a religious war. King Asoka felt the sinfulness of war after the battle of Kalinga, and subsequently ruled his country by the right law and brought peace to his world. The Dhammapada says, "Hatred is not stopped by hatred, Hatred ceases only through compassion. This is the eternal law." In the eyes of the Buddha, hatred and love are equal. A world that lives by the true law has no use for weapons. Struggle stems basically from personal greed and vanity. Buddhism emphasizes the forsaking of selfish delusions and helping each other. The true spirit of Buddhism arises from reflecting deeply on oneself and seeking earnestly for the Way. It manifests itself from the first in continuing a life of effort and gratitude. Monotheistic religions lack the spirit of tolerance and easily vulnerable to disputes. Similarly labor and management must stop their disputes and work together for their mutual interests. Buddhism has these concepts, but how can we make them live in this world? The problems are:

(1) How can we make people in Europe and America understand the Buddhist spirit of internationalism, rationalism, and humanism?

(2) How can we resolve the dualistic conflict in Europe and America by the Buddhist concept of the Middle Way, and realise the spirit of mutual help?

(3) How can Buddhism help solve the impasse of Western mechanical civilisation and guide science and use it ?

(4) How can Buddhism help bring about a peaceful world that will use atomic power beneficially ?

(5) How can we use the idea of mutual aid to help soften the conflict between labor and management ?

(6) How can the Buddhist idea of Great Wisdom and Compassion help man know himself and vitalize his activities ?

9

BUDDHISM IN THE AGE OF SCIENCE

—Buddha Sakyamuni as Viewed by a Scientist—

by Yoichi Yamamoto, Dr. of Engineering
Professor at Nihon University

1. Buddhism teaches the fundamental truth.

The Japanese word for religion is *shukyo*, which is interpreted in the Japanese way. *Shu* means most important; and *kyo*, teaching. Hence, *shukyo* means what teaches the most important thing. Buddhism is a religion which teaches the fundamental truth established by Buddha Sakyamuni.

The fundamental truth is the most important thing that all the people should follow. Buddhism which teaches it is only the true religion in the world.

This meaning of religion is not yet known. Religion has hitherto been interpreted as what give us peace of mind and makes us feel life worth living. By this mis-
✓ interpretation religion has been separated from science. Here we have the wrong view that the progress of science makes religion useless, or that science has its limits and leaves the outside of the limits to religion. The true re-
/ ligion which teaches the fundamental truth leads to science.

It does not separate itself from science, but leads to it.
| Therefore, it is all the more necessary in the age of science.

2. The way of change of all things.

The fundamental truth shows us how all things should be. All things in this universe originated from one thing and have their own way of change. This way of change of all things is revealed by the fundamental truth. In other words, all things in this universe exist in accordance with this truth. This is the ultimate truth in this world.

✓ The original thing which creates all things is an ultimate existence, which is not matter, but not nothing. It pervades all the space in this universe, and creates things under various conditions. All things in this universe, including things on the earth, are created in the ultimate existence. Therefore, human beings, with their lives and minds, are ultimate existence itself. The ultimate existence is found in phenomenal things, not in the form of itself.

According to Buddhism, this ultimate existence is called | *sunyata*. All things, which are created by *sunyata*, void, change according to a certain law. This law is called *dharma* in Buddhism. This *dharma* is the fundamental truth which shows the way that all things should be. The *sunyata*, which is the ultimate existence of all things, fills the universe in the form of infinitesimal particles. Some of the

particles which are condensed and fixed by the distortion of the sunyata turn into matter. The phenomena of matter are caused by the fluidity of sunyata which acted to matter. This sunyata is called energy by modern scientists.

3. Buddha Sakyamuni found out the fundamental truth.

All things and phenomena are the sunyata in their origin. The sunyata makes everything. This is the fundamental truth of all things. Without the knowledge of this fundamental truth, we cannot see the way that a human being should be. This truth reveals the Buddhist teaching that matter and mind are one. This truth unites materialism with spiritualism. Our social activities are manifold. They are politics, economy, law, industry, art, education and so forth, which are the phenomenon of human society. Out of these, things that are produced by the fundamental truth are right, true, good and beautiful, while others are not. Generally speaking, human life is full of suffering, because it is full of things not produced by the fundamental truth.

Buddhism teaches what this fundamental truth is. Buddha Sakyamuni found this truth, and expounded it, in order to give us peace of mind and the eye to see the truth.

4. The Buddha's words expressing this truth.

All things change ; appear, and disappear. The Buddha says that all things are impermanent. All things are fixed and secured in themselves. This state of things is

called by the Buddha the state of “Nirvana, calm and tranquil”. All things are dependent on each other and have no substantiality by themselves. The Buddha says that all things have no self. The three traits of things : impermanence, tranquility, and interdependence, constitute the fundamental truth. From this truth comes out the teaching that the cause of existence is twofold ; primary and environmental. The Four Noble Truths and the Eightfold Path are also based on this truth. The words of the Buddha expressing this truth may be rendered as follows :

 All things in this world
 Are made from one thing
 That is called sunyata.
 All things that are made
 Are helping each other,
 Depending of each other.
 When they are in harmony,
 They are quiet, and at peace.
 When the harmony is spoilt,
 Things change, come and go.
 Though the things in this world
 Repeat their changes endlessly,
 The Way that their changes should be
 Cannot be changed, destroyed.
 It enlightens all people forever.

Everything in this world, whether it is the body of a

human being, or his mind, or anything produced by his mind, is good in so far as it accords with the fundamental truth, and is not good in so far as it is against the truth. Nature works in accordance with this truth, but man does not always. Here lies the roots of his suffering and evils. The social evils of today come from lack of knowledge of this truth. To teach all the people of today the fundamental truth established by Buddha Sakyamuni is the only way to the peace of the world.

5. The position of Buddhism in the age of science.

The fundamental truth of Buddha Sakyamuni is to be relied on, not to be sought for. Western scholars have hitherto tried to find this truth, not to rely on it, so that they have formed many perverted views. The scientists tried to find laws, by establishing many hypotheses, but do not yet reach the reality of all things. They do not yet understand, for instance, what electricity really is. It will be made clear only when we see that electricity is the sunyata which appears through the medium of metal. Electricity has no independent existence. It is a phenomenon of the sunyata which is connected with metal.

The opinion that religion is not necessary to a scientist may be true as far as the other religions than Buddhism are concerned. Buddhism teaches the fundamental truth that rectifies the perverted views involved in science.

6. Buddhism and mechanical civilization.

Men have been endeavoring, since the appearance on this earth, to make their living happier and more pleasant by utilizing that part of Nature which they find around them. Present civilization has been made as the result of this endeavor of human beings. In olden times, they made things by their hands, but, in the course of time, many kinds of machine were made, thanks to the fundamental truth which led men to the making of machine, whether they were aware that they were led by the truth or not.

We should realize that the mechanical civilization of today is based on the fundamental truth. This truth has made the progress of the civilization and brought prosperity to men. Human life of today is enriched, given light, and made pleasant by this truth. If we forget this and ignore the fundamental truth, the richness of the human life of today will be lost. It is urgently necessary to let all the people know what the fundamental truth is in order to develop the mechanical civilization to a more satisfactory extent.

In present business circles, human relations are considered to be one of the most important factors in the process of production. It is also generally held that the best quality is guaranteed when all the conditions in the process of production are in harmony. These facts show that the fundamental truth works as the basic principle in modern

industry.

7. The fundamental truth is the core of Buddhism.

The fundamental truth is the most important teaching of Buddhism. All Buddhists should reconfirm that this truth is the ruling principle of human life, constituting a true religion. This truth should be the principal theme of Buddhist preachings. Buddha Sakyamuni was the Great Saint, because he found this truth, which is applicable to Nature and man.

In the fundamental truth
There is the royal road
To a rich, bright, pleasant life
For all the people in the world
Who wish to have peace of mind.
Those who see this fundamental truth
As the most important teaching
Will be shown the true realities
Of all the things in this world.
They will be given power enough
To save all beings as well.

Buddhism is a religion which reveals the fundamental truth, leads science to the right path, and saves all people from their suffering. In this sense we can say that Buddhism is the only true religion in this world.

10

ECONOMIC THOUGHT IN BUDDHISM

by Entai Tomomatsu

President of the Kanda-dera, Tokyo

I. Moderationism of Sakyamuni

THE original Buddhist sutras repeatedly say, "The lives of all people are supported by food. They live if they eat, otherwise they perish." (1) An annotation to the Dhammapada explains the above more clearly by saying, "Lives cannot be saved without eating. Nobody can survive without food. Food is the first requisite. Human achievement will be accomplished after the people are fed." (2) These common-sense and rational lines are also quoted in the Buddhist teachings in Japan, for example in the SHORYOSHU by KUKAI, the founder of the SHINGON sect. These lines are taken to be words uttered from the bodily experiences of Shakyamuni when he was awakened to the ideal of Moderation after his asceticism and studies and life of training. According to the life of Sakyamuni, the young aspirant for truth, in the belief that an ascetic life only could lead him to enlightenment, took only a small portion of cereals

for six years with the idea of torturing his own body, but this resulted in nothing but waste of time and exhaustion. Convinced of his wrong ideas in the past, Sakyamuni at length accepted a bowl of milk offered by a village girl (3) and declared, "I have now stopped this asceticism. It was good for me to put an end to the meaningless ascetic life. I am now aware that any life of the sort, in the hope of acquiring immortality, will be as useless as a rudder in a boat on the land" (4). The idiosyncrasy of the thought of moderation by Sakyamuni was in resistance to the extremely absurd religious ideas of his age. They thought that torture itself might bring some religious benefit. Sakyamuni said, "You novices have to avoid the two extremes of indulging in pleasure and torturing yourselves, neither of which will be of benefit to you. Live your religious lives in moderation, without going to either of these two extremes." (5) The substance of Moderationism is explained as the "right ways" of opinion, thinking, words, actions, life, diligence, concentration of mind, and meditation. Among the above, "right life" (*sammâjîva*) by which is meant the right means of living, points to right economic ways of living. It is noteworthy that one of the Theravâda codes, supposed to be original material, records the opposition by Devadatta, a disciple of Sakyamuni, which caused a crisis, breaking up the

order of his master by preaching the going back to asceticism. He sternly insisted that bhikkus, all through their lives, should live in the forest, without stepping into villages to beg for food, never accept invitations, wear ragged clothes, decline to receive those things offered by Buddhist laymen, live under wild trees but not under a roofed house, and not eat fish and meat as such was a crime. (6) Of course his extreme stoicism was not acceptable to Sakyamuni who rejected it at the risk of breaking with his own religious community. Thus the rationalism of Buddhism having been firmly established gave cause to the development of various economic activities and the group movements in religious ways.

Sakyamuni while praising quiet thinking in the forest (7) did not stick to such a life but held to a free attitude saying, "Any village, forest, sea or land would be a paradise to live in for a saint." (8) This stimulated the rise of Buddhist culture in the basis of the urban economic activities in business transactions and traffic in the market towns (Nigama) and the fortified cities (Nagara) while the Brahman culture generally limited its activities to village (Gâma) economy. The thought of Sakyamuni has opened the way of preaching among the general public, rich men (Setṭhi) and the governing class (Râja). The rich men being capitalists and bankers even at that time, were naturally

laymen. Buddhism in some cases was liable to be criticized for its stoicism and non-committance in worldly matters, but this was due to the too strong emphasis placed by the priesthood, on getting delivered from worldly bonds, while in fact it maintained a positive attitude to the way of life of priests as well as laymen; this pushed forward social economic activities. Ideas on donation and its virtues originating in ancient Indian philosophy, if not with Sakyamuni, were taken into his thought of moderationism and right living and were the core of Buddhist cultural movements. The words of Sakyamuni, "Virtue is a pleasure all through in one's life" (Puññam sukham jīvitasaṃkhyamhi) (2), are the propellent of a bright positive morality. The thought of "non-virtue" by Bodhidharma, who rebuked Emperor Wu of South Lien dynasty (China) was attained by him after deep thinking in the Buddhist philosophy on the annihilation of self. Even Bodhidharma did not negate virtue itself, but only warned against the thoughts of virtue linked as a merit of one's own creation. The right interpretation of virtue in Buddhism is the perfect coordination of it with non-virtue. As it is well known, the Dānakathā, Śīlakathā and Saṃgāthā (codes on donation, commandments, and birth in heaven) were the subjects on which Buddha began his preaching. As far as the wish for birth in Heaven was concerned the

general public in his days adhered to the moral rules of donation and commandments. The religions before Sakyamuni used to teach the offering of the blood of animals to the gods in order to attain Paradise. Against this inhuman heretical teaching Sakyamuni preached that the same blessings could be obtained by the practice of donation and commandments, and this was the replacement of barbarous superstitious ceremonies by the right ones which would contribute toward the promotion of the welfare of the public. It is recorded that Sakyamuni praised the donators of housing for priests, assuring them that the virtue of such acts would enable them to enjoy happiness in this life, and attain Paradise, (3) (4) The epitaph of king Asoka says that "Its" virtue was to make the people to live under the blessings in this world and leading them to the paradise in the future lives. One sacred scripture again clearly points out the virtues of Cunda (a lay man who served the last meals to Sakyamuni) in six blessings; age (âyu), colour (vanna) happiness (Sukha), fame (yasa), heaven (sagga), and governing (âdhipateyya). (5) Age was a long happy life; colour the right racial complexion which was the decisive factor in the society at that time; happiness from wealth and high ranking; fame from the special privileges in society; heaven was nirvana; and governing meant power to rule over the people. The ideas of donation and

virtue in Buddhism grew into very strong social morals and philosophies as they promised happiness in present and future lives. The thought of giving was not only for the theoretic preaching but developed into the practical stimulation of the planting of fruit-bearing trees, construction of vessels and bridges, opening of water springs, and the building of housing which resulted in the appearance of large engineering works, fostering traffics and the promotion of industries. (6) As described on the epitaph of king Asoka, the Buddhist thought on donation and virtue gave rise to the construction of hospitals for men and animals, the transportation of herbs, the planting of roadside trees, the digging of water springs, and the freeing of prisoners. All these virtues were introduced into our country via Central Asia and China. We see an actual examples of the above in one of the subjects in the examination for the qualifying of a full ranking priest in the Nara dynasty, which was for the construction of a wooden bridge over the river Uji near Kyoto. We have gone more thoroughly into examples of the same nature in several other works by the present author. (7)

- (1) Dhammapada 217 (2) Dhammapada 331
- (3) Cullavagga 6, 1 (4) Vinaya of Dharmagupta 50
- (5) Dighanikaya
- (6) Vinaya of Dharmagupta 50 (Taisho edition vol. 22, p. 914)

- (7) Essays on Virtue in Buddhism' Meritorious thoughts

from the epitaph of the king Asoka. The donation housing and the thought of virtue. (Ref. Jan, of Feb, and Mar, numbers, 1932, of "Present-Day Buddhism")

III. Impartiality in Buddhism.

The superficial view that Sakyamuni broke down the caste and colour system in India in his ages cannot be accepted offhand by the students of the origination of Indian castes and colours. Sakyamuni holding to moderationism with little prejudice, did not recognize the differences of merit among the caste and colours of people although he did accept them as far as they existed. Moreover he treated everybody of his communion impartially. He said, "the Ganges in the east, the Sindhu in the south, the Bhasa in the west, and the Sita in the north, flow into the sea, where none of their former names can be traceable. In the same way, the peoples from the four castes of King, Brahmana, rich and landlord, after they have cut off their hair, are clad in priest's robes, and have joined the priesthood in the name of Buddha, are not of any caste but are called "Sakyaputta". (disciples of Sakyamuni) (1) Upâli, the son of a barber who entered the priesthood together with a prince of Sakya clan, was treated without any discrimination. In this case we see clearly the rational-

ism of Sakyamuni in his words, “Upâli, I shall permit you to enter the priesthood. Heresy does not show its secret rules to its disciples but the Buddha does. He preaches and saves everybody equally with his mercies, just as a shopkeeper sells his goods to anybody. Buddhism in the same way has no preferences in treating the rich, poor, or different classes.” (2) The above example shows the rationalism of Sakyamuni very clearly; it concurs with its economic character. As long as the purpose of a shopkeeper was to sell his goods in order to earn profit, it would be impossible to him to discriminate between his customers by clan or the colour of their skin. Here we see the natural harmony between the rise of Buddhism and the economic activities by the merchants. (3) The merchant’s bodies, which probably started among the same clan, became organized, disregarding the difference of clan, with the common purpose of gaining profit. They went round the villages ringing bells and called upon the people who had the same interest in their enterprises, (4) collected the capital and divided the profit equally among themselves. (5) Both the Mâhâyana and Theravada sutras have records of codes of group morals as the four characters of a Bodhisttva, namely donation, kind words, utilization, and impartial distribution. The records of a pious millionaire, Hatthi, who, following these four teachings, administered

over 500 merchants and gained a tremendous amount of money, (6) can only be understood by the interpretation of these codes as the morals of the capitalization system in trades wherein we notice the flow of the rational spirit of equality for everybody.

The Buddhist idea of equality is also seen in the treatment of men and women, while in general it has been understood that Buddhism made a strict discrimination between them. Its branding women with "Five Obstacles and Three Obediences" was perhaps an outcome of the diffusion of Buddhism in later ages, probably in countries where such a discrimination of women was severe. As far as we can tell, no such prejudices existed against women in the age of Sakyamuni. One day he taught a pious king who was gloomy over the birth of a daughter by saying, "Buddha is born of a mother, the mother of Buddha, the mothers of Kings are all women". The Buddhist idea of women was transmitted into our country and in the *GYOKUYO*, a diary of a nobleman, in the Kamakura period (13th century) we see that *CHOKEN*, a priest of the Tendai sect, says that all women were mothers of all Buddhas and of the truth, but not all men. The *Therigatha*, *Psalms of the Sisters*, a collection of religious poems composed by women, say, "Nothing can stand on the way of women when their wisdom is displayed" (7). The famous sutra,

“The Worship of Deities in the Six Directions” (Dighanikaya) enumerates a man’s duties to his wife, as respect, courtesy, non-adultery, recognition of her authority, and the giving of ornaments. It the two temples of TOKEIJI of Kamakura and MANPUKUJI of Nitta, Kozuke Province, have given unconditional protection even in defiance of the rulers, to divorced women and such-like, as long as they stepped into the temple grounds. We notice in the same sutra that wives were placed in responsible positions in economic activities, with duties to their husbands, to regulate business, to be kind to servants, to be virtuous, to preserve the property, to be dexterous in every way, and to be diligent. The same sutra teaches equality between masters and servants by saying that the servants were to be treated well by the masters, charged with work appropriate to their capabilities, afforded meals and wages, tended in sickness, given dainties and allowed timely rest. It is surprising to see such well regulated rules as the above, almost the same as present-day Labour Standard Laws, initiated twenty five hundred years ago when the caste system among people was strict, and a servant’s personal rights were disregarded. All of the above came from the idea of brotherhood in humanity, and it is our desire that these Buddhist ideas be put into practice more strongly even at the present time. In the meanwhile, self-criticism

by Buddhists is required for their having brought about an atmosphere of discriminating against those who were engaged in slaughtering, although it naturally came from the precept of non-killing.

- (1) **Ekottarâgama, 21**
- (2) **DAI SHOGON RON (Sûtrâlamkāra) 8**
- (3) **The rise of Buddhism and activities of the merchants. (MITA Academy's Magazine, Feb. No. 1925) The Original Buddhist Priest Order and Merchant Class. (Magazine, Buddhist Science, May No. 1925.**
- (4) **Vinaya of Sarvâstivâdin, Vol. 25**
- (5) **Jâtaka 2, p. 218**
- (6) **Maddhyamâgama, 9**
- (7) **Therīgathâ 60**

IV. Self-effacement in Buddhism.

For the use of the Buddhist order which maintained moderationism as against stoicism, houses or monasteries were built which stimulated Buddhist construction, and a number of rich donors appeared. In connection with such, the problem to whom those properties belonged has to be considered. In the case of Jetavâna, Sakyamuni said, "You gentlemen, you are donating this monastery for the use of the itinerant monks who came and who will come" (*âgatânâgatacâtuddisassa samghassa*). (1) Here we see that Jetavâna did not belong to Sakyamuni but to the itinerant monks who were there then, and who were to come

in the future. We are not going thoroughly in this essay into the ideas of the common property of the priestly order; this was explained in our previous works. (2) But we would briefly say that they originated in the idea of self-effacement and non-ownership by Sakyamuni. "Self" meant the self's ego which Sakyamuni always taught was to be controlled. In Dhammapada he said, "The fool will desire undue reputation, precedence amongst monks, authority in the monasteries, honour and offerings among other families". (3) As seen in the above, there were some non-Buddhist-like people even in the days of Sakyamuni. It is probable that there were some things which grieved I-Tieng, a Chinese priest (8th century), who made a journey through Buddhist states in India. He said, "In the name of gods and men, woe to those who egoistically appropriate priests properties without consulting others; it is the biggest evil in the Buddhist order!" (4) The priests' properties means those intended for use by the itinerant priests from the four directions. The Chinese characters "SHODAI", as used in the title of TOSHODAIJI Temple in Nara, was a phonetic translation of "cātuddissa", meaning the four directions. The properties of priests were ruled as indistributables which should not be disposed of even by the groups of priests, communities, or individuals. They were generally heavy and solid establishments (Gurub-

handam guruparikkhâram), and were well preserved and are appreciated up to the present by the name of “JUMOTSU” (Heavy Treasures). The idea of the common property of the order has been traditional to the temples in China and Japan without interruption, and for the benefit of preservative administration, the diversion of the use among each other of the three Treasures (Buddha, Dhamma and Samgha) was prohibited. This system was brought into our country, and sponsored the idea of dividing up the administration, as we see in the systems in large temples in Nara, and those divisions had their individual finances and operation. For instance, HORIUJI temple had twenty eight divisions “Bun” (Division), namely, general, ‘Three Treasures, Buddhist Images, Stupas, Birth Buddha Images, Baths, Constant Lamps etc. and “SHU” (Group) for Vijnaptimâtra, Vinaya and Gandhavhûha etc. The SHU in later days came to mean sect. Some other temples had six SHU just like the various courses in present-day universities, and every one of them composed a financial unit, each one of them having its own particular inventory. A play and musical division of a temple in the Nara Period invested capital in the name of TERA AKINAISEN (the temple’s trade funds) with a trader of TSURUGA of ECHIZEN province, and traded with China. A division of another temple owned some land in Nara city, earn-

ing income for funds for Buddhist studies. Such social economic ideas in priests' orders affected the followers, and developed into the idea of disdaining avarice by only clinging to one's property. Moreover under the influence of the thoughts on Moderationism, Virtue, and Equality, Buddhist people in general came to donate their own properties to the priests' order.

- (1) **Cullavagga 6, 9-1**
- (2) **The idea of common property of priests' orders (The MITA academy's magazine, Jan. No. of 1925. Studies in Buddhist economic thought (Vol. 1. Feb. No. 1932)**
- (3) **Dhammapada 73**
- (4) **GUHOKOSODEN (The careers of high priests who travelled in India) Vol. 1**

V. Buddhist ideas on Pawning. (Aksaṇḱâ)

We have described Sakyamuni's teachings on self-effacement in connection with the donation of temples for the priests but they were based on the documents preserved by Vibhajiavâdin (one of the schools of Theravada). The term "Priests from the four directions" is also used as priests from the four directions with Sakyamuni as the head man, taking him as a member of the group of priests from the four directions, which is taken as one of the expressions of the democratic school of Buddhism. On the other hand the disciplinary code handed down by the Dharmagupta school keeps the re-

cord of Sakyamuni's words as, "Donate this Bamboo Garden (Venuvana) to the Buddha and the itinerant priests from the four directions". (1) In this case we have to be careful not to take these expressions as synonymous with "the itinerant priests from the four directions", or, "the itinerant priests from the four directions with the Buddha as the head man". In the first expressions as above, the Buddha and the priests are clearly distinguished. In the sect of the Dharmagupta it is thought that even the remnants of the food offered to the Buddha should not be eaten by the disciples, as the ranking of the Buddha and a disciple was so different, and it was believed even if it had been taken it could not be digested. In the Mahâratnakûta Sutra it says, "The supervising Bhikku should not give away the things offered to Sakyamuni, even if superfluous, to resident or itinerant priests, because priests as well as laymen are to remember that even a piece of string offered to him is the Buddha's. If a suit of clothes were offered to the tomb (Stupa) of Buddha, it should rather be left there, even to be decayed by the weather. The clothes should not be traded with any other goods because they are above valuation by people, and they belong to the Buddha himself." The above scriptures are supposed to have been traditionally spoken either in the Dharmagupta school or

in a part of Mahâyâna sutras of the same origin. Here we notice extremely puritanic uneconomic ideas in Dharmagupta and its followers. In them the ideas of Sakyamuni of economical rationality in moderationism, and his teachings on equality and self effacement are suppressed. The idea of the prohibition of the use of old clothes offered to the tomb of Sakyamuni as sacriligious, is a mysticism or an asceticism common in the religions of India. They are somewhat similar to the Catholic thought of charging no interest in the medieval ages in Europe, but were not permissible in Buddhism which was thoroughly rational, practical, and utilitarian. To give away the clothes once offered to the tomb of Sakyamuni to the poor was a fulfilling of the Buddhist ideal of mercy, and even reasonable from the view point of the utilization of the clothes. Such biased views as those by Dharmagupta did not develop in Buddhist history.

At the same time, the schools of Sarvâstivâdin keep the record that the merchants of Vaisâli persuaded Bhikku and sold the offerings to the tomb of Sakyamuni in order to earn the expense of its maintenance. (3) As long as they were offerings to the tomb, the trade must have been done after the death of Sakyamuni but the code took the form that such was done according to his approval. The further developed scrip-

tures of Sarvâstivâdin say that some Inexhaustibles (Ak-saṇikâ) were offered as alienation in mortmain as the construction funds of the housing for priests. (4) The particulars of the Inexhaustibles are unknown but it is understandable that they were not to be preserved in a treasury but were the objectives for trading in order to earn income. Sakyamuni permitted the earning of honest profit for the benefit of the priests and his followers, in helping the above purpose, utilizing such properties which belonged to the Three Treasures in trading. Furthermore, the Buddha is said to have particularly regulated the utilization of the Inexhaustibles in his instructions that the articles offered for pawning should have double the value of the money loaned, Documentary agreements had to be written, on which the guarantee, the date of contract, the names of the supervising authority and competent party had to be put down. It is probable that these are not the words of Sakyamuni, but the public rules made by a certain school of Sarvâstivâdin in later ages. The letting or trading of the monastery's properties, as in the above examples, was not only practiced by a sect of Sarvâstivâdin, but transactions of the same nature are recorded in the Mahâsamghika school as well as in Yogabhûmi and other Mahâyâna sutras (6) (7) whereby it is conceivable that financial transactions in Buddhism were carried out on

a considerably large scale. The more conspicuous activities of the same nature are described in the Buddhist history of China. One of them by MUJINZON (The Inexhaustibles Temple) which was sponsored by the donors of KEDOJI temple in the first half of the 7th century is recorded. In this case, the offerings by the general public were described as innumerable, consisting of money, silk, gold, and jewels. One third of them was used for the construction and repairing of temples, another third for alms-giving, and the remaining third for the Inexhaustible funds, (8) which was termed "funds for cereals for priests", "Long Life Funds", or "Pawn Money" etc. In Japan the temples in NARA invested widely for the benefit of the Three Treasures. The temple's trade money as related in the preceding lines is one of the examples of the sort. Such practices became more popular in and after the ASHIKAGA Period (the early part of the 14th century) and was called MUJIN (Inexhaustible) or TANOMOSHI (MOSHI meant mother and child, viz. capital and interest). These trading professions originated of course, in the Buddhists ideas of liberty and self-effacement in moderationism, and at the same time it has to be remembered that they were rooted in the spirit of mercy in the relief of poor people, and also as bringing prosperity to the general public. For this we appeal for

sincere reflection by present-day Buddhists.

- (1) **Vinaya of Dharmagupta Vol. 33 (Taisho edition**

Vol. 22, p. 798)
- Vol. 50 (,, p. 936)**
- (2) ,, **Vol. 50 (,, p. 645)**
- (3) **Vinaya of Sarvâstivadin Vol. 56 (Taisho edition**

Vol. 23, p. 415)
- (4) **Vinaya of Mûlasarvâstivadin Vol. 22 (Taisho edition**

Vol. 23, p. 741-743)
- (5) **Vinaya of Mahâsamghika Vol. 10 (Taisho edition**

Vol 22, p. 311)
- (6) **Yogabhûmi (Taisho edition Vol. 30, p. 534)**
- (7) **Bodhisattvabhûmi (,, ,, p. 926)**
- (8) **TAIHEIKOKI, p. 493**



MODERN SIGNIFICANCE OF BUDDHISM IN WORLD THOUGHTS

by Shokin Furuta

Prof. Hokkaido University

THE co-existence of opposing elements as they are is becoming more and more difficult ; co-existence apparently means the most severe antagonistic relations. Germany and Korea are separated into two parts respectively. The world is divided into U.S.S.R. satellites and U.S.A. sympathizers. Thus Orient and Occident are clearly differentiated. The progress of modern science and advanced means of transportation by air are making the world smaller both in time and space. However, it appears impossible for us to expect an early solution of this antagonism. In the case of religions, antagonism should and could be avoided from the viewpoint of the spirit of friendship which exists in every one of them. As it is, opposition among religions is inevitable, and is more profound and stronger than in other fields of human activity. The antagonism between Islam and Hinduism almost makes us believe that the harmonious co-existence of religions can never be realized. Turning to the religious situation in Japan, we have no difficulty in finding many examples of antagonism among religions, Christianity and Buddhism for example,

although intellectuals are not led by religious passion in openly attacking the religions which they do not embrace. We cannot help feeling keenly the difficulty of the harmonious co-existence of religions.

Then, must we say that Buddhism too is destined, like other religions of the world, to find itself shadowed by antagonism? Buddhism is often called the religion of tolerance. Why is it so called?

Buddhism, in the history of its propagation in Japan, cannot be said to have been entirely free from antagonism, but cases of harmony are far more predominant than those of opposition. Judging from this, Buddhism has more elements of harmony than those of antagonism. Therefore, the antagonism among religions is not inevitable to Buddhism. We have to say that Buddhism is indeed a religion of conciliation rather than one of antagonistic opposition.

Such elements or characteristics of Buddhism have a great significance in the thought of the world. Considering the position of Buddhism as a world religion, it can be said to have something significant to offer to a world beset with a great variety of antagonisms. I contributed to the *Mainichi* an article entitled "Buddhism without Buddhism", in which I expressed my opinion that the hope of the ideological conciliation between East and West depends solely upon the ideas and characteristics peculiar

to Buddhism. I am going to reiterate and advance the same opinion in order to emphasize that Buddhism is a religion without antagonism, and also that as such it has a great significance in the thought of the world.

In my belief, the greatest philosophical problem in the 20th century is how to realize a reconciliation of East and West in their ways of thinking. Here the contact of Buddhism and Christianity comes into the picture.

In Japan, it was in the 16th century that Buddhism came into contact with Christianity for the first time. The contact, however, was of a limited nature, due to the missionary work of Christianity, and did not present such an ideological problem as is seen nowadays. Now Buddhism and Christianity have to conciliate each other in some way. Their contact is of course a part of the multi-sided contact between East and West. Christianity is about to find its way into Japan, a Buddhist country. The contact is unprecedentedly great. On the other hand, intellectuals of the West are coming to be interested in Buddhism. Here again the contact will be on a large scale.

The conciliation between Buddhism and Christianity, the two most essentially different religions, is a matter of the future. There is no predicting. But, judging from the elements or characteristics of Buddhism, a harmonious conciliation appears to be possible. I believe that the elements or characteristics of Buddhism boil down

to “Buddhism without Buddhism”. In other words, it is a Buddhism stripped of its qualities as one of the religions of the world.

The expression “Buddhism without Buddhism” may be misleading. By it, I mean that the teaching of Buddhism is by its nature, not to be restricted by sectarian elements. Buddhism is not a religion which limits its contents by opposing other religions. The real significance of Buddhism lies in the unlimitedness based upon sectarian elements.

We cannot find in the original teaching of Buddhism any specific and fixed idea of sectarian egotism. This characteristic of Buddhism is worthy of note. Buddhism is the teaching of the Buddha, the enlightened one, that teaches us the way to enlightenment. The enlightened one is the person who has attained the truth, and this truth is not accepted by one of the sects. It can be said all the doctrines and teachings through which one can attain the truth are contained in Buddhism. If I am allowed to speak from the point of view of Buddhism, Christianity itself cannot be but Buddhism in that it shows, in the end, the way to the truth. Buddhism and Christianity have respectively their own history, and I am not disregarding their historical background in saying that the two are one. What I mean is that Buddhism is devoid of elements for opposition to other religions because

it denies itself as a religion by being a religion without deity. Essentially there is nothing to be antagonistic about towards other religions.

The word Buddhism is a vague term. On its way to Japan going through India and China, Buddhism has been divided into sects due to difference of interpreting its contents. However, despite many historical changes, Buddhism is essentially the teaching of the enlightened one through which one can become enlightened. In this sense, it can be said that any teaching which brings truth to light is Buddhism. Opposition to other religions owing to sectarian egotism is not possible for Buddhism.

Such a transcendental nature of Buddhism is very comprehensive. It is most clearly manifested in the words of Chinese Zen monks. Let me cite an example. The Zen master Yün-mên-wen-yen (949) said, “Chien-shih-chüeh”, in answer to the question by a priest, “What is the Buddha?” *Chien* means “dried” and *shih-chueh* a kind of dirt-scraper.

Words exchanged among Zen priests are often mistakenly regarded as something very unusual having nothing to do with common sense. Yün-mên’s answer should not be understood as an effort to identify the sacred with the filthy. What the great priest intended was the destruction of the fixed idea of the sacredness of the Buddha which the disciple

had expected to find in his master's answer. Of course, the Zen master thought of the Buddha as the Enlightened one but at the same time believed that his existence should not be a limited one. Yün-mên thus expressed his view that truly the enlightened one was illimitable and could be known by any name. "Chien-shih-chüeh" may be an extreme case, but there is no exception to what is universally inclusive. Such must have been the idea the Zen master tried to express emphatically by that concise answer. If Yun-men had known Christianity, he might have said, the "God of Christianity", in answer to the question asking for the definition of the Buddha as illimitable and therefore not opposing. Thus the Buddha is all in his way of thinking. Tung-shan-shou-chu too (910—990) was asked the question, "What is the Buddha?" He said by way of answer, "Ma-san-chin." Literally it means, "The hemp weighs three lbs." The noun and the numeral in the answer can be substituted by any set of them. What was said by the above two priests can have meaning only when they are uttered by enlightened persons. The Buddha is by nature inclusive and consequently can be identified with Christ. In this sense, Buddhism never stands in opposition to Christianity.

However, I do not mean to say that although Buddha can be identified with Christ, there is no difference between Buddhism and Christianity. They are different

religions. Their conciliation is not their identification. What I want to clarify is that from the point of view of Buddhism without Buddhism we can find in Buddhism a passage through which the two religions can be harmoniously conciliated. In Japan Buddhism was conciliated with Shinto. The conciliation, we might say, was due to what could be called the fundamental nature of Buddhism without Buddhism. It can be said that Buddhism must embrace be endowed with the ability to the thoughts of the world.

If Buddhism and Christianity are opposed to each other as the two great religions of the world, the antagonism between East and West will certainly be intensified in the field of religion. However, religion should be the first in man's activities to dissolve the antagonism. It is our duty to let the entire world know that Buddhism is the most comprehensive religion free from antagonism.

I believe that herein lies the role of Buddhism to cope with the ideas of the world.

12

THE TRAGEDY OF WESTERNIZATION

by Shinn Yamamoto

Westernization means that non-western civilization accepts western ideas, institutions and technology. This socio-cultural phenomenon has appeared in the non-western world from two or three centuries ago. Leaving it as it is without reflection or resistance, it may lead to perfect westernization, that is, the suicide of non-western civilization. For western civilization will penetrate to all parts of the non-West and disturbs the unity of the indigenous civilization and finally may lead us from the present disintegration to dissolution.

But westernization is inevitable for us. At least, as for technology, it is so. Japan attempted to accept only western technology prudently. It was the aim of "Wakonyosai" (Japanese soul with western Technology). But it is impossible to accept only technology and reject the rest. The Japanese soul has been affected by the western soul. It was the spiritual situation of our intelligentsia in the Taisho Era. The reaction to it broke out in the Pacific War. It was not fertile, for it was an archaistic and anti-

foreign politico-moral movement. If it were purely ✓ cultural, Buddhism would have been selected among the cultural heritages. Unhappily, Shintoism was chosen as the leading principle. It was sterile. We were defeated on the battlefield of resistance against westernization.

Then we realized, that westernization was the inevitable current and that it was very difficult to resist this current. But we can not stop resisting. The modernization of the non-west is something beyond westernization and its process is very tortuous. If we are not creative, we may be assimilated to western civilization. But if we are vital and creative, we may have a narrow escape. We must find a creative way.

THE BUDDHIST CONCEPTION OF PEACE AND THE METHOD OF ITS REALIZATION

By Shobun Kubota,

Professor, Rissho University and Meiji University

(I) What is the Buddhist conception of peace? The answer may well be stated: Buddhism is the teaching of peace. According to the Buddhist doctrine, one can attain "Nirvana," the highest state of enlightenment, by acquiring and continuously maintaining peace in one's spirit. International peace can be realized when each individual has attained such a state of spiritual tranquility; then this mundane world will be transformed into "Sukhavati," the Buddhist Paradise.

(II) The founder of Buddhism was Gautama Siddhartha, to be known later as the "Buddha," meaning the "Enlightened." He renounced a life of worldly comfort and became a religious mendicant, then after a severe test he emerged into the state of enlightenment, to be revered by his followers as the Buddha.

Undoubtedly Buddha was a genius endowed with rich religious sentiments. But what led him to create a new faith was the social environment in which he lived. In this connection, the following three points deserve parti-

cular mention.

i. There was bitter conflicts among nations in the Indian Sub-continent at that time.

ii. Multitudes of people suffered from social discrimination due to the rigid maintenance of the four-caste system.

iii. The Brahmanic religion could not provide the solution of these problems.

It may be said that Gautama Siddhartha established a religion in order to give a solution to these problems. Particularly significant was the fact that Buddha did not come from the Brahman caste, which was entrusted with the conduct of religious ceremonies and rituals; instead he came from the Kshatriya or military caste. Born as the son of a ruler, Gautama Siddhartha might perhaps have conquered the whole India if he had had such an ambition. But he did not pursue such a course. He knew that conquest by force will receive retaliation sooner or later. Instead, he chose a path that leads to the realization of peace among individuals and nations. This is Buddhism. The Buddhist conception of peace is here, and this is the reason why Buddhism is called the teaching of peace.

(III) As to the method of realizing peace, the ultimate objective of Buddhism, it is necessary.

i. to apply the true spirit of Buddha to the affairs of

our contemporary world,

ii. to enlarge and strengthen the functions of the present World Buddhist Conference, and

iii. to promote cooperation among various organizations of the World dedicated to peace.

In order to facilitate these, it is desired to set up an organization to conduct liaison among the Buddhist nations of the world.

THE BUDDHIST VIEW OF WAR

N. Ito

(1)

ALL religions are against war since it is a total destruction and a cruel massacre. In Buddhism, non-killing is the first of the five precepts to be observed by its followers. Because war is the great violation of the precept of non-killing, it is natural that Buddhists should be against war.

Since the beginning of human history, wars have been incessant. The progress of culture or civilization cannot prevent them. As a matter of fact, the progress of civilization is enlarging the scale of cruelty and massacre.

Buddhists have been maintaining in vain their protest against war from the standpoint of the precept of non-killing.

The problems to be considered now are as follows :

- ✓ 1. The prevention of war and establishment of eternal peace constitute the ideal of Buddhists. Buddhists should do all in their power for that purpose. However, should their assertion be regarded as what Kant called a postulate ?

2. In the history of mankind, the prevention of war has never been realized. Can Buddhists be allowed, in view of this, to shift from an absolute attitude to a relative one in their protest against wars?

Let us put aside the precept of no-killing for the time being and discuss war from a general Buddhist point of view.

(2)

Wars are often referred to in the scriptures of Buddhism, because in the days of the Buddha there were wars. The Buddhist view of war could be best deduced by a comparative study of references to war in thousands of the sutras. Such a comparative study, however, is too great a task for a man to carry out. The alternative is to draw a conclusion from the doctrinal point of view. It is to begin with the study of the fundamental teachings of Buddhism in order to pass judgement on war.

Q. 2 According to the fundamental doctrines of Buddhism, all things are impermanent, have primary and environmental causes, and have no substance. From this point of view, we could say that 1. war is a suffering that appears as a part of human life, 2. a war is not an independent being in itself, and therefore 3. the removal of suffering, or ignorance which causes suffering, will prevent war.

We can also discuss war in connection with Cakravartiraja (Wheel-rolling King or Gold-wheel-rolling King), who is the ideal king of Buddhism. The king is the Buddhist incarnation of the ideal of politics. Therefore, we can consider war in terms of the king. In this case, however, the conclusion could be the approval of war because the use of armed forces could be regarded as one of the prerogatives of a king. The armed forces were regarded as one of the seven treasures of the king. The six other treasures were gold wheels, white elephants, blue horses, gems, ladies, and rich men.¹

The above-mentioned method of proving by doctrines can be applied to a large variety of problems and in its application we have to be cautious. First of all, the interpretation of the fundamental teaching of Buddhism on which the discussion is to be based allows the possibility of many different opinions. The existence of many sects in Buddhism is the proof. What the Buddha taught was so profound that many ways of interpretation were possible. In the second place, even if a specific way of interpretation of the Buddha's doctrines were established, there would still be left enough room for subjective opinions of the persons who interpret them or apply them to human life. Thus opinions would differ. It would be possible to make assertions contradictory to the precept of non-killing. Thirdly, in view of such a

logical possibility, Buddhists should always bear in mind that the fundamental doctrines of the Buddha are to abide by the Middle Way instead of going to extremes. People are apt to forget it and look for conclusions favorable to themselves.²

In short, the above method of reasoning is liable to lead people to the idea that the end justifies the means. Therefore, it could be said that a more appropriate study of the relation between Buddhism and war would be through its literature.

(3)

In Buddhist scriptures, the king or the state is very often treated. As is well known, in some sutras it is the main theme. Therefore, war is naturally discussed in them. It would take much time to collect such references. We are lucky to have the Maha-Satya-Nirgrantha Sutra in which war is discussed at some length.

A detailed study of the sutra is not to our purpose. According to the generally assepted theory, most of the earliest Mahayana sutras were compiled in the period of the Kushana Dynasty. In those days syncretic trents were quite strong in the field of religion, and Mahâyâna sutras were ideologically influenced by various sources from outside, as exemplified by the *Saddharmapundarika Sûtra*. The sûtra in question could be regarded as showing the

further progress of the syncretic tendency, and so it must definitely have been compiled later than the *Saddharma-pundarika Sûtra*.³ Then it can be said that the sūtra was compiled some time after the 2nd century.

The affairs related in this sūtra were, however, those of the days of the Buddha. The question concerns the degree of modification of such affairs due to the state of things in the days of the compilation of the sūtra. The result of a most careful historical study would solve this question. Such a study is not within the scope of this article.

(4)

In India of the days of the Buddha, the Aryans were engaged in agriculture, handicraft and trade in the valley of the river Ganges after they migrated from Punjab to the middle reaches of the river and then spread over the lower valley. Many cities came into being in these districts. They became the centers of states based on the caste system. Of such states, Kosala, Magada, Avanti and Vamsa were more powerful ones. They were ruled by kings. Freedom of thought was enjoyed there, and, as indicated in the sūtras, many thinkers were very active in asserting their respective opinions. The situation was apparently similar to that in China in the Age of Civil Wars, which was almost contemporary.⁴

Jainism was the most influential religion at that time. Mahâ-Satya-Nirgantha was the son of the founder of Jainism, Nigantha Nâthaputta, respectfully called Mahâvira. Mahâ-Satya-Nirantha⁵ was a Jain but his doctrines were admitted by the Buddha as true and just. He was assured of Buddhahood by the Buddha. Thus, his theory was approved by the Buddha and expounded in the *Mahâ-Satya-Nirgrantha Pûta*.⁶

The sutra tells a story, the plot of which is as follows :

Accompanied by many disciples, the Buddha went to Avanti. In Ujjayini,⁷ the capital, Buddha preached in a park of the king. Mahâ-Satya happened to be on his way to the capital together with his disciples. The king, a Jain, went to meet Mahâ-Satya and escorted him to the palace to entertain him. Mahâ-Satya praised the virtue and insight of the Buddha and advised the king to go to the park to see him and listen to his preaching. Then the king and high officials of the court accompanied Mahâ-Satya to the Buddha. Thus the Buddha found himself in the great assembly of Manjusri, Sâriputra, Mandgalyâyana, Mahâ-Satya, the king and others. In answering a question from the king, Mahâ-Satya expounded his own views on war and politics. The Buddha approved his views.

This story is related in Chapter V, "The Question of the King". Section 3 of the chapter, which deals with

Mahâ-Satya's views, may be summarized in the following way.

(5)

The king's question included two hypotheses, that is, 4 civil war and invasion.^{7a} In other words, the king wanted to know if he should go to war when he was threatened by a rebellion, or when his country was about to be invaded. First of all, Mahâ-Satya told the king of the necessity of the most careful meditation,⁸ and then explained the matters to be meditated and measures to be taken. Mahâ-Satya divided the emergency into three stages. In the first stage, the king was told, there are three points for meditation.

1. Reconciliation should be aimed at on the ground that hostilities only hurt both parties. For that purpose, a man of high virtue, a trustworthy person or a good friend of the rebel leader or the invading king should be selected as the mediator. 2. If the enemy should be so confident of his victory that he should not accept the proposal of reconciliation, the king should prevent the opening of hostilities by giving him what he wanted to have. 3. The king should reinforce his army to make it invincible so that the enemy might give up the idea of opening hostilities through terror. These are the measures in the first stage recommended by Mahâ-Satya.

In the second stage in which the above three steps have proved to be of no avail, Mahâ-Satya continued, it is necessary to try another set of three steps. 1. The king should make up his mind to have the compassion to protect his people against the enemy that is going to kill them recklessly. 2. The king should make every effort to make the enemy surrender. 3. The king should do everything in order to deprive the enemy of the freedom of action so that the war might be prevented. He said that these efforts come out of Buddhist compassion.

(6)

He went on to say that, only when all the above measures should turn out to be futile, should the king resort to the war of defence. In other words, the king is allowed to fight, against the precept of non-killing.

After expounding his theory, Mahâ-Satya explained the tactics. Of course, the tactics reflect the conditions of the state, a small one in India of the 5th century, BC, when weapons were very primitive. The army of those days consisted of elephant units, horse units, and infantry units. Mahâ-Satya began with the stationing of his army. (a) The army should be divided into three groups according to the degree of strength. (b) Each of these groups should be stationed properly. (c) In the first line, the troops in the second and lower grades of the

top group should be placed. The troops of the second group were to be sent to the second line. (d) On both wings of the first and second lines, the troops of the first grade of the top group should be placed, so that the weaker units of infantry might be protected and be prevented from panic. (e) The king should go to war field with the best of his troops. War - not war.

Then the king, Mahâ-Satya added, could be sure of his victory for the following five reasons.⁹ 1. The men are well aware of the fact that the king has done everything to maintain peace. 2. They are awed by the king's virtue. 3. They will try not to disgrace themselves for the sake of the king. 4. They will not worry about the home front. 5. They will try to compensate for their indebtedness to the king and to fight it out.

(7)

At any rate, a war is the violation of the precept of non-killing. However, a forced war of defence as mentioned above is not regarded as a grave violation. The sin will be forgiven after repentance. It is because the king does the three things before the war, out of Mahâ-maitri (Great Compassion). The king is entitled to unlimited happiness for his efforts in making his people religious, protecting them, and trying to maintain peace in an emergency at the risk of his life and wealth. The

king should be blessed and not blamed when he is forced to declare war after doing everything in his power to settle the situation without fighting.¹⁰

(8)

The conclusions deducted from the sūtra are as follows :

1. War is sin because it is the greatest violation of the Buddhist precept of non-killing.

2. Against a challenge, every effort should be made to make possible a peaceful solution even with some concessions.

3. When the challenging nation does not accept the proposal for negotiations, hostilities should be opened.

4. Even this war is a violation of the precept, but is not a great sin. If it is a war of defence to protect the country and the people, the king is not committing a sin, but is to be blessed.

This is the Buddhist view of war. Similar ideas can be found in other religions, too.¹¹ Especially, the idea of a “Just War” in Christianity is a corresponding one.¹² The idea was first advocated by St. Augustine (354-430), who held a unique and important position in the Christian world.¹³ After being studied by many Christian scholars, this theory was completed by Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century. Since then, it has been the established theory in Catholicism¹⁴ St. Thomas explained why a

war should not necessarily be regarded as a sin. He said that a war is not a sin, 1. if it can be sanctioned by the king autoritas principis, 2. if it has a just cause (Justa Causa), namely, if it has the reason to attack the enemy for its fault (Propter aliquam culpam), or 3. if the fighter wishes to reward the good and punish the wicked. The first of the three conditions was due to the European feudalism. The greatest importance was attached to the second one, Justa Causa. The classification of wars into just and unjust ones depended upon the existence of the just cause.

The theory of the just war was carefully studied by scholars belonging to the Catholic Church.¹⁵ The study was continued in modern times by the Spanish school, regarded as the forerunner in the study of international law. Grotius was so much influenced by the theory that his work in international law devoted much space for the discussion of war. In the 19th century, the theory was abandoned by positivists of international law. However, it must not be overlooked that even since then scholars of Catholic inclination have been advocating the “Just War” theory,¹⁶ and also that Soviet international jurists are developing the similar theory.¹⁷

The present writer does not intend to discuss the theory of the just war as the European and American scholars did in the 19th century. What should be pointed out

here is that, although the positivism advocated by most of the Western scholars in the 19th century is apt to be regarded as scientific, yet something more than positivism, namely introduction of value-concept, would be necessary in order to see that the international law gives a proper criterion to political reality. From this point of view, the theory of the just war developed by the Catholic Church needs careful study. In the second place, a judgement based on the idea of the just war is easily liable to subjective opinions, and consequently, an objective decision becomes very difficult.

We can, therefore, say with certainty that the view of war expressed in the Buddhist scriptures has more objective elements as a criterion of judgement, making an objective decision easier. In the language of today, what is stated in the Mahâ-Satya-Nirgrantha Sûtra is as follows :

1. The war of aggression should be avoided.
2. The war of defence should be permitted.
3. The use of force in a war of defence (presupposing the holding of armaments before the war) is not a great sin.

NOTE

1. See the *Bukkyô no Senso-kan* (The Buddhist View of War), by Tomojiro Hayashiya and Keimei Shima, Daitô Shuppan Sha Co., Tokyo, 1937, p. 19 f.

2. *Ibid.* This book, written in 1937 before the beginning of the World War II, should be read taking into consideration the world situations of the time.
3. Dr. Hajime Nakamura says that this sūtra was formed in the latter days of the period of the formation of Mahāyāna sūtras. See the *Daijō Bukkyō no Seiritsu-shi-teki Kenkyū* (Studies on the formation of Mahāyāna Buddhism), edited by Shōson Miyamoto, 1954, p. 384. Dr. Nakamura does not give the date of the formation of this sūtra. He says that the compromising attitude of the Mahāyānists shown in the *Saddharmapundarīka* developed in the time of the formation of the *Mahā-Satya-Nirgrantha* and *Mahā-Parinirvāna* to the extent that other religions than Buddhism were given a *raison d'être* in Buddhism. See his *Indo Shisō-shi* (A History of Indian Thought), p. 123. But this view may be interpreted differently.
4. The four countries were Avanti, Kosala, Magadha, and Vamsa. The details of the information on these countries are given in the *An Advanced History of India*, by R.C. Majumdar, H.C. Raychandhun & Kalikindlar Data, London, 1950, p. 57 f. Political History of Ancient India, by Hemchandra Raychandhuri, 1953, Part II. For the Indian thoughts of the time, there are many works in Western Languages. In Japanese, Prof. H. Nakamura's book, *Indo Shiso-shi*, 1957, gives a suscent but sufficient explanation.
5. This is called in Japanese *Daisassha-nikenji*.
6. The *Daisassha-Nikenshi-Shosetsu-Kyō* (The Discourse

of Mahâ-Satya-Nirgrantha) or Daisassa-Nikenji-Juki-Kyô (Assurance of Buddhahood to Mahâ-Satya-Nirgrantha), 10 vols., translated by Bodhiruci. The *Taisho*, Vol. 9. The Sanskrit original has not yet been found.

This sūtra is explained in the *Daizôkyô Yôgi* (An Outline of Mahâyâna Sūtras), by Nisshô Honda, Vol. 1, and in Hajime Nakamura's article in the *Daijô Bukkyô no Seiritsu-shi-teki Kenkyû*. But these explanations are too terse to cover the subject in question.

7. The modern Ujjain.
- 7a. It should be noted that a war, which is a conflict between two nations, is considered as being different from a civil war, which is a conflict within a nation. In each case, the conflict is expressed by the term "fight". From the standpoint of Buddhism, there is no difference between a war and a civil war, because both are against the precept of non-killing.
8. The word *cintanam* means to think in the light of Great Compassion of the Buddha, not to think aimlessly.
9. In regard to the following five points, Nisshô Honda says, "Moral education should be given constantly to the men so that they become good soldiers who can advance boldly and never retreat." (*Daizôkyô Yôgi*, Vol. 1, pp. 184-5.). This interpretation may be admissible, but the interpretation given here seems more natural.
10. The original text is in the *Taisho*, Vol. 9, p. 337-8, *Daisassa-Nikenshi-Shosetsu-Kyô*, Vol. 5, Chapter V,

Ôronbon (The Ouestion of the King), Section 3.

11. It seems that Islam has a special position in this respect. Islam is based on the Koran; therefore, the study of the Korean is required for the solution of the problem. Judging from the law books written by Moslem lawyers, it seems that Moslems think of wars differently from Buddhists and Christians. Majid Khadari (Bagdad) says that Moslems are jingoistic (*The Law of War and Peace in Islam*, 1941). See also Haneberg: *Das Muslimische Knegsrecht*, 1891, and Jurje: *The Islamic Theory of War* (Moslem World, XXX, 1940).
12. This is held by Christians, but this idea comes from Roman Law. It originates from the idea of “Bellum justum et pium” (a just and pious war), which developed from *Collegium Fetialium* conceived during the period of the Roman Kings about 500 years B. C. This idea was brought into the Christian Church in Rome, but it was not supported by the Christian Church in the Eastern Roman Empire and the Orthodox Church in the Medieval Age. Justinian’s *Corpus Juris Civilis* does not mention *Fetiales*.
13. For this view held by St. Augustine, see (1) Cambes, *La doctrine politique de Saint-Augustine*, (Hire Bordeaux, 1927).
Kostus, *le droit des geus dez Saint-Augustine*, (Rcv. Dr. Jut. 1933).
14. The theory held by St. Thomas is explained in detail in the *Summa Theologica*, Part II.
15. See Vanderpol *La doctrine Scholastique de Droit de* June, 1919. This book is very helpful, because it

contains the translations of important parts of the text made in the Medieval Age.

16. Important reference books are written since the beginning of the 20th century are by Salvioli (1918), Guyau (1925), Regout (1934), Cugr de Solages (1947), etc.
17. For further research in this field, the view on international law held by the government authorities of the Soviet Russia must be studied. See, for example Korovin, E. *Kratki Kurs Meznarodnoro Pravo*, Moskva, 1942.

15

BUDDHISM AND THE WESTERN SYSTEM OF PRODUCTION

by Fumio Masutani

Of all the races of Asia, we were among the last one to embrace the teachings of the Buddha. On the other hand, we were the first to adopt the Western system of production. Concerning the relations between Buddhism and that system, we can say that, from the Buddhist point of view, an antagonistic attitude should not be taken toward the system.

It is, of course, impossible to find in Buddhism such elements as positively support the Western system of production, since the religion came into being twenty-five centuries ago. What the Buddha taught was the way to cultivate the mental attitude of inner satisfaction and also how to get rid of avarice. He did not recommend seeking after the fulfilment of desires. Apparently, therefore, his idea was against the present system of production. For another thing, we can find among the precepts the Buddha set for bhikkhus, provisions preventing them from being engaged in production and trade. In view

of this it could be said that the Buddha was against the modern production system in this respect too. However, to regard Buddhism as antagonistic to the Western system of production for of such superficial reasons is to jump to a conclusion without logical thinking. Is it true that the Western way of production comes from avarice, and is against moral contentment? Did bhikkhus have to stay away from production and trade because they were vices from the Buddhist point of view? Let us discuss production and trade from the Buddhist standpoint.

In his famous work, *Die protestantische Ethik und der "Geist" des Kapitalismus* (1904-'05), Max Weber (1864-1920) treated the Western system of production in detail. His theory is of interest to us. According to him, the system was not a friend of avarice at all, but closely related to strict self-denial based on the idea of identifying the profession with the calling (Beruf) of God. He believed that those people who dedicated themselves to the cursed desire for gold, old as the history of humanity, were not the ones who built up the modern system of production.

Here arises a problem which is more important to us. The existing production system has developed into the present form on the basis of the idea of identifying the profession with the calling of God. Then what idea can support the system when it is introduced to Asia which

is morally and spiritually different from Europe? More precisely, can Buddhism be an effective mainstay of the new system which is being introduced to Asia?

In discussing this problem it is necessary to know the state of affairs in the society where Buddhism was created. In Buddhist literature, we are told clearly who listened to the Buddha's teachings, and who supported him. They were the warrior (Kshatriya) class centering around kings (Râja) and a new class of common people represented by capitalists (Sreshthin). In those days, the clan society was giving place to the civil society. Such cities as Râjagaha and Sôvatthi were being established as the centers of civil societies. With cities as the basis, kings were setting up a new political system. Capitalists were establishing a new production system relying on guilds. Under such circumstances, the Buddha became the moral supporter of this society. He taught people, on the basis ✓ of the idea of causation (paticcasumuppâda), to get rid of ignorance, avarice, and recommended equality, moderation, and devotion. His ideology and system of practice were well organized.

Is that Buddhism which in those days played such a great part is no more able to be the mainstay of the ✓ modern system of production? Such a way of thinking is groundless. The real value of the Buddha's view of the world based upon the idea of causation is to appear

in the new era of science too. Never before was the need keener for that removal of avarice, anger, and ignorance on which the Buddha placed such emphasis. The equality, moderation, and devotion which he advocated will add to the happiness of mankind when they are related to the modern system of production.

Concerning the problem of production and trade, we have to look into the essential nature of the bhikkhu. According to the sutra entitled Pindolya (Samyuttanikâya, 22, 80), the Buddha one day called new bhikkhus. Before them he said, "Bhikkhus, you shave your heads, carry bowls with you, and beg from door to door for food. Such is your way of living. To live by begging is the humblest way of life. However, many fine people are leading begging lives. It is because they have great purposes."

✓ The "great purpose" in the above passage is the free translation of the original word *attha*, which means what we pursue as good. In order to attain what is good and excellent, we have to concentrate our efforts on its attainment, and cast other matters away, because it is concentration and resolution that make possible the attainment of something good and excellent. Concentration and resolution are born from great renunciation. To leave the secular world is nothing but the manifestation of renunciation, resolution, and concentration. In view

monks attain enlightenment, but also at saving all the other people, that is, the laity. The Prince's commentary was substantially based on the commentary written by Fa-yun of Kuang-chai-ssū Temple, a great Buddhist scholar in the Liang Period. Fa-yün's commentary was among the books imported from China by the Prince. In interpreting this part of the sūtra, however, the Prince stated explicitly that he did not follow Fa-yün's commentary. He had his own standpoint in commenting on the sūtra. In this commentary, he tried to explain the true purpose of Buddha Śākyamuni. Everything he did in his life was for the purpose of bringing the true teachings of the Buddha into practice.

For the past thirteen centuries and a half after the death of the Prince, Japanese Buddhism has developed into various sects. The doctrines of these sects are different from each other in many points, but common in one thing, that the teachings of the various sects of Japanese Buddhism constitute the leading principle of the daily life of the Japanese people at large.

16

PRINCE SHOTOKU AND BUDDHISM

by Shinsho Hanayama

WE are very glad to have a meeting of the representatives of various nations in Asia for the celebration of the 2,500th year of the Buddhist Era.

Buddhism was introduced into Japan about fourteen centuries ago. The first Japanese to interpret Buddhism in the Japanese way was Prince Shotoku. The Prince Regent ruled Japan for thirty years. Through his administrative activities during this period, the imported Buddhism was made Japanese Buddhism, by which Buddhist-colored Japanese culture was created. He was a sincere lay devotee. He promulgated the "Seventeen-article Constitution", the first national Constitution to be written in Japan. He lectured on sūtras at the court, made Buddhist images, and erected temples and pagodas. He despatched envoys to China and imported Buddhist books from there. With reference to these books, he wrote an eight-volume commentary on three Mahāyāna sūtras. This commentary was the first book to appear in Japan. The MSS. of four of the eight volumes, which cover his commentary on the

Saddharmapundarīka, have been preserved without damage as a treasure of the Imperial Family.

It seems that the Prince learned much from the attitude of Vimalakīrti, a layman whose words and deeds are given in the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*. According to the sūtra, the layman was once ill. The Buddha requested Śāriputra, his disciple, to go and inquire after him. The disciple refused, telling his master the following story. When he was sitting in meditation in a quiet forest in order to attain enlightenment, Vimalakīrti came to him. Seeing him sitting in meditation, in such a place for enlightenment.”

To Śāriputra, a visit to Vimalakīrti meant another chance to be scolded. Prince Shotoku explained the reason why the layman scolded the monk in the following way. Śāriputra was a Hanayana Buddhist after all. The monk thought that he could not sit in meditation for enlightenment in a noisy place. So he retired into a quiet forest. But Vimalakīrti thought differently. He thought that everything in this world is a treasure. Therefore, there is no difference between this and that, between forest and town, or between quietude and noise. We should not think that body differs from mind. If we realize this, any place is good for meditation, whether it is a noisy town or a house of laymen. This is the truth of the Void. Śāriputra did not realize this truth. He clung to the manifold phenomena of the objective world and thought

that all things were different from each other. He would not be able to get peace of mind even if he sat in meditation in a quiet place. So he was scolded by Vimalakīrti.

Vimalakīrti also says in the same sūtra, “To live a life as a layman without giving up the Buddhist practice is the true sitting.” The Prince comments on this sentence in the following way.

It means that if we understand the true teachings of the Buddha we can practise according to the teachings while we live as laymen. We laymen can lead people anywhere at any time in any condition or circumstance. To do this is to sit in meditation. Śāriputra did not realize this truth. He thought that one who wishes to attain enlightenment should leave home. He could not give up the difference between monkhood and the laity. He would not be able to attain enlightenment, even if he continued to sit in meditation in a quiet place.

This way of interpretation is also seen in his commentary on the *Saddharmapundarīka*. The Buddha says in this sūtra that a Bodhisattva should keep away from kings and princes, those who follow religions other than Buddhism, and woman and children, and also that a Bodhisattva should sit in meditation in a quiet mountain or forest.

This sūtra is one of the most excellent Mahāyāna sūtras composed in India in the period when Mahāyāna thought developed into the stage of the teaching of Ekayāna or

the One-vehicle. But it still retains in itself such primitive and Hīnayānaic teachings as those mentioned above. The Prince commented on these teachings in the following way.

To keep away from kings and princes means to give up pride and arrogance. One who comes into contact with dignitaries is liable to become proud of himself. This passage should not be read literally, but be interpreted as a precept against pride. To keep away from those who follow religions other than Buddhism means to be careful not to have wrong views. To keep away from women and children means to be careful not to love them blindly. It should not be interpreted literally. The Buddha's advice that a Bodhisattva should sit in meditation in a quiet mountain or forest should be interpreted negatively. In other words, the word "should" in this sentence should be read as "should not". If those who wish to attain enlightenment leave home, society, and the State, and enter into a mountain or a forest for sitting in meditation, nobody will be left in the world to propagate the teachings of the Buddha. The Mahāyāna Buddhists should not sit in meditation in quietude.

In this way the Prince interpreted the sūtra freely, sometimes even violating the original meaning, because he had his own philosophy, which he obtained from his understanding of the true meaning of Mahāyāna Buddhism. The teachings of Buddha Sākyamuni aimed at having

of this, Western Buddhist scholars often refer to the Buddha's departure from the secular life as the "great renunciation."

Such a way of life corresponds to that of professionals in the present society. When a man devotes himself to his profession, he forgets food and sleep, fame and wealth, and sometimes even his family. Then his renunciation, resolution, and concentration are established. The mental attitude of a professional in society of today might be regarded as similar to that of a bhikkhu. In other words, it could be said that a bhikkhu is a professional who devotes himself to the practice of the doctrines of the Buddha.

Bhikkhus had to stay away from production and trade. It was not because they were vices, or of no significance to people in general. It was simply because they did not constitute the "great purpose" (attha) itself. For illustration, let us think of marriage. It is indeed a great event in life but a bhikkhu remains single all through his life since he devotes himself to the endeavor to realize one great purpose without paying heed to other things. If all the people remained single without understanding the reason why bhikkhus did not marry, how could the human race be conserved? If, then, all the people imitated bhikkhus in staying away from production and trade, the life of man would be reduced to that of the

cave man.

✓ The mental attitude of the professional as seen in the life of a bhikkhu is increasing in importance in the present-day society. The Western system of production which we are now discussing is permeated with the professional way of thinking. The present standard of science is the result of the accumulated efforts of devoted scientists disregarding food and sleep. The present system of production is founded on their achievements. Engineers have been forgetting fame and wealth in constructing facilities which make possible the present production. Laborers too acquire concentration and skill through the professional way of thinking. Only with these factors combined can the present system of production be effective.

How to adopt the modern Western system of production is a matter of great significance to the countries of Asia, including ours. We should like to emphasize that Buddhism should not stand obstinately in the way of its adoption. We believe Buddhism should and can be the moral mainstay of the new system of production in Asia.

17

BUDDHISM VERSUS THE INDUSTRIAL CIVILIZATION NOW OVERWHELMING THE WORLD

1. Remarks on the present situation of the industrial civilization.

Up to now, specially to-day, science has not ceased to bewilder mankind with its wonderful achievements. Like children entering an amusement fair, we have not yet gotten over the pleasure of admiring these scientific marvels. Hardly have we realized the full implications of one discovery that another is already proclaimed. The fast development of science, the discoveries made during these fifty years overwhelm us and we have the impression that we are sitting in a plane which takes off too abruptly. The atomic era has begun with giant steps. The period from the discovery of electron and neutron to the first explosion of the two atomic bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki does not exceed a score of years. Two years after the truce, the atomic bombs tested in Bikini were a hundredfold more powerful than those dropped in Hiroshima and those atomic bombs tested in 1948 in Enitewok were

still a hundred fold more powerful than those tested in Bikini! In parallel with the lightning development of atomic bombs is the development of rockets. The time from the V1, V2 rockets crossing the Channel, the teleguided intercontinental missiles, the rockets carrying satellites like Spoutnik I, Spoutnik II, Atlas IV to the satellites orbiting around even the Sun, is only fifteen years.

Besides these strategic inventions and achievements, atomic energy has also been used in the economic and social field. We have already witnessed those atomic submarines and planes and soon, we will certainly have the opportunity of watching those trains launched into space to carry tourists from the Earth to other satellites. In many industrial branches, atomic energy has started to replace steam or electric energy and the energy of the atom helps mankind to gather results a millionfold bigger than those supplied by electricity and steam. If before, the chemical energy of a gramme of matter could give us about 40 large calories, now with the same amount of matter, we would produce an amount of heat which is equivalent to 22 billion great calories. With the energy supplied by the atom, we will see that soon, industrial production will be increased to an unimaginable extent.

The twentieth century man—(living in a century

which launches the atomic era)—must enjoy a most hopeful and promising life with no worries about clothes and food. With a longer life span, man knows how to contract the space of the universe, to live a life of plenty with the most modern conveniences which were never dreamed of by our predecessors 50 years ago. What surprises us is that man is always living in anxieties with all the cares gnawing at his heart. He worries about lack of food, clothes, shelter, unemployment war, disease and death. Man lives a hasty, hurried, fiery and impetuous life. Young people especially seek to discard worries and ignore realities with “Rock and Roll” and “hoola hoop” dances; they play with Death in breath taking speed car racing like Françoise Sagan, James Dean; they learn how to vomit with Paul Sartre, to acclaim and applaud swindles, betrayal, rapes, murders and robberies of those personages in the novels of the Japanese writer Shintaro Ishihara.

We are living in a world with really amazing contradictions: on the one hand, people are afraid of war; on the other, they hastily prepare for it. They produce abundance but they distribute misery. The world is getting more and more crowded and man feels more and more lonely. Men are living closely to each other as in a big family but each individual finds

himself separated from his partner more than ever.

II.—Is the present day gloomy situation the product of science and is science to be condemned?

When did the unstable, irrational, contradictory and sorrowful situation of the present day world originate? Could we lay the blame on science, machine and atomic energy? of course, not! To disapprove of science and reject machines was what oriental humanists like Okakura Kakuzo in Japan, Gandhi and even Tagore in India did with all their enthusiasm and sincerity, and to-day in the West, there is even a movement led by the intelligentsia aiming at fighting the harmful materialist civilization. The above-mentioned disapproval and protest did not bring any favourable result because, willy-willy we could not stop the powerful wave of the mechanical civilization now flooding the world. The attitude of anti-science, anti-mechanical civilization, is not a constructive attitude. Granted that science, in the eyes of mankind to-day, could not adequately solve the problems of existence in every angle but, at least, it has partly solved them specially in the material side of existence we should not condemn science because if we do so we are ungrateful, having forgotten the benefits which science has given mankind to-day.

Science, technique, machines are only mankind's

efficient instruments. They could harm man who in turn could also benefit by them. The best course is to investigate the cause of the disease, i.e. to find out the remote causes which lead mankind to the present day crisis and not to lay the blame on science and its achievements.

III.—Then, what are the causes of the crisis of the present day civilization?

The misery of mankind to-day lies among other things in the fact that man has too much honoured reason, and placed it on the supreme status. Mankind has believed that happiness could be secured through development of intelligence and reason. Reason has brought forth science. The child of reason has been pampered. Man puts all his hopes in it, believing that, with science, man could conquer nature, conquer all material obstacles and become master of the universe. Indeed, with reason and science, man could conquer nature and yet he has not secured happiness. Why is it that happiness is getting further and further away from us? Because, while cultivating and worshipping reason and getting passionately fond of science, man has forgotten that he has a heart, which has not been taken care of and has been left withered to be invaded by passions and lusts.

This lack of balance between the mind and heart

is the original cause of other lack of equilibrium, the cause of all kinds of crises, contradictions, breakdowns, miseries and sorrows in society. Men become strangers to their fellow-men; they become enemies and wolves. Men have reconciled themselves to throwing food into the sea rather than giving it to the hungry; Men's hands are soaked more with human blood than with animal's blood. If this is so, it was because they had only a mind to calculate, analyze, weighing the pros and cons. Their hearts failed to harmonize with their minds and love for other people became a myth. Aldous Huxley rightly said: "The economic, social and international organizations of to-day are mostly built on a loveless basis". Man if endowed only with a mind, however, talented and intelligent he may be, could only become a fabulous omnipotent personage who could move heaven and earth rather than building his existence. A famous educator in France, Mr. Paul Masson-Oursel, while examining the cause of the miseries of present day Europe has said: "All our miseries: oppression, poverty, social hatred, obsession of the necessary war come from the fact that very often modern Europe prefers reason to conscience, reason to life". The truth expressed in this sentence could be upheld not only by Europe but by the whole world as well.

IV.—What could Buddhism do to improve the present-day industrial civilization?

We have found out the defects of the present-day civilization. These are: excessive admiration for and enthronement of reason have resulted in the loss of balance between reason and all other human abilities like sentiment and virtue. The lack of balance in each individual results in the lack of balance in society and in the world.

Then to remedy things, should we give up reason and deny it like a number of religious theocrats does? No! Mankind cannot live without reason. Or should we stop scientific and industrial inventions for a score of years to stabilize the present troubled economic situation as asserted by a number of European thinkers represented by the famous French writer Georges Duhamel? We need not stop the development of reason in this way.

The main thing is to brace up the withering heart, to free it from the entanglements of desire and lust which are now harassing it, to train it to vibrate strongly before the Truth, the Good and the Beautiful. At the same time, we have to harmonize the heart with the mind. Reason must be made to serve love, and love to serve reason. These two parts should not be like two branches which grow in a parallel

direction. They should be closely twined to support each other and to create a harmonious, balanced and stable force.

But this force, the harmony between reason and love, should not stand separated and alone. Alone, this will get weak, worse and dangerous. Each individual should be an indivisible element of the whole. In other words, there should be a balance, a harmony between the inner heart and the external circumstances, between one with another, between the individual and society. We should strive to make each individual deeply and clearly feel that he forms the whole and the whole is himself.

These two principles: to harmonize reason with love, the inner heart with external circumstances to create a united, clearsighted and compassionate bloc, these two principles could be satisfactorily and adequately given to mankind by Buddhism.

Buddhism is a religion of wisdom and compassion. Buddhism is not afraid of the light of intellect. On the contrary it could help develop intellect indefinitely to drive back darkness because darkness i.e. *avidya*, ignorance, according to Buddhism, is the origin of suffering and crimes.

Yet the light of wisdom is not a lustreless but miraculous light of compassion. In Buddhism, to know is

not only for knowing but for loving and attaining happiness. Through compassion comes the light of wisdom. But when the light of intellect is generated, compassion could become greater in scope. Wisdom and compassion are two wheels of a vehicle which carries man to the realm of true happiness.

A one-wheeled vehicle cannot run. But even if it has two wheels, if it goes the wrong way or with a haughty bearing or if it goes too slowly or too fast as if it were alone on the road, it cannot go far and certainly it is bound to end in a mishap. The driver on the road to happiness must understand its rule. This is a mutual law. Nobody could understand and obey this law better than the Buddhists because the whole foundation of the Buddhist philosophy is based on this law. Speaking in Buddhist terms, this is the law of **hetupratyaya**, of conditional causation, according to which everything arises from conditions. It upholds that in the universe, no living being could remain isolated. However large or small, all beings rely on each other, harmonize with one another to survive. The universe is the product of **hetupratyaya** and not of any extraneous cause. It is not created by any mystical power. Thus, even if the intellect is developed to its extreme limit, and theocracy is overthrown by science, the conception of the universe of Buddhism

will still survive. As science progresses, the law of conditional causation gains even better proof of its validity.

Buddhism is based on this cosmogony to build a conception of life which is very appropriate to the present day world where the whole of mankind can live united as in a big family. The Buddhist conception of life proves to everybody the close relation between one's self and the other, between an individual and society and mankind. Because of these close relationships, the advantages and disadvantages, gains and losses could not be enjoyed or avoided separately. The two recent world wars have demonstrated that there was neither victor nor vanquished, neither winner nor loser. We could only say generally that: mankind has suffered a lot from war. The law of conditional causation has clearly proved that selfishness is not only harmful to others but also to one's self and that altruism is not only good for other but also for one's self. Speaking generally, a beautiful or bad action of an individual or of a group affects the whole of mankind.

It is not that the venerable members of this conference, as well as the majority of mankind, are unaware of the above-mentioned facts. To know for the sake of knowing is easy, but what is difficult is to

practise one's knowledge. Many an individual finds himself too isolated, too small and weak before the tide of the mechanical civilization which is blindly and stormily progressing.

That's why, conferences like this one are necessary to help us, Buddhists, to confirm our common position and to unite in our good-will and efforts to direct activities of all Buddhists towards the common goal. We firmly believe that the force of more than 300 million Buddhists in the world, once adequately organized, will be able to escort a beneficial influence upon the early reincarnation of Bodhisattvas to guide us in the work of transforming this Svaha world into blissful place.

18

BUDDHISM AS THE PRINCIPLE UNDER- LYING THE SCIENTIFIC ATTITUDE TOWARD LIFE. (THE AQUISITION OF PEACE IN ITS TRUE SENSE)

by Sugi Yamamoto

TO whatever extent we may rationalize our life, we human beings have to admit the existence of the invisible world as well as the visible one.

Having cleaned the room and made it as spotless as possible, and then washing our hands clean, we sit erect at the desk. On such an occasion, most of us feel serene. But this serenity is that of the visible world. It is, so to speak, a feeling of relief that all that is to be done has been done. However well we may clean our room, the doubt will remain whether this cleanliness is like that of the other, the invisible world. And this doubt will dispel the feeling of serenity and cleanliness which we had before.

To secure thorough cleanliness, we shall have to resort to some scientific method of cleaning, such as the use of disinfectant drug or gas. Even this will not clear the room completely of invisible viruses or disease germs. Such a method is rational and scientific, but it is far from the tie of life.

This is only one example out of many. Our life, both on the physical and spiritual sides, has a connection with the invisible world, which carries various contradictions in its train.

Why do these contradictions arise? They arise because we human beings are already aware of the invisible world.

The desire to overcome anxieties caused by these contradictions and reach beyond them has kept a light burning in the human heart and led it toward light and brightness. At the same time, the limitation of unknowable (or unknowing) knowledge has become a dreadful ignorance, which in turn has ever been in conflict with the aspiration to know all.

This is the clash of human yearning for the world of reason against human laziness which will remain in ignorance. It also symbolizes human beings suffering from misery despite their earnest pursuit of happiness.

It may be argued that if we think the matter out so far, we shall have to cease to live. And one may ask: Haven't we been living for thousands of years without thinking in that way? But the intellect, which will never rest until that is scientifically clarified, has become an indispensable asset of modern men. This intellectual desire to live a rational life and seek a rational way of living cannot possibly be eradicated.

In this way we pursue rationality on one hand and yet

on the other we dare to be inclined to remain among irrationalities.

This is shown in our self-deception that while human beings, in general, are suffering from various contradictions of their own making, we are supermen of a sort, specially favored by the universe, and we conceitedly suppose that we are exempt from the moral law, by which the good prosper and the evil perish (good causes bring good results and bad causes invites bad effects). Knowing that death is an absolute affirmation (or inevitable) to everybody, we think ourselves alone to be immortal. This is the cause and root of the fear of death, self-negation, nihilism, and the sense of inferiority (inferiority complex).

Education, ethics, philosophy and religion prevalent in present day human society and various enlightenment and culture movements based on them—all these have originated from the effort to liberate human beings from these contradictions. This is the manifestation of the desire to rationalize our life. Therefore we may say nothing is more urgent for human beings than the solution of these contradictions.

*

*

*

The naivete of those men who offered up evening prayers after seeing off the sun setting in the west and who admitted the existence of a Creator God or Superintendent God, has after a long conflict with intellect been replaced

by modern men's meek acceptance of natural law. Man has come to seek the true life in a new and different way. In other words, ignorance has been replaced by wisdom.

Wisdom of this sort is the intellectual perception that ignorance ceases to be ignorance when truth is attained. This is a situation acceptable to anybody and everybody. This is the truly scientific attitude. There is here the comprehensive mode of human existence, whereby man is enabled to live in the world of insight with eyes abruptly awakened to the principle of the interdependence and conditionality of all things?

Man has been living in this state for a long period of time, overcoming, though slowly, the contradictions on his suffering from irrationalities in spite of the search after rationality, and the contradiction of his whining at disbelief while seeking truth. And man has come to see that there is life in a world other than the visible one. He began to find the extension of life in that world. Man's search in this field has, in modern times, been directed toward the world of minute particles and at the same time toward of great creation.

The worlds of atoms, electrons and protons and numerous laws discovered in the course of man's search have convinced man that there is no way to human happiness but by the light of human wisdom. The mode of existence of palpable and visible things is seen in the worlds of atoms etc., in their session, union, gregation, and dis-

persion. This fact has taught man that atoms etc. are also transient, like visible things around him, and that the process of creation around him is the same as that of the eternal cosmos. This broadened man's visual field wider and wider.

Man has spent a long time expanding the area of science forcibly, and has striven to overcome the anxieties of life. This is nothing but the modification of life. It is nothing but the illumination of things by the light of wisdom. This is the creation of humanity, the elevation of man's aim from the desire of mere life to some nobler aspiration.

But this boundless world of reason seems to recede with a mocking beckoning, laughing at the naivete of man's search. For all the progress of science, what has become known is almost nescience compared with infinite facts and laws yet to be known, such a consciousness always remains. Facing this sorrow, scientists must have felt unspeakable loneliness and helplessness and often wandered in despair.

For scientists and researchers, this extremely dreary and lonesome life, like a groping in the dark, is an endless and thorny path.

Discouraged at the unequal conflict of his life with the exploration of the vast unknown. Has man resigned himself to laziness, or lost sight of his true self and fallen victim to nihilism? Certainly man often trifles with his

life, oppressed by the thought of his worthlessness, and forgetting his true self. It is certainly the picture of a wandering soul. Yet aided by the great wisdom which, coming to an impasse, somehow finds a way out, man is awakened to high ideals and feels an infinite joy in their realization, and marches onward toward it. The value of education increases when one knows that experience leads true knowledge and is a way of perfecting human personality. By meditation and reflection, man can have a philosophy in the conduct of his daily life, which he sees, will perfect his personality in a deeper and ethical sense. Clearly recognizing that religion deals with the relation of his body of flesh and blood to the highest ideal that he can realize he has come to seek there the life of insight which is quite free of delusion.

*

*

*

This has been proved by the fact that man in the course of his progress from the ancient to the modern times, has been awakened to the principle of inter-dependence of all things, and discovered the right orientation in the development of wisdom, and left great achievements behind.

But for this, we human beings would still be unable to feel delight in the intercourse of mind with mind or feel boundless sympathy with one another. We would still be in the state of beasts and indifferent whether a passer-by

be an idiot or a vagabond. We would not have developed the faculties of deep cognition or fine emotion. We would be seeking the satisfaction of carnal desires, driven by impulse and instinct.

But the limitless mystery of the universe will remain forever an infinite mystery unreachable to human beings. Only by obeying it, can we make it our own to a small extent. But we must not forget that small-ness is connected with infinitude.

It is a joy of life obtained by the insight that all exists as it should be and in accordance with the law of the infinitely great universe and on the moral principle that one reaps what one has sown. The present body of today itself is the basis of tomorrow's hope and tomorrow's life is connected with infinitude.

In the world of reason, man is merely one biological form, which is still feeble and immature. But reflected in the mirror of wisdom, the feebleness and immaturity themselves become objects of boundless joy. This form, in today's condition, the cause, can expect tomorrow's form the result. Only when one comes to this knowledge, can one devote oneself whole-heartedly to today's work or mission.

Hereupon one can clearly grasp the delight of cultivating personality, rectifying one's conduct of life, and revering all life. Life devoid of ideals is, on the contrary, decadence

itself, and is thrown into the dust-bin. It is an irrational state of life, in which one is miserable with discontent and complaints even amidst very favorable conditions of life. Hope being out of sight, one is unable to know what to do with one's life, and runs against the wall. One feels no gratitude, and makes no development. Such a man wavers at a slight thing. He can not believe in others. He is solitary forever. His mind is always shrunken.

One who is trying to remove one's own faults to perfect his personality and who becomes better by getting rid of his bad habits is not like one who is always whining at his own drawbacks. Such a man is an incarnation of life in the process of living. One who seeks education and builds culture is an incarnation of the life force. The Buddha teaches us how to make this reason, this truth of the universe our own by illuminating it with Wisdom. He tells us to make eternal truth our own, and discover the worth of life in that truth. Such is the teaching of the Buddha.

A good cause produces a good effect and an evil one an evil effect. What was born has been born as it should be. One perfects his personality in his given conditions. That is the teaching of enlightenment, endorsed by this doctrine. To act in obedience to this doctrine is the act of Wisdom. The scientific attitude toward life is not mere obedience to scientific laws, but the awareness that they

should be Until this truth is understood fully, it is impossible for man to acquire true peace and make it his own.

19

The Peace Concept of Buddhism

Hajime Nakamura

Department of Indian and
Buddhist Philosophy,
University of Tokyo,
Tokyo, Japan

I. The Peace Concept of Early Buddhism

The concept of “peace” is expressed with the word ‘*sānti*’ in both the ancient and modern languages of India. As ‘*sānti*’ is described as the ideal state of man in Buddhist literature, we can say that Buddhism has aimed at peace in its long history.

The principle of action in relation to others in Buddhist ethics has been regarded as benevolence (*maitrī*), which might be defined as love in its pure form. The most conspicuous illustration of it is the love of a mother toward her children.

“Just as with her own life

A mother shields from hurt her own, her only,
child,—

Let all-embracing thoughts

For all that lives be thine,

An all-embracing love

For all the universe
In all its heights and depths
And breadth, unstinted love,
Unmarred by hate within,
Not rousing enmity. (*Suttanīpiṭaka*, vv. 149 ; 150)''

For those who endeavour to practise benevolence
there is no discrimination.

With all am I a friend, comrade, to all,
And to all creatures kind and merciful ;
A heart of amity I cultivate,
And ever in good will is my delight. (tr. by Mrs.
Rhys Davids)

Even to our enemies we should be compassionate.
Sāriputta, the Elder, is said to have expressed himself
as follows :

“Cherish compassion even to your enemy. Pervade
everywhere with the mind of benevolence! This
is the teaching of the Buddhas.”

(a verse cited in the *Milindapañhā*, ed. Trencker,
p. 394)

The peace concept of Buddhism was established on
the basis of the spirit of benevolence.

Shakyamuni deplored that the peaceful life of com-
mon people was seriously damaged owing to the con-
flicts of various states which occurred in the days of
the rise of Buddhism. People seek riches ; kings want

the expansion of territories. (*Majjhimanikāya*, vol. II. p. 72 Gāthā)

The king having forcibly conquered the earth,
To the shore of the ocean, holding the land
This side of the sea, may yet all unsatisfied
Hanker after the further side also. (tr. by Mrs.
Rhys Davids)

For that purpose kings begin warfare, and trouble common people with distresses and damage. They oppress their subjects arbitrarily with strong sovereignty. In this respect kings are not different from robbers.

“The ksatriyas on the throne are just like serpents. When they get angry, they inflict punishments upon common people. So try so that they will not be resented, and that you may keep your life in safety.” (*Samyutta-Nikāya*, vol. I, p. 69 Gāthā)

Shakyamuni withdrew himself from the reign by kings as far as possible, and aimed at establishing an ideal society (*saṅgha*) among recluses, thereby ameliorating society at large under the spiritual influence of Buddhism. He was not a politician who wanted to improve society with political power, nor a demagogue who used the passions of the populace for his own interests. He made much of the spiritual and moral influence by persuasion which one man wields

over another, and aimed at social amelioration by non-violence. The order founded by him never resorted to punishment by power, in contrast with the orders of other religions. The punishments inflicted by the Buddhist order upon its members when they performs misdeeds are based upon the voluntary agreement of the punished. Punishments were not extended to those who wanted to leave the order.

Such a thorough-going pacifism makes Buddhist ascetics keep aloof from military affairs. According to the rules ordained by the order of early Buddhism, monks should not see armies. In case of special reasons they may put up in the army for two or three nights, but no more. Even while they are putting up, they should not see the parade or exercises of the army. (*Pācittiya*, 48-51)

To the secular world, they advocated the ideal of realizing peace. Politics should be advanced “without killing, without hurting, without conquering, without making conquer, without becoming sad, without making sad, only complying with the Law (*dhamma*)”. (*Samyutta-nikāya*, vol. I, p. 26: the Chinese version of the *Samyuktāgama*, vol. 39, Taisho, vol. II, p. 288c) Early Buddhists made efforts so that wars would not occur, and persuaded monarchs to that effect. When Ajātasattu, the king of Magadha wanted to attack

the Vajjis neighboring to it, and sounded out the opinion of Shakyamuni through his minister, Vassakāra, he admonished him not to wage a war. (*Mahā-parinibbāna-suttanta*, and the Chinese versions corresponding to it.).

To prevent military invasion by means of spiritual inculcation, however, was of limited power. Even Gotama Buddha himself could not do anything. Vidūḍabha, a son of King Pasenadi of Kosala, besieged Kapilavastu, the capital of the Sākyas with the four kinds of armies. When the invading army passed, Shakyamuni was sitting in meditation under a withered tree. Seeing him, Vidūḍabha asked him: “Why are you sitting thus under a withered tree, while there are many fully leaved trees with their branches copiously grown?” The sage answered: “The shade of relatives is superior to that of non-relatives.” Hearing this, the prince refrained from attacking Kapilavastu, and returned home. Vidūḍabha came again to attack the capital, and the same thing was repeated. When he came the third time, Moggallāna, disciple of Shakyamuni suggested that he cover Kapilavastu with a (miraculously made) iron basket. And the master did not agree to the proposal, and said: “Previous deeds (*Kamma*) are now ripe for me. We shall receive fruits.” He let things go on, and

the Sākyas were massacred by Vidūḍabha. (The Chinese version of the *Ekottarāgama*, vol. 26) In those days many cities were going to be overcome by a powerful king doms, and the Sākyas could not avoid this fate, which was beyond the power of early Buddhists.

In order to maintain peace over a wide territory, powerful sovereignty and well-established social organization are needed. These were realised by King Asoka in later days.

II. The peace Concept of Mahāyāna Buddhism

The ideal of benevolence was emphasized in Mahāyāna Buddhism in later days. Pacifism was especially advocated. The ideal ruler should govern his country with a moderate policy, and keep the peace, without invading other countries. “A king should fulfil the duties of a king which have been observed by his ancestors, cherish all the subjects in his country, guard his own country, and not invade the territories of other countries.” (*Mahāyāna-saṃnipāta-ksitigarbha-daśacakra-sūtra*, vol. 2, Taisho, vol. 13, p. 733 a) “A king should aim at bringing forth beatitude and profit through the concord of all countries” (The larger version of the *Gaṇḍavyūha*, vol. 11, Taisho, vol. 10, p. 713 a)

To act as a war-monger and mischief-maker to cause a war, and thereby to make profits was strictly forbidden by the disciplines of Mahāyāna. “O, you, son of Buddha ! You should not act on behalf of a country, nor join an army, nor organize an army to kill people, in order to make profits. No a bodhisattva should not even frequent an army. How much less become the enemy of a country ! If he does so intentionally, he begets a light sin.” (*Brahmajāla-sūtra*, Article 11, Taisho, vol. 24, p. 1005 c)

It was regarded as ideal to have other countries give up weapons spontaneously, without resorting to force. Cakravartin, the ideal universal monarch, does not threaten people with force, gives up weapons, does not hurt people. So, kings and people under his rule do not move from their own abodes, for he does not deprive them of their peaceful abodes. All countries surrender to him without being forced by means of weapons. (*Mahāsatyaka-nirgrantha-nirdeśa-sūtra*. Taisho, vol. 9, p. 332a-b. In the *Abhidharmaśāstra*, vol. 12, p. 12 b, also, nearly the same thing is set forth.) A king should conquer the four quarters with virtues, and fulfil his duties. (The larger version of the *Gaṇḍavyūha*, vol. 11, Taisho, vol. 10, p. 712 c) King ‘Suddhodana, father of Śhakyamuni, is lauded as having defeated his enemies by good deeds,

without waging a war. (*Buddhacarita*, II, 40. Taisho, vol. 17, p. 515 a) “ Even if an army of another country should invade and plunder, a king should know first whether the soldiers are brave or cowerd, and then conclude peace by means of expediency”. (*Dharmasamuccaya-sūtra*, Taisho, vol. 17, p. 515 a)

It is likely that such an ideal was realised to some extent. To Gunavarman, an Indian priest who came to China, a Chinese king asked: “ When foreign armies are going to invade my country, what should I do? If we fight, there must be many casualties. If we do not repulse them, my country will be imperilled. O master, please tell me what to do ! ” The monk answered: “ Just entertain a compassionate mind, do not have a hurtful mind ! ” The king adopted his advice. When the banners were going to be hoisted and the drums beaten, the enemies retreated. (*A Historiography of Eminent Priests*, vol. 3, Taisho, vol. 50, p. 340 b)

The above-mentioned passages teach only us not to hurt enemies. They do not teach us to repulse them deliberately. But, when enemies have invaded actually, what should we do? A king should observe the duty of protecting the territory. (*Saddhamasmṛtyu-pasthāna-sūtra*, vol. 5, Taisho, vol. 17, p. 32 a) Other countries may take advantage of the peaceful at-

titute of the king: his subjects may rebel. So the expediencies to protect the country are discussed in detail. (The larger version of the *Gaṇḍavyūha*, vol. 11, Thisho. 10, p. 712 c; *Mahāyāna-mahāsamnipāta-ksitigarbha-daśacakrasūtra*, vol. 2, Taisho, vol. 13, p. 732 c) The Buddhists, pacifists as they were, had to take the problem of defense seriously, being situated among the conflicts of feudal states.

Because of the duty of protecting his country, the king had to repulse the invading army of other countries. He had to be dragged into the whirl of warfare, although he was a pacifist. “When the enemy does not want to carry on negotiations with the king, he conquers it with his army, strategical measures are discussed in detail. (The larger version of the *Gaṇḍavyūha*, vol. 11, Taisho, vol. 10, p. 712) To conquer the enemy is solely for having people relax. (ibid. vol. 11, Taisho, vol. 10, p. 713 a)

III. Tolerance and War

The spirit of tolerance should be the basis for the collaboration of different religions for the cause of peace. Both Jainism and Buddhism have been regarded as religions abundant in the spirit of tolerance. Viewed from this standpoint, we find a curious Buddhist the Mahāyāna Sūtra, in which a Jain monk

preaches the dharma and is acknowledged and praised by the Buddha. The sūtra is entitled “Dai-sassha-ni-ken-ji shosetu-kyō” in ancient Chinese (according to Japanese pronunciation). The Sanskrit original is now lost; the Chinese and Tibetan version alone are extant. The Chinese version is contained in the 9th volume of the Taisho Tripiṭaka edited by the late J. Takakusu and K. Watanabe; it is mentioned in No. 179 of “A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka” by B. Nanjio (Oxford 1883). It was translated into Chinese by Bodhiruci, an Indian monk, in the year of A.D. 519, of the Northern Wēi dynasty. The Sanskrit title of the Chinese version must have run, “Mahāsatyakanirgrantha-putra-vyākaraṇa-sūtra”. The Sanskrit title of the Tibetan version is “Bodhisattva-gocaropāya-ṣaṣṭha-vikurvaṇa-nirdéśa.”

The contents of the part of the sūtra which we want to discuss are as follows: The Great Satyaka nirgrantha, as ascetic, came from a southern country with 880 million nirgrantha disciples. He wandered through many counties, teaching the peoples and finally arrived in the city of Ujjainī. (In Buddhist Sūtras Jain ascetics are mostly called Nirgranthas). King Pradyota of the city welcomed him cordially. Then upon invitation, the Jain ascetic made a long sermon,

which was finally acknowledged and praised as conveying the true spirit of Buddhism (saddharma) by the Buddha.

The frame of this Sūtra is very unusual for a Buddhist scripture. In other sūtras, Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, their disciples and lay-devotees make sermons, but there is, except this, not a single sūtra in which a Jain heretic (—heretic from the then Buddhist point of view—) delivers a sermon. This form of sūtra means that in medieval India, where this sūtra was composed, Jains and Buddhists were on fairly good terms just as Jainas and Hindus in modern India.

As far as I know, this sūtra has not yet been dealt with by scholars. In the following we shall give some teachings set forth therein.

In the first place the Jain ascetic teaches the king Pradyota the following precepts:—

1. One should not destroy life.
2. One should not steal (One should not take that which is not given).
3. One should refrain from unlawful sexual intercourse.
4. One should not tell lies.
5. One should not slander others.
6. One should not abuse others.
7. One should not indulge in vain conversation.

8. One should refrain from covetous desire.
9. One should refrain from anger.
10. One should not entertain false faith i.e. one should believe in the law of karma and its reward.s.

These precepts, he stresses, should be embodied in practical politics.

Then he goes on to teach the king the ideal policy to be carried on by the universal monarch (*cakravartin*). His sermon is detailed and interesting. The ideal figure of the *cakravartin* is common to Jainism also, but here it is set forth along Buddhist lines. The seven treasures of the *cakravartin* are discussed in full detail. However, in order to avoid prolixity we shall skip it.

Here I just want to deal with one thing i.e. the problem of peace and war which is also discussed therein.

The Jain ascetic teaches—The *cakravartin* “does not threaten people by force”. “He discards weapons; he does no harm to people”. So “other kings and living beings do not move out of their own abodes, because they are not deprived of their safe abodes”. “All countries spontaneously obey him without being forced by him.” (Taisho Tripitaka IX, 332.)

However it must have been possible in those days

that, however eagerly a king might build up his defence forces, the forces of other countries might invade his country. As it was a king's duty to protect his own country, he had to repulse the invading enemy. The above-mentioned sūtra describes how to carry on battles:—

A king should be careful in the following respects before he begins warfare. In the first place, if the enemy is as powerful as his own army, then warfare will inflict damage upon both armies. There is no benefit thereof at all. If the enemy is more powerful than his own army, then, pondering that they would survive, and that the king with his army would be annihilated the king should try to solve the conflict between two countries by means of peaceful arbitration (negotiations) by the good offices of his good friends and intimate friends of the enemy king. In the second place, in such cases he should try to solve the conflict by giving generously (unstintedly) anything the enemy king demands. In the third place, when the enemy is more numerous and his own force is less powerful, he should try to solve the conflict by arousing the astonishment of the enemy king by pretending that his own army is a more powerful force.

If these three ways fail, then he is allowed to take

up arms. In this case also, he should be careful in the following respects. In the first place, he should think: "On account of the lack of mercy on the part of the enemy king, we have to fight with, and kill, living beings. However we hope that the combatants will kill as few as possible". It means that he wants to protect living beings. In the second place, he should make efforts to cause the enemy king surrender and to have both armies not fight each other, resorting to any possible measures. In the third place, he should try not to kill the enemies, by capturing them alive (as prisoners of war).

After he has cherished the above-mentioned three sorts of mercy, he arranges the four armies (i. e. elephants, horses, cars, and infantry), and orders them into operation. Soldiers should be divided into three classes. The soldiers of the supreme class should be divided into three sub-classes: the superior, the middle, and the lower. The brave soldiers who belong to the low sub-class of the most supreme class should be put in the foremost front, the soldiers of the superior sub-class of the most supreme class, i. e. "the stoutest soldiers and horses" should be put in the second rank on both wings so that the infantry men in general would never fall into a panic. The personal guard of the king should be consolidated

carefully by the best elephants, horses, cars, and infantrymen. After completing these preparations, he gives battle. ...When he gives battle after taking all means (to solve the trouble), he incurs only light and minute sins, even if he kills living beings. He need not necessarily observe any (redemptive) ceremony in expiation of his sins. The reason is that, as he had chenshed the abovementioned three sorts of compassion (maitrī) before he began the war, he committed only light sins.

This is the teaching of the Jain ascetic.

The teaching of the same purport how to carry on battle in order to lessen harm and damage was set forth by Jains who stressed ahinsa. Many precepts were, for example, set forth in the *Laghu-Arhan-Nītī-śāstra* by Hemacandra (12th A.D.) (cf. M. Winterniz : *Geschichte der Indischen Literatur*, III S. 531.)

In order to avoid prolixity the writer does not want to elaborate on the problem. What he wants to point out here is the fact that the problem of peace and war was discussed in an unusual Buddhist sūtra whose substance was ascribed to a Jain ascetic, and that the teaching delivered here is testimony to the fact that Jainism and Buddhism were not hostile to, but rather in good terms with each other, at least in the medieval age of India.

I have just introduced materials relevant to the peace concept of Buddhism. I hope this short note will be of some help to solve the problem, a problem of great importance.

1. The Ethics of Zen Buddhism and the Spirit of Capitalism in East

by Shinzō Ohno, Dr. of Economic

(Professor of Meiji University)

According to Max Weber, 'the spirit of capitalism' can only be appropriated to capitalism, West European or American, "because capitalism did exist in India and in China or in the Ancient or Middle ages, but it lacked the characteristic spirit". Has there not been one, among the systems of religious or ethical thoughts which developed in the East that contained such a vocational ethics as would be instrumental in rationalizing capitalism and in accelerating its progress positively? This is a question which I asked myself long since. To this question, I have now no choice but to answer with confidence that what has played such a rôle fairly distinctly in the East is Mahāyāna Buddhism, especially the ethics of Zen Buddhism perfected in Japan. Jainism, which arose in India almost contemporaneously with Buddhism, established on the one hand a strict rule containing nonkilling, no-lieing, no-stealing, no-adultery, and non-possession, and on the other hand urged its adherents to observe what was called by Max Weber ascetic thriftiness, in so far as it regulated without their full awareness their way of thinking personally and rationally with regards to the matter of deliverance. Consequently it is only natural that the Jains once attained the highest rank in the whole of Indian society in holding the predominant percentage of national wealth. The coming into existence of Mahāyāna Buddhism seems to have been not unrelated with the development of commercial capitalism, which was mainly effected by the trade with

far off countries in the West, and which was accelerated by the establishment of great empires in India during the period from the 3rd century B.C. to the 7th century A.D. In my opinion, Mahāyāna Buddhism has been literally protestant in the sense that first it tried on every occasion to restore the original teaching by way of subjective and idealistic thinking, and stood against the old Teravata Buddhism which tended to transform the original Buddhism into a mere formality and a set of rules, and to fossilize it. Second, it has also been protestant in the sense that it protested against the dogmatism, mysticism and escapism of Teravata Buddhism, taking the standpoint of intellectualism, humanism, and empiricism, far more exacting than the original Buddhism. And thirdly, Mahāyāna Buddhism has been also protestant in the sense that it came to be tinged with a dynamic and practical color which was more secular, so that it might fit the aspiration for deliverance of the lay followers, especially the commercial and handicraft class who aspire to overcome the world while remaining in this world, rather than for monks or those who are aloof from worldly business or are escapist recluses. Therefore in Jūjikyō (Ten Stages Sutra) for instance, which may be called a book of Mahāyāna ethics, and which forms a part of the Avataṃsaka Sūtra, we find the spirit of rational and foreseeing calculation of big merchants highly evaluated and, at the same time, perpetual exertions, a thorough-going self-control, and generous charity mentioned as Bodhisattva's meritorious deeds. A merchant can become a merchant Bodhisattva by being a genuine entrepreneur, or literally, a captain of industry. To realize this ideal, it is therein preached that they should always exert themselves whole-heartedly in an effort to promote positively the welfare of the people in society, with non-attachment, compassion, and charity as their spirit.

The religious and ethical foundation of the spirit of capitalism in the East however, was laid down by various sects of Mahāyāna Buddhism, especially Zen sects which had developed in Japan. The Zen sect is often called the doctrine of self-reliance as against

the doctrine of salvation from without or the difficult path as against the easy path. And as it has appointed itself to be the Buddha-mind school, it developed a highly idealistic and subjective denomination, which regarded the personal realization that "I am Buddha", i.e. "I am no other than myself" as the essential factor of enlightenment. Since Zen Buddhism establishes as its motto the principle of "disregarding letters; a special transmission outside the teaching; directly pointing to the mind; becoming Buddha by seeing into one's nature," it makes one's respective and absolute experience of mind its fundamental principle, so it developed the thought-tendency of respecting whatever highly personal and experiential. Further, Zen identifies our mind with the life of the universe, regards everything as particular being which is endowed with a unique character, and is ever bent on putting into practice what was grasped by experience; and so it can be said that Zen developed a highly pragmatic and dynamic character.

It was in China that the so-called Zen sect was formed. Over there the pragmatism of Zen was, from the beginning, united with the thought of economic efforts, and the respect of the life of labor. This was expressed, among others, in Paichang Huai-hai (749?-814; one of the disciples of the famous Zen patriarch Ma-tzu)'s motto, "One day's no work is one day's no meal", which inspires us with the life-principle of toil and labor.

From this life-principle, "samu" or physical labor in due course came to be introduced into Zen monasteries. This was often carried out in the form of "fushin" or the union of labor by many people participating. As a result the common masses or practising monks, irrespective of their position, came to participate in it. Samu should be whole-heartedly performed with all one's might. When one becomes one with samu itself, he is in the state of samādhi (concentration). Thus it came to be considered that whatever samu is performed in this state of samādhi, it itself is the work of the Buddha or the activity of the Buddha.

Another principle regulating the life in Zen monasteries was

• the rationalization of economy in consumption. By this was meant the regulation of life by means of three principles: decency, equality, and thriftiness. The first principle might be interpreted to be the right choice of goods to be consumed, their kind, quality, etc., for the monks' proper use of them. The second principle of equality might be understood to be the monk's efforts to share as equally as possible their scarce goods. The third principle meant the injunction to the economical use of goods or a strict prohibition of extravagance. With regard to the economy in goods to be consumed, especially it was preached that even a grain of rice should never be wasted, and that even one or ten million grains of rice could come out of single grain of it. It also requests that the personal or common possessions of the way-seekers, whether it be natural or artificial, should never be wasted, but used always with deep consideration, and that even water should be used so as to be most useful. Indeed, the fundamental teaching of Buddhism on the consumption of goods as is expressed in the phrase "mottai-nai" ("too precious to be wasted"), seems to have been most thorough-going in Zen Buddhism.

Therefore, in the Zen monasteries, it has been the custom that meals should be taken on every occasion not only with gratitude and reflection, but also in a solemn and orderly manner. Furthermore, the work of Tenzo or the monks in charge of cooking has been considered to be the best opportunity for the monks to accumulate the unseen merit by performing services in the background. Also it is expected that Tenzo should never leave aside his tasuki (a string used for tightening the clothes during working-hours); it should be the symbol of aspiration for enlightenment. This kind of work is called, in Zen Buddhism, gyōji, which means the work performed in the state of samādhi (concentration). To sum up, what characterizes the life in Zen monastery is meditation and unseen merit, perseverance and labor, thankfulness and service, decency and thriftiness.

2. The Teaching of Zen Buddhism in Japan as Vocational Ethics

Zen Buddhism developed in China, but it failed there to grow enough to be the vocational ethics for the citizenry. It is true that it was Buddhism that gave the Chinese people a real religious mind. But with the persecution of Buddhism in the last half of the T'ang Dynasty as the turning point, Buddhism was replaced by Taoism as the religion governing the soul of the Chinese people. Taoism was a kind of magical religion respecting gods and superhuman beings, intermingled with Laotian mysticism and the superstitious faith of the traditional Chinese. Taoism took from Buddhism the karmic thought and the ethical element such as is expressed in the following verses: "Do whatever is good, abstain from doing whatever is wrong". But even these elements were never able to exert a very deep influence upon the Chinese mind, because of the highly superstitious character which Taoism assumed. Accordingly Taoism not only came in its essence to be totally lacking in the ascetic character, but remained as ever a kind of religion whose main character consisted in superstition. As a result, it was not able to perform a thoroughgoing rationalization of secular life, and left within itself a predominantly superstitious and animistic character.

While Taoism was religion or ethics for the Chinese people in general or the ruled, Confucianism was the ethical thought for the Government officials or ruling bueraucrats. Since Confucianism was, as I see it, a system of political ethics based upon a kind of austerity, it resembled Protestantism, which was a sort of ethical system with its power of rationlizing the secular life, so long as it confronted the worldly life with an ethics highly ascetic and self-negating. This ethics, however, was not more than formalities regulating man's spontaneous and social associations or the inner relationship of the family in particular, and so it lacked, to the

last, the strictly and rational demand that we find in Protestantism. Furthermore, as there was no faith in a transcendental God in Confucianism, there was consequently no fatal gap between the worlds of here and here-after. Therefore, Confucianism was a doctrine system essentially humanistic and pragmatic, because of its this-worldliness and secular optimism.

Thus we are led to seek the circumstances in which the bourgeois vocational ethics, as a religious and ethical corollary of the development of capitalism, came to be formed in the East, especially in the inner relationship between the doctrine and practice of Zen Buddhism which was completed in Japan, the development of capitalism. The most famous and most eminent thinker among the founders of the Zen sects in Japan is unquestionably Dōgen, the founder of the Sōtō sect, who lived in the 13th century. It is a well-known fact that Dōgen not only preached about Buddhism for monks, but also Buddhism for the laity, and furthermore the principle of "the worldly law itself is the Buddhist law", or the standpoint which identifies social activities with the Buddhist law. The doctrine identifying the worldly law with the Buddhist law which Dōgen preached was no other than the truth that no sooner one reaches the state of as-it-is-ness and non-attachment than his daily work becomes the works of the Buddha or the way of the Buddha, and so any seemingly trifling activity one performs shines forth as it is as if it were a precious bead. Therefore what Dōgen preached was not something which positively served for forming the psychology which precedes vocational life or the formation of capital. What he demanded of laymen was a kind of "spiritual renunciation" or the attitude with which men busied themselves in their vocational life while they were not attached spiritually to the profit accruing from it, or not bound by it. While demanding this, he tried on the practical side to regulate his daily life rationally and efficiently, though it was ascetic, by uniting the manner with his ideal of behavior. Thus, it can be said that the rôle Dōgen played in accomplishing the

bourgeois vocational ethics was not similar to that of calvin, but rather one prior to Luther.

In contrast to Dōgen, it might be said that the two renowned Zen monks, Engen Jakushitsu and Musō Soseki, who lived in 14th century, did more to contribute to the formation of new vocational ethics. Jakushitsu (1290-1367) is now known only as a tasteful poet and recluse. He fervently preached that those who practice Zen should be free from the dualistic view, which is the cause of all kinds of suffering, or ratiocination, should minimize their sleeping-hours, forget to take meals, may, even grudge time for cutting the nails, in order to attain the bliss of deliverance which is apathetic; and should strictly observe precepts day and night so as to arouse a great unwavering courage in their mind, and keep on striving hard. Along with the above injunction, he planned to remove all kinds of obstacles that were apt to arise, in the cleavage between daily work and religious practice, by uniting the asceticism as was seen among the bhikkhus in the early Buddhist orders and the labor-is-first principle as was held by Paichang Huai-hai. Jakushitsu's mind was well expressed in the following verses:

Not caring about rich or fame,
I sit in meditation
With water and mountain in front of me.

Along with the above state of mind, his attitude to daily life in seeking the way was that "outwardly I may look as if I were running here and there, being run after by sundry affairs all day long, yet in the depth of my mind I never forget even for a moment the right striving for the sake of deliverance." Thus, Jakushitsu's teaching and practice might be considered as a suggestion of a type of vocational ethics for the citizenry held out from the side of Zen monasticism.

Furthermore, Jakushitsu was fond of leading a self sufficient and hermit-like life in calm circumstances for the sake of his

own discipline. Contrary to him, however, Musō (1275-1357) first of all flatly rejected the commoner's delusion that identified the Way-seeking-mind with the escapism which urged them to live in a forest or a mountain outwardly renouncing worldly fame. He preached that so-called worldly activities could be of benefit to the people or a suitable means for every one to be enlightened, in so far as one can perceive the Buddha Dharma therein. He not only taught that the less avaricious a man was, the more profit would come to him, but also believed himself that greed was not always hard to discard if one really wanted to as strongly as one hoped to attain happiness. He taught that if one renounced all sorts of greed, worldly and unworldly, one's innate boundless treasury would open of its own accord, and one could get a good command of infinite kinds of skilful means and the immense power of samādhi, so as to be useful both himself and others. So much that Musō himself was ever mindful of striving and endeavoring in his every activity, and used to preach the necessity of performing everything with diligence.

Accordingly Musō rejected the thought, such as Chuang-tsu's, which regards the distinction of man as rich and poor, or high and low to be natural, and, citing the Buddhist karmic theory of cause and effect, maintained that if one's mind became pure by giving up greed for fame, then fame, position, and riches would naturally follow. In parallel with this idea this unusual monk, who was endowed with an exceptional insight into political and economic problems, suggested that the material value was to be judged, in like manner with the spiritual value, by the presence of some particular property or by the degree of its scarcity, and also pointed out that the nature of luxury consisted only in one's intention to show off one's own riches to others.

3. The Establishment of the Vocational Ethics of Zen as the Spirit of Capitalism in Japan

The type of vocational ethics which assumed a character typical of capitalist and the social and economic character which was conducive to the accumulation of capital might be said to have first been presented in Japan by Suzuki Shōsan (1579-1655) who lived at the beginning of the Tokubawa period. He was born of a family of a retainer of the Matsudaira Clan in Mikawa province (present Shizuoka prefecture), and took part in the battle at Sekigahara, and the two battles in Osaka, siding with the Tokugawa Clan. He felt deeply the problem of life and death while a child, and after coming of age he used to frequent temples, warrior as he was. At the age of 41 he was ordained, and built a temple at Ishinodaira, north of Okazaki, in Mikawa province to instruct people, whether priests or laymen. In his advanced age, he went up to Edo (present Tokyo, to enlighten a large number of people. There he died at the age of 76. It was Shōsan's constant and strong desire to realize the core of the Buddhist teaching, that is, the truth of the five aggregates having no entity, in daily activities. He did not recognize any personal religious authority, and kept to the last the attitude of not regarding any particular religious order to be absolute. Instead, the absolute authority, for him, was the Buddha only. He preached that one should take refuge in the Buddha who was absolute, facing Him wholeheartedly, with the realization of being a sinridden mortal. In short, Shōsan's attitude as a Buddhist was non-sectarian and at the same time super-sectarian. Furthermore, he generally laid more emphasis upon laymen's Buddhism rather than upon monks' Buddhism. He emphasized that the cross-roads to hell and to the way for enlightenment consisted in the momentary state of one's mind. He said, "Whether you go to hell or to heaven just hinges

upon your momentary state of mind at present. Anger refers to hell, greed to hungry spirit, and ignorance to beasts; these three are called the three evil kingdoms. Adding to them the three more kingdoms asura, human beings, and heavenly beings, we call it all the six kingdoms. These six kingdoms are all present in this mind of ours." In the field of practice, Shōsan taught, "The Buddhist way of practice consists in protecting one's self." He interpreted this protection of one's self to be on guard so as to keep all kinds of passions and defilements from entangling one's self. He also taught, "Mind is an enemy that always tries to tempt itself. Be ever on guard against the mind. When one has extinguished one's self, this mind becomes utterly free." He called the state of mind "jiyū" (freedom) in which one has negated one's self and realized the innate or real self and one takes a move on that standpoint. This freedom or the free activity performed by this self which was identified with the absolute self was what he aimed at in his practice of the Way. According to him, to practice the way is tantamount to being ready to sacrifice oneself without hesitation at any time and in any place. We should learn to die freely in life rather than seek an enlightenment in the next world. Since the true discipline consists in attaining freedom in the face of death, on the ground of which the freedom of life is realized. A warrior should realize this freedom on the basis of courage in fighting. Every kind of art should be performed in the state of mind of samādhi (meditation). The freedom of such kind should also be realized in politics and the ideal state in which "every business pursuit is alike free" should be created.

From the aforesaid view-point, Shōsan highly esteemed the practical activities in the actual society. He said, "I do not mind even if I could not attain enlightenment. The point is whether we can carry this freedom into effect or not." He usually emphasized the preparedness for death. It was not because he expected to make it the gate through which he would pass into a happier world, but because he esteemed the conduct performed in

the absolutely autonomous state of mind in which he could die in the present world. With him, death meant something which should be esteemed since it does not belong to the next world, but to this very world. Besides, according to him, those who aspire for enlightenment should single-mindedly discipline themselves with the great and solid determination such as Niō's and acala's (Buddhist guardian gods). It was the gist of Shōsan's instructions to aspirants for enlightenment, "Always keep the single character of shi (death) in your mind, and exert yourselves renouncing all the other trifling matters." We could see in him a distinct epoch which divides Zen Buddhism into two types: the mediaeval quietistic one and the modern, voluntaristic, and activistic one. It is due to this that he afterwards came to be called the founder of the so-called "Niō Zen".

What interests us most, however, is that Shōsan broadened the thought of modern vocational ethics to a remarkable degree. He rejected the traditional way of thinking by which the secular life was distinctly removed from the devotional life, whereby he tried to actualize the Buddhist ideal of discipline within our secular life. He untiringly preached that the respective labor of every one of us who is engaged in secular vocation did accord in itself with the religious practice as a Buddhist. According to him whatever vocation one may be engaged in, it accords itself to Buddhist practice, and through it one can become a Buddha.

Furthermore, also according to him, there is no vocation that is not sacred, since every vocation is to be regarded as a manifestation of the only absolute, or the Buddha. We should think in this way: the only Buddha is ever at work so as to profit the universe by dividing Himself into thousands of millions. He says, "The location of every one of us is a part of the sole Buddha, and is what was given by the way of heaven. If there were no specialist-artisan, no manufacture would ever be produced. If it were not for warriors, society would not be kept in peace. If it were not for farmers, no food would be put out. If it were not for mer-

chants, there would be no freedom of materials or the circulation of goods. There are many other vocation sin this world that benefit our community. There are innumerable numbers of vocations in this world: astronomers, geologists, doctors, vaudævillians, fishermen, hunters, etc., but any one of them is none other than the 'virtuous work of the sole Buddha' or a 'function of the single Buddha'.

According to Shōsan, the people of this world, being ignorant of this truth, despise themselves, do evil deeds, and contaminate their vocational life. But the real self is the Buddha, and every vocation is the work of this Buddha. Therefore, that we engage ourselves in our respective vocations is at once in accord with following the absolute Buddha. Thus, Shōsan emphatically told the farmers that their Buddhist practice would automatically be accomplished if they concentrated on their work of husbandry. In the same way, he taught artisans and merchants that the concentration on their respective vocation is at once their practice of the Buddha's way. Further he urged artisans with sincerity to "perform every work with device". This could be interpreted to be recommending them in to become the work itself as they performed it and to accomplish it rationally. He advised merchants to reject "honest poverty" and to adopt "happy plenty" while they were pursuing profit straight-forwardly. In so doing, he never preached utilitarianism nor Mammonism nor advocated hedonism. First of all he taught merchants to cultivate the virtue of honesty so as to gain profit, and then he told them not to develop attachment to the profit after gaining it.

Shōsan did not even deny salvation for those who were engaged in hunting, which at that time was generally regarded as the most sinful occupation. Once he taught a hunter who came to him for his advice with the serious question how he could be saved while being engaged in that mean occupation, saying, "It is your mind that goes down to hell. Each time you kill a bird, grasp your mind, and kill it completely. If you extinguished all your minds in this

way, you will become a Buddha." After all, the fundamentals of Shōsan's vocational ethics were that it equally esteemed every occupation as being at once the function of the Buddha and that it not only positively recognized the pursuit of profit, but also it urged every one to try to increase the welfare of the occupation every one to try to increase the welfare of the community without thinking if enjoying by himself the profit he gained. This is to be interpreted to the effect that we should not consume the profit gained from our concentrated pursuit for it for our own benefit, as but direct it for the formation of capital. As we have seen, above it has been one of the characteristics of the thought-tendency of Zen orders toward economic life to consume all kinds of property including free goods austerely and rationally, that is, to utilize it decently. This means that the ethics of Zen Buddhism as handed down to Shōsan played a positive rôle in consolidating the basis of the spirit of capitalism in the East, especially in Japan, in almost like manner that the vocational ethics of the revolutionary schools of Protestantism did in the West. If so, it would be only natural that Shōsan should have been a staunch antagonist of the bad ethics of a feudalistic tendency, such as Kirisute-gomen (a kind of socially recognized privilege of warrior-class people, by which they were free to kill any inferiors who were disobedient to them), Junshi (suicide on occasion of the death of one's lord), and the custom of joint subjection to guilt.

4. Positive Justification of the Regime of Commercial Capitalism in the Ethics of Zen Buddhism

The vocational ethics of Zen Buddhism which has been mainly established by Suzuki Shōsan was succeeded and recognized by the three eminent Zen monks: Shidō Bunan, Shōju Rōjin, and Hakuin who followed him.

Shidō Bunan (1602-1676) was once an inn-keeper at Sekigahara in Mino province (present Gifu prefecture). At the middle of his life he became a monk, and went up to Edo (present Tokyo) to educate himself and to enlighten others. It is a well-known fact that throughout the latter half of his career, he completely detached himself from worldly fame and led an astoundingly rigorous and simple life. Like many other Zen masters, Bunan's conviction was that man can attain Satori (enlightenment) only if he could detach himself from the five kinds of desires: carnal desire, desire for possession love of life jealousy, and desire for fame. But at the same time he had an especially deep sin-consciousness, and an equally rigid view of life in terms of transmigration. Therefore, he said, "Those who aspire to enter into the path of the Buddha should, first of all, realize that there is no enemy but their own selves." He epitomized the final goal of Buddhism in the following verses: "If one could only die in the true sense of the word while living, then everything he does would be good." Besides, as for our attitude toward the Buddhist practice, he taught thus: "Go on killing your ego endlessly, and you will become empty, when you will find yourself to be a teacher to others." Consequently, the regulations he made for the sake of his disciples were all highly ascetic in nature. He preached to his followers that even a sheet of paper or a penny should never be wasted.

On account of the fact that Shōju (1642-1721) was educated by Bunan, the former led a secluded life at his birth place, Iiyama

in Shinano province (present Nagano prefecture) throughout his life. There he concentrated on hisself-discipline, while leading a very simple life. Like a typical Rinzai Zen monk, he was not only an advocator of overcoming the plane of life and death or the world of discrimination of enlightenment and delusion by means of an unceasing discipline and fervent determination, but also faithfully practiced what he said. What he emphasized most of all was the so-called realization of "Only today" or an attitude toward life to pass every day in the most fruitful way, bearing the motto, "Today, just at this foment" all the time in his mind. In actuality, this Zen monk's whole life was the sum-total of the days which he led with the motto, "Discipline with right thinking"; unceasing continuation".

Hakuin (1685-1768) was born in Suruga province (present Shizuoka prefecture), and became a monk while young, and he was once a disciple of Shōju. He is known as the reviver of Rinzai Zen Buddhism, nay, Zen Buddhism in general. He widely edified not only lords and warriors, but also peasants, merchants, and tradesmen by his sublime and deep thought and his free and skilful preaching. Like Shōsan, Bunan, and Shōju, Hakuin also used to preach to the effect that the final goal of seeing into the nature and becoming a Buddha could only be attained by unceasing and untiring effort. Furthermore, just like Shōsan, he taught people that only if they always kept in their minds the motto, "Discipline with right thinking; constant sitting in meditation", they would be able to enter into the great samādhi such as was attained by the holy masters in the past, in whatever kind of vocation they might be engaged. With Hakuin, the so-called "Discipline while moving" was immeasurably superior in value to the so-called "Discipline in calmness". Because it is certain that the economic life of our country would decline, the social order would be disturbed, and both our country and society would face the danger of cessation, if we threw away our respective vocations and just sat doing nothing. He pointed out that an admirable order or social economy is grounded

upon the foundation of the mutual rendering of services on the part of various branches of our vocational activities, and tried to show that our productive activities are by themselves indetical with the eternal reality, and that they by no means run counter to the teaching of Buddhism. We can see an extremely pragmatic view of the vocational structure of the modern society depicted very graphically in a pamphlet Hakuin made, entitled "Miyono Haratsuzumi", a part of which runs as follows:

"And yet we have the shelter to protect ourselves,
From rain and dew and we
Never passed a day without having our daily bread,
Or without enough clothes to keep us warm .
Does not this mean how fortunate we are,
What have we done for the world
That is really worth a penny?
Yet no little amount of harm
Have we done to the world.

.....

Our noble lords of old days
Armed to the teeth with coat of mail,
With spears and swords in deadly struggle
Tried to build the peaceful world
Which we enjoy nowadays.
We have enough fields to cultivate.
For whatever crops we wish to have:
Rice, wheat, barley, and millet.
When we pass along a lonely lane,
When we are in the mountains or fields,
None would try to hurt us.
In cities like Edo and Nagasaki
If we behave ourselves reasonably
None would try to hurt us
Always ready is a bowl of rice

To appease our hungry stomachs.
 There are cheap taverns we can lodge in
 At every nightfall that comes.
 The rivers are bridged, and if not,
 We can pass them by ferry boats,
 Or we are sure to find out
 Either a horse-back or a palanquin.
 A sweet drink from fermented rice
 Or fine rice-wine well warmed
 May be secured everywhere.
 Too many dainty dishes will be served us,
 So that we may have troubles in our stomachs.
”

Along with the above verses, Hakuin not only advised people to get out of the phantasmal world of fame and fleeting attachment, but recommended them to lead a life of endeavor and labor, rejecting the life of extravagance and slackness. He warned tradesmen among others not to commit unfair weighing or measurement in an attempt to earn exorbitant profits. On the other hand he called people's attention to the importance of capital in carrying on agriculture and trading.

5. Conclusions

It is the present writer's conviction that, by reviewing the development of the thought of vocational ethics in Japanese Zen Buddhism treated in the above he was able to prove that Max Weber's views on capitalism in general or the spirit of capitalism in the East were in most cases not correct. Yet the question remains: Whether the vocational ethics formed by Zen Buddhism actually played a leading rôle, being rooted in the ground of the profit-seeking enterprises in the country concerned, in this case, Japan, as was the case in Protestant schools in West Europe? In

this connection, present writer cannot agree with some scholars who are of the opinion that it was not until the beginning of the Meiji era that capitalism was introduced into Japan by way of the transplantation of the modern capitalism of the West. Nor can he agree to the view of some scholars that the ethics of Bushidō (the spirit of Japanese warriors) served as a favorable spiritual hotbed when modern capitalism was introduced to Japan, on account of the fact that most of Japan's representative, modern capitalists or entrepreneurs belonged to the class of warriors or its vicinity. Indeed, it is true that industrial capitalism began to be transplanted into Japan around the time of the Meiji Restoration, but what was termed by Werner Sombart early capitalism had really been in existence in Japan since the Empō and the Genroku periods (1673-1797). Besides, the bourgeois capitalistic vocational ethics had been firmly established as well when the ethics of Bushidō were accomplished, though in Japan this new thought of vocational ethics did not immediately exercise its influence so as to bring about a political and economic revolution in society. It was because the new administrators in the Tokugawa period reorganized the decentralized feudal system of the middle ages into the ideally centralized feudal society of distinct classes and succeeded in consolidating it. For this purpose they discarded Buddhism and adopted Confucianism or that in Chu-tsu's scholastic line, which was idealistic and rationalistic, and made it an instrument of ruling the country. In this way there came an age when Confucianism was overwhelmingly dominant, and for some time the creative and revolutionary power such as was seen in Buddhism at the beginning of the Tokugawa period was, so to speak, suffocated to death when it was yet in embryo long before the Genroku period (1688-1707). At the same time the Chōnin (common people) who were developing into the bourgeoisie seemed to be pushed into the narrow frame of a feudalistic caste. In the periods of Empō and Genroku, however, a new economic system, in which "silver begets silver", was in the process of creation, in distinction

from the previous periods.

After the periods of Empō and Genroku, a new kind of learning developed in Kyoto and Osaka, which was called Shingaku (the science of mind). At the beginning, it started as a merchants' morality or a teaching on economic ethics among the chōnin with property, and afterwards developed into a philosophy or ethics for the chōnin in general. The founder of Shingaku was Ishida Baigan (1685-1744), and this teaching was completed and developed by Nakazawa Dōji (1725-1803). Although Shingaku started from the theory of human nature and the principle of Confucianism interpreted by Chu-tzu, it advocated the trinity of Shintoism, Confucianism, and Buddhism, and aimed at subliming them by admitting their respective standpoints. As a result, there have appeared some scholars who try to identify the vocational ethics of Shingaku as taught by Ishida Baigan with the spirit of capitalism in Japan. In the present writer's eyes, such a view is not correct.

The six virtues which Shingaku emphasized were loyalty, filial piety, contentment with the realization of one's ability and circumstances, honesty, frugality, and perseverance. Of the above-mentioned virtues which remind us of the middle ages and feudalism, what the founder, Baigan, attached greater importance to were filial piety and perseverance as ethics for family relations. After all Shingaku was nothing but a rationalized system of ethics for merchant families, oppressed under the feudalistic social system. According to its ethics, "occupation" was generally understood in terms of "nariwai" or occupation for livelihood, "tosei" or a means for getting one's daily bread or after all, the trade of a family. In this understanding, there is no profound and religious sentiment. Every occupation regardless of its kind, is not identified with the work of the Buddha or the means by which everybody is led to enlightenment. Nor is there seen any protestant spirit which impells society to be finally revolutionized. Therein we can only see a positive phase of self-restraint which is not unrelated to the accumulation of capital on account of the fact that there is the

virtue of contentment with the realization of one's ability and circumstances, along with the virtues of frugality and perseverance, which are emphasized.

On the other hand, there are a few scholars, though small in number, who try to identify the thought of Jōdo Shinshū (The true sect of the Pure Land) which developed in Ohmi province (present Shiga prefecture) with the spirit of capitalism in Japan. This is because the Ohmi merchants are, as is apparent from their general appellation of Ohmi monto ("monto" means the groups of Jōdo Shinshū followers), mostly the devotees of Jōdo Shinshū. The characteristics of the Ohmi merchants are that their only joy of life is to carry out their occupations whole-heartedly, and they cut down their own enjoyment so as to identify their money-making activities with the object of life or their absolute object. It is true that Jōdo Shinshū was the most familiar of all the Buddhist sects to the Ohmi merchants. But it is not impossible for us to think that the union of asceticism and the self-objectification of money-making is an example of a more intensified form of egoism held by the commoner's families in the Tokugawa period, mentioned above. Furthermore, ethnologically speaking, Ohmi province is where the immigrants from the Shan-shi province of the Continental China, well-known since old times for their ability in trade, used to live from long ago.

When we come to think of this, then we have to pay more attention to what kind of relationship there was between Shingaku and the ethics of Zen Buddhism. We can point to the fact that Shingaku, in spite of its incessant advocacy of the trinity or the sublimation of Shintoism, Confucianism, and Buddhism, in reality depended in most cases upon the teaching of Zen Buddhism in dealing with them. It is quite apparent that the principle of "No deliberation" (by Tejima Toan) and "No self" (by Nakazawa Dōji) which were used by all the Shingaku scholars for consolidating the basis of their ethical theory were nothing but the final principle of Buddhism of the five aggregates have no entity.

Besides, at the meetings of Shingaku followers, it was one of their customs to sit in meditation after the fashion of the Buddhist *samādhi*. Furthermore, Oguri Ryōun, under whom Ishida Baigan, founder of Shingaku, studied, was a recluse who was fond of Sō Gaku (the learning of Sun), newly-established system of Confucian learning that had been formed by taking in the profound teaching of Zen Buddhism. Tejima Toan, who developed Shingaku, on the other hand, was deeply influenced by the famous Zen monks: Takuan, Ikkyū, and especially Bankei. Tōrei Reigen (1721-1793), under whom Nakazawa Dōji (who completed and spread Shingaku) studied, was one of the foremost disciples of Hakuin. As was to be expected, in Dōji's Shingaku, the trinity of the three teachings was in the form of Buddhism in which Shintoism and Confucianism were assimilated. In short, the inmost sanctuary of Shingaku was a kind of Zen, or Shingaku-Zen.

In this way, Mahāyāna Buddhism in Japan formed, especially through the unique development of the ethical doctrine of Zen Buddhism, the spiritual basis of capitalism, and has been working on the spiritual side for the rationalization of the accumulation of capital and the activities for acquiring profit. This fact, in parallel with a series of the other factors, assured the especially rapid growth of Japan's economy after the Meiji Restoration.

