Tolerance

A STUDY FROM BUDDHIST SOURCES

Phra Khantipalo

Tolerance

A STUDY FROM BUDDHIST SOURCES

Phra Khantipalo

Much has been written about tolerance, but in the West, at least, it has been little practised. Semitic religions have nearly always been identified with belief in this or that set of dogmas: they nearly all have their creeds to which their worshippers must subscribe and should not question too much. This applies to Judaism, Christianity and Islam and to a less extent to Hinduism as well.

By contrast, the Way of the Buddha has no dogmas and invites all to come and see for themselves whether it is true or not. The Buddha did not make statements which were to be believed blindly. He encouraged his followers always to enquire into the truth. He taught not doctrines but *method*.

This fundamentally different approach by the Buddha has been responsible for the remarkable absence of conflict within Buddhism and for the Buddhist tolerance of other religions.

This book analyses the particular ingredients which have contributed to Buddhism's 2,500 years of peaceful progress. It will prove of practical use both to Buddhists and to the followers of all other religions.

Note has been taken of the rare cases in which intolerance has occurred and can still be found in Buddhism. Finally a chapter is devoted to the crucial problem of how tolerant beliefs can face and triumph over intolerance and over their latest menace — Communism.

It is a thought provoking work supported throughout by abundant quotations from the Buddhist scriptures and writers of all the main schools of Buddhism.

25s net
IN UK ONLY

TOLERANCE

A Study from Buddhist Sources

PHRA KHANTIPĀLO

TOLERANCE

A Study from Buddhist Sources

RIDER & COMPANY
London

RIDER & COMPANY
178–202 Great Portland Street, London, W.1

AN IMPRINT OF THE HUTCHINSON GROUP

London Melbourne Sydney
Auckland Bombay Toronto
Johannesburg New York

★

First published 1964

This book has been set in Baskerville type face. It has been printed in Great Britain by The Anchor Press, Ltd., in Tiptree, Essex, on Antique Wove paper.

In Gratitude

My gratitude is deep indeed to my Ācariya, Venerable Buddharakkhita Thera of Bangalore, in whose quiet vihāra this book was thought out aided by numerous books from the library. A discussion with Ven. Saddhārakkhita Bhikkhu is gratefully remembered as this was really its conception. The period of gestation and its actual birth have been greatly helped by Ven. Sangharakshita Sthavīra's advice and his beautiful hermitage-vihāra in Kalimpong.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank the following authors and publishers for permission to quote various extracts from their books: Messrs. Allen & Unwin for *Mahayana Buddhism* by B. L. Suzuki, *Indian Philosophy* by S. Radhakrishnan, *Buddhist Wisdom Books* by Dr. Edward Conze, *The Buddha's Philosophy* by G. F. Allen. *Luzac's Oriental List for Buddhism and Five Centuries After* by Dutt, *Udanavarga* by Rockhill, Messrs. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. for *Life of the Buddha* by Brewster, *Bodhisattva Doctrine* by Har Dyal, *Lankjavatara Sutra* by D. T. Suzuki, *Early Buddhist Scriptures* by Thomas, Bruno Cassirer for *Buddhist Texts* translated by Dr. Edward Conze, Clarendon Press Ltd for *Saddharma Pundarika Sutra* by H. Kern, *Lotus of the Wonderful Law* by W. F. Soothill, Oxford University Press for *Tibetan Yoga* by Evans Wentz, *Some Sayings of Buddha* by F. L. Woodward, the Pali Text Society for various extracts from their publications, John Murray Ltd. for *Quest of Enlightenment* by E. J. Thomas, Penguin Books Ltd. for *Buddhist Scriptures* edited and translated by Dr. Edward Conze, Mentor Books for *Age of Adventure* edited by Giorgio de Santillana, the Buddhist Society for *Sutra of Wei Lang* by Wong Mou Lam, *Sutra of 42 Sections* by John Blofeld, *Selected Sayings from the Perfection of Wisdom* by Dr. Edward Conze.

CONTENTS

APPENDIX II THE COMPASSIONATE CHARACTER OF BUDDHAS, BODHISATTVAS AND DISCIPLES

The royalties from the sale of this book are devoted to the English Sangha Trust (at the Hampstead Buddhist Vihāra, 131 Haverstock Hill, London, N.W.3) supporting a Saṅgha of Buddhist Monks in England.

DIACRITICS. PRONUNCIATION AND NON-ENGLISH WORDS FOUND IN THE TEXT

I. DIACRITICS AND PRONUNCIATION

Just sufficient of these have been used to guide readers in the correct pronunciations and not so many, it is hoped, as to confuse them by an abundance of dots and accents. Scholars will have no difficulty, as they know already where such marks have been omitted. Generally the following scheme has been adopted:

Long vowel marks as on ā (f*a*ther), ī (mar*i*ne) and ū (l*u*natic) are used throughout.

The Sanskrit ṛ is generally written ri, as in Sansk*ri*t.

No fixed rule is adopted for ś. Where the convention has grown up to use sh in its place, this is continued, as in bhik*sh*u. In other cases ś has been used and can always be taken to approximate to sh, as in *sh*all.

The consonants ṁ, ṅ are used and both give the pronunciation of ng, as in si*ng*.

The Spanish sound ñ is equivalent to the English ny, as in te*n-y*ears or n in *n*ew.

The dotted ṇ, ḍ, ṭ, ḷ, and various types of dotted ṣ, have been ignored as being difficult for the English tongue to achieve without the guidance of a teacher.

Readers should remember, however, to give the proper stress to double consonants, as in Bu*d-dh*a, and not to ignore aspirated consonants, as in *Dh*arma.

II. NON-ENGLISH WORDS

A minimum of these have been used, such as will in time pass into the body of the English language. Upon the first occasion of their use an English translation follows in brackets. For short definitions of them a glossary is appended with these terms given in alphabetical order.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE FOOTNOTES

AN	—Anguttara Nikāya.
ASHB	—A Short History of Buddhism.
Asta	—Aśtasahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra.
Atth	—Atthasālinī.
Bodh	—Bodhicaryāvatāra.
Dhp	—Dhammapada.
DN	—Dīgha Nikāya.
MN	—Majjhima Nikāya.
PG	—Precepts of the Gurus (in Tibetan Yoga and Secret Doctrine).
PTS	—Pāli Text Society.
Sad Pun	—Saddharma Pundarika Sūtra.
SCE	—Sūtra of Complete Enlightenment.
Sik	—Sikśasamuccaya.
Sn	—Sutta Nipāta.
SN	—Saṁyutta Nikāya.
SWL	—Sūtra of Wei Lang.
S42S	—Sūtra of 42 Sections.
Udv	—Udānavarga.
Vim Mag	—Vimutti Magga.
Vin Pit	—Vinaya Pitaka.
Vis Mag	—Visuddhi Magga.

INTRODUCTION

Nāmo Buddhāya
Nāmo Dharmāya
Nāmo Sanghāya

'This is the Buddha's doctrine: not to cherish enmity, not to fight, not to abuse.' (1)

'*When you see men in disharmony try to create harmony.*
Speak good of others and never of their faults.
Cherish a good mind even for your enemy.
Hold to the mind of compassion and regard all beings as your parents.' (2)

'The Buddha addressed the assembly and said: "Patience is the best thing in the world: it is the way to contentment, it comforts solitude, it is honoured by wise men, it cements friendship, it gains fine reputation, it leads to freedom, power, dignity, it illumines the world, it brings skill, it subdues melancholy and enmity, it adds to beauty, it smooths racial relations, it brings excellent rewards. It works for goodness, longevity and honour. Patience hurts nobody and is the Buddhadharma." ' (3)

'A loving heart is the greatest requirement! Not to oppress, not to destroy, not to exalt oneself by treading down others, but to comfort and befriend those in suffering.' (4)

Here is the whole message of the Master of Wisdom and Compassion ringing down through the ages, a message which has inspired so many people in so many countries to the peaceful practice of what we now call 'Buddhism'. Within the vast collections recording the sayings of the Buddha and the almost infinite number of commentaries, treatises and guides to the Way which have accumulated, there lies a treasure store rich in clear understanding, shining with the radiance of limitless compassion. One jewel of these riches the writer, unlearned though he is, has sought to display, that many may see its excellent lustre—this is

1. Ratnakaradakavyuha Sūtra.
2. Upāsaka-śīla Sūtra.
3. Mahāsannipata Sūtra.
4. Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king.

the jewel of tolerance. A many-sided gem is this, gleaming with Enlightenment and guiding all who have followed, practised and understood His Way in all their thought, speech and action, indeed it is radiantly evident in all the records of both Master and those following Him.

And so an attempt has been made to set these forth in some order. In doing this the writer feels greatly his lack of understanding compared with the eminent ones of the past, also his inability to express well the profound ideas connected with this spirit of tolerance. Indeed, what is here written is but the connective tissue between the vital organs—merely holding together the invaluable sayings of the Lord and His sages. Or, these sayings might fitly be compared to jewels sparkling with wisdom and compassion but in a base-metal setting—such is this commentary.

In writing about this subject one finds that it is intimately connected to all the principal Buddhist doctrines. To take a simile from a famous Sūtra: It is rather like taking hold of one gem in Indra's Jewel-Net. When one takes hold of a connection in a net all parts of the net are moved. So here the jewel of tolerance, when examined, leads us also to admire such gems as the Eightfold Path, the Abhidhamma, the Pāramitā and, finally, the crest-jewel of Anātman.

While this is a compendium of sayings, it is also more, for sweet words alone are not esteemed by Buddhists. As the Lord has said:

'Just like a beautiful flower that is brilliant but devoid of fragrance, even so fruitless are the fair words of him who does not put them into practice.' (5)

When a person does as he says, and moreover when his thought always accords with these outward expressions, then indeed his words are worthy. They are worth taking up, studying, appreciating and applying to one's own life. The Buddhas and their words are pre-eminently worthy and, since their minds are completely Enlightened, their speech and action never depart from this Highest Wisdom and Compassion. Countless are those who, going along this Ancient Way of the Buddhas, have also come to Enlightenment. The quotations presented here of Buddha-words are therefore worthy, as they are the teachings of the worthiest,

5. Dhp 51.

those who have gone beyond mere hearing of doctrines, beyond learning and intellectually knowing doctrines, those who have penetrated and realized completely the Truth.

Now what is meant by tolerance in Buddhism? As a virtue it is nowhere directly mentioned by the Buddha and the exactly equivalent word cannot be found in the early Pāli scriptures. But a quality much stressed in many places is patience (see Chapter I, Section III, for a comparative definition of this and tolerance). With the cultivation of patience, other noble traits of character appear: endurance, forbearance, friendliness, forgiveness, which may all be summed up under the quality of tolerance. Thus toleration for a Buddhist is far more than merely 'putting-up' with; it is more even than 'bearing with', for such sorts of tolerance are only negative. Buddhist tolerance is founded upon very positive factors, as may be seen below. It is, moreover, a tolerance expressed at all levels of Buddhism. It is not the tolerance of unlettered savagery nor yet that of indifference, but this tolerance finds expression through a high level of culture and by sublime religious teachings. Without fear of contradiction, one may say that Buddhadharma is the only one of the world's major religions in which deep faith and true tolerance co-exist.*

So much talk about tolerance—and here is a book on it, a quality which Buddhists have always taken for granted! Buddhists have never remarked on this subject and so far as the writer knows there is no ancient treatise in any of the Indian languages or in Chinese or Tibetan dealing with it. It does not apparently call for any comment by religions with which Buddhadharma has co-existed; Jains, Hindus, Taoists, Confucianists, Bon and Shinto followers all thought that tolerance was the natural thing—of course, religions and religious persons are tolerant, they would not qualify for these names otherwise. Doubtless this is an over-simplification, but it remains broadly true of the Far Eastern ideas on Dharma. But to anyone with a different background, coming from the West where religions have always been intolerant, Buddhism poses a strange question. Here is a world religion, having millions of followers divided between many different schools of thought; it has doctrines diverse and apparently contradictory; and it has spread over all of Eastern Asia and come into contact with many other religions: yet neither has there been appreciable bigotry and intolerance

* But see a contrary Christian viewpoint in Soderblom's *The Living God—Studies in Basal Forms of Religious Experience*.

within its own body, nor has it conflicted with other faiths—how can this possibly be? In this Introduction we will give only brief answers to this and other related questions. *How* Buddhism can be tolerant is best explained by the mention of two fundamental qualities: Wisdom (prajñā) and Compassion (karunā). *Why* is it tolerant? Because it has no fixed dogmas. *With whom* is it tolerant? Both with those practising its Way and all outsiders. *Where* and *when* has it been tolerant? In all countries to which it has spread and in all its long history. In the course of the various chapters to follow these answers will be expanded and, it is hoped, substantiated.

The world today presents a striking contrast to the spirit of tolerance prevailing in Buddhism and very few people indeed can doubt the value of this virtue now. Is not the 'news' full of 'wars and rumours of wars' besides numerous sorts of lesser strife? Our present world is full of doctrines which, since they are dogmatic, must clash with each other. Thus Capitalism opposes Communism, and Christianity largely accepting the former necessarily collides with the latter. Again, Christian teaching is at loggerheads with Islam, while the latter has strongly persecuted many other faiths. All such teachings, though they talk about peace, because of their dogmatic assertiveness actually provoke the many troubles from which the world suffers. Therefore a Way teaching tolerance, moreover one which has so practised it that religious persecution of other faiths is unknown in its history (see Chapter 2, Section I, and Chapter 3, Section II), must be of great relevance in the present day.

In this connection Dr. Conze says:

'All those who dwell in Asia can take pride in a religion which is not only five centuries older than that of the West, but has spread and maintained itself without recourse to violence, and has remained unstained by religious wars and crusades.' (6)

Such a fine record is unparalleled among the great world religions with the one exception of Manichaeism, which seems to have been strongly influenced by both the Buddha's teachings and by those of Mahāvīra. (Jainism, since it is confined to parts of India, is not here considered as a world religion.) Those who value tolerance may therefore be interested in a teaching which has consistently adhered to this principle.

Why is there this contrast between Buddhism, a non-persecuting

6. ASHB, p. 111.

religion, and the intolerance of many other faiths? Most of this book will try to answer this question from the Buddhist standpoint. But first let us examine the reasons underlying the opposing attitude of most religions so that things are seen in their correct perspective.*

The foundations on which the various world faiths rest are of two contrasting types. The great majority are Divine-Revelation religions. That is, where a 'God'† has revealed certain matters to individuals he is said to have selected. Such Gods are thought to be All-knowing, All-loving, All-powerful (etc.), Creators of the Universe. Since they have these attributes, whatever they reveal is taken to be THE TRUTH. Also those through whom such 'TRUTH' is revealed are at least thought to be divinely inspired prophets or else a relation or aspect of God, even God himself. Difficulties are therefore threefold. First, there are claimed to be a number of such Omnipotent Gods. Thus the Christian speaks of God, the Muslim of Allah, the Jew of Yahveh, while the Hindu may give many names to Ishvara. It is not surprising that the various myths and theologies woven around these Gods are quite different and their attributes and relationship to their creation may vary considerably. Secondly, various degrees of exclusiveness are propounded for the intermediate messengers between these Gods and men. They are prophets, avatāras, the Last Prophet, the Son of God, God's Messenger, etc. It is intended by such titles to increase the importance of one's own prophet in the eyes of men at the expense of the others. The third difficulty lies with the TRUTHS. One cannot have a number of such divinely inspired TRUTHS which conflict with each other. Either some of the Gods are wrong or their messengers were mistaken or fraudulent, or plainly some of these TRUTHS are untruths. Viewed from this basis, the religion one believes in becomes merely a matter of blind faith or convention. (My family is Christian/Hindu/Muslim, etc., therefore I am a Christian/ . . . etc.) The three facts outlined here have produced much trouble. Numerous wars have been fought by followers of different dogmatic religions against one another. We need not speak only of the past, for this continues in the present and will remain as long as dogmas are blindly believed.

Nor is this all. The blind believers have not been content to

* See also 'Religion as Revelation and as Discovery', by Venerable Sangharakshita Sthavīra, *Maha Bodhi Journal*, Vol. 63, No. 3.

† Where 'God' is spelt with a capital 'G' it denotes the Supreme Creator conception (in India, Ishvara).

fight only those of other faiths, for they have also fought, persecuted and massacred others of their own religion. So Protestants have battled with Catholics and Sunnis with Shiahs, while the sects of Zoroaster's faith have been far from tolerant with each other. Sects arise upon differing interpretations of the same scripture; for instance, all Christians honour the Bible, but the United States knows 700 different brands of Christianity, most of which will support their various doctrines by appeal to different interpretations of the Book. Moreover, most will claim that their particular doctrine is correct and that of others is faulty. But this is only due to differences in the minds of individuals—one thinks a passage means one thing but another thinks quite differently (see Chapter 1, II, B4). What a shallow basis for doctrinal squabbles or even for the beginning of wars! See how much trouble comes from blind faith in Absolute Gods, the unquestionable nature of their messengers, and most of all from dependence on the 'divinely inspired' words of scriptures.

A fourth cause of contention between religions and followers of different sects may be mentioned here. This is the priesthood, those who are trained in 'correct' interpretation of the doctrine, pass it on to others, perform ceremonies and who act as intercessors between God and his created men. Priests have always wielded great power, since it is through them alone (they say) that men can come to God. Using this exclusiveness, they have aroused their faithful to fight the others—who are, of course, misguided heathens or heretics since not under those priests' power. Priesthoods are common to the older Christian Churches, Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Hinduism and have even tended to develop in non-clerical Islam.

Contrasted with these religions is Buddhadharma. No exclusive Creator God is found within its doctrines. It has, therefore, no quarrel with other faiths on this score. Since such a God is denied existence, a messenger from him also cannot exist. The man born to become Gautama Buddha had by his own exertions achieved the exalted and fully enlightened state called Buddhahood. So the Buddhas are not messengers from gods, nor yet incarnations (avatāra) of them, but they *are* called 'Satthādevamanussānaṁ'—'teacher of gods and men'. Regarding the Buddha, His life and example, a pioneer English Bhikshu has written:

'Only one thing more can here be told of that great life: a fact which cannot be omitted here, for without its deep significance the whole in-

comparable history of Buddhism could not be understood. It is a fact that, when He passed away, His near disciples, looking back on all those years of constant teaching and example, could say of Him: So passed away the Great, the Loving Teacher, who never spake an angry or a cruel word.* Only that, and yet what blessing for humanity has not been hidden in that brief pregnant summary of a life—greater than any life amongst the myriads of the sons of men! A Teacher of Religion, the founder of a great religion, who lived amongst his fellows, those holding views and following creeds the most diverse; who lived and taught for forty years the new Truth He had found, the Truth wherewith He burned to help His fellow-men; and yet, who never spoke an angry or a cruel word! Think, you that read, what potency of truth lies hidden in that little sentence. Forty years of teaching, and never an angry word—no word of blame or harsh denunciation of the worldly of His time; no threatenings of hell for those who would not follow the way He taught! It is because His followers could truly say that of His life, that, in such contrast to all other of the world's great faiths, Buddhists this day can boast that on their Creed's behalf has never one drop of blood been shed, never a persecution waged, never a "Holy War" been prosecuted; although today five hundred million human beings have taken refuge in His Name, His Truth. To the Buddhist, that fact, did it stand alone, were proof beyond traversing of His religion's truth. For men who *know*, no longer fight or angrily denounce one another; where wisdom is, there is perfect tolerance.' (7)

Again, the Buddhist scriptures are not to be regarded as word for word absolutely true, but are in fact indications, guides, skilful means to aid the unenlightened towards the state of Buddhahood. What is experienced in this state can never be set down in conceptual language. Hence Buddhists do not blindly follow the words of their scriptures but try to get at their inner meaning by means of their practice. As the Sūtra says:

'The Tathāgatas† do not teach a Dharma‡ that is dependent on letters. . . . Anyone who teaches a doctrine that is dependent on letters and words is a mere prattler, because Truth is beyond letters and words and books. . . . But no one must become attached to the words of the scriptures because even the canonical texts sometimes deviate from their

* This is quoted as though in some Buddhist scripture but it has not been possible to trace its source.

7. *The Religion of Burma.*

† See Glossary.

‡ In this book 'Dharma' when used by itself always means 'the Teaching of the Buddha'.

straightforward course owing to the imperfect functioning of sentient minds.' (8)

Buddhism differs, too, in that it has no priesthood. There are the bhikshus (monks) and bhikshunīs (nuns) of the Saṅgha (Order), who, if learned themselves, are qualified to teach others, but they neither conduct lay ceremonies nor of course do they have any intercessory powers. Their preaching has ever led to peace and never resulted in strife.

For all these reasons Buddhists have never waged a 'Holy War' to convert others to their truths, nor even have they fought amongst themselves over correct scriptural interpretations.

* * *

Buddhism has also to be seen with reference to the general Indian background. Why is it that in India the most terrible persecutions and worst examples of intolerance are not found? And why, on the other hand, have occasional periods of persecution occurred? To answer these questions it is necessary to go to the roots of Hinduism, which has in India's long history been the dominant complex of beliefs and ideas in many parts of the country and for long periods of time.

All systems of thought recognized in Hinduism as 'orthodox' are based more or less upon the Vedas. Great reverence is accorded these books by most Hindus, few of whom know any of their contents. This reverence, nourished on ignorance, is scarcely justified, for the Vedas are a primitive type of religious literature in which natural forces are deified and worshipped with hymns intended to placate them. Magical spells abound for controlling the powers of nature but one will look in vain for a philosophy of life or even an ethical code. It is not surprising that systematic meditation practices and the development of wisdom find no place either. This is not to decry the Vedas but only to view them in proper perspective. There are certainly fine poems and hymns, but what is most relevant to the present enquiry is the presence in these books of much blood-spilling and the glorification of violence. Sacrifices to appease the gods are frequently described, and not only of such animals as cows and horses, but also of men. A literature extolling the efficacy of such sacrifices with much reference also to beef-eating and, much worse, to the plentiful

8. Lankāvatāra Sūtra, Ch. 3, LXXVI.

consumption of intoxicants, cannot but lead to the growth of less admirable aspects of mankind.

The Upanishads, composed in a later period, interest a Buddhist for the remarkable variety of speculations on Brahman and Ātman which the Lord Buddha and His followers have in many places shown as false (see Chapter 1, II, A3). For the Buddhist, the examples of the seers (rishis) related in these texts do not seem very edifying. We find these beings, who are regarded as being spiritually highly advanced, cursing with their mighty power, and burning up whole countries. Power and violence are here again shown as favoured. Other Hindu scriptures, important in relation to our subject, but which are post-Buddhist, will be mentioned later. It seems doubtful whether a truly tolerant religion can be established on such foundations. Such has proved to be the case, for apart from the occasional persecution of Buddhism, Jainism and other heterodoxies, Hinduism has an unequalled record of internal intolerance, such being a fair description of the caste system instituted and upheld by the traditional Hindu law.

From such a brief examination of ancient Hindu scripture one inevitably and regrettably concludes that since Hinduism is founded upon scriptures dogmatically said to be God-given, the tone of which is far from non-violent, it follows that whatever persecutions took place were due at least in part to this element of savagery.

Then from where is the opposite tendency derived: that of mildness, gentleness and tolerance?* As teachings encouraging it are not characteristic of the 'orthodox' scriptures, one must turn to other systems—the 'outsiders'. Jainadharma has always been famous for its emphasis on non-violence (ahiṁsa). For the Jain, 'ahiṁsa paramadharma' has always to be observed. It is natural that a doctrine striving not to harm or kill any being should be essentially pacific by nature. Where ahiṁsa is strong, tolerance must be likewise. This is one religion which has in scripture and practice promoted peaceable relations between men.

For the Buddhist, non-violence is not the highest teaching, but its place, an important one in Buddhadharma,† should be described. This principle may be regarded from three points of view. Ethically it is a doctrine of non-offensiveness towards others

* On ahiṁsa, see a fine passage at pp. 212–15 in *Buddhist Thought in India* by Dr. E. Conze.

† See Additional References 11.

whereby their security (as well as one's own comfort) is upheld. Individual and social justice is quite impossible unless the ethics of non-harming are practised. The Pañca-śīla (Five Precepts) of the Buddhist layman are in fact all ways of training to eliminate violence both to oneself and all others. The ethical practice of ahiṁsa and its advantages are to be seen from the following:

'Intact is the strength of one who keeps his heart in obedience to reason and strays not to ways of ill-will, aversion and hate. He hurts not himself, he hurts not others. He is a blessing to himself and to all else. He becomes beloved of all. His paths are made smooth. None envy him. Nobody is against him. Nobody grows jealous of him. He wings through life like a swan through the blue sky unhindered, an object of delight to all eyes.

Where such a loving one dwells, there all is at peace; for the loving one never interferes with others' rights, with others' freedom, with others' lives, in any way. He helps others in pleasant, kindly acts, endearing, encouraging, energizing and vitalizing all with his benign nature.' (9)

Psychologically, ahiṁsa is practice in controlling and overcoming mental factors (cetasikā), such as anger, ill-will and remorse (see Ch. 1, II, A4). To the extent that these are overcome, so the desire to destroy becomes less. Those who have completely cured the illness of anger and related diseases practise throughout their lives the virtue of harmlessness. So that this may grow speedily, not only abstention from hatred is necessary but also its positive counterpart, the cultivation of the wholesome factors of Maitrī (altruistic loving kindness), Karunā (willingness to share others' sorrows, compassion) and Muditā (sympathetic joy). A more detailed account of these negative and positive mental factors in relation to the growth of tolerance will be given below (see Ch. 1, II, C5).

How is ahiṁsa to be viewed philosophically? In laying hold of the gem of ahiṁsa, and so of toleration, we soon find that the whole jewel-net of the most profound and fundamental teachings of the Exalted One are moved and related. Each may be briefly noted here for its connection to our subject. For exhaustive and systematic treatment of these doctrines readers must turn to manuals specially devoted to their exposition.

The Buddhist upholds ahiṁsa, as he neither wishes harm upon himself nor upon others. He thereby practises the Buddha's

9. *Dharmapradīpika of Gurulugomi*, IV.

teaching that deliberate actions (of thought, speech, body) are potentially productive of result. This means that all karmas (volitional deeds) have inherently sufficient energy to come at some time to fruition. (Results or vipāka are, however, limited, since conditions may be unfavourable to their arising or counter-active karma may be strong enough to prevent the fruiting of previous action.) Thus realizing:

> 'I am responsible for my deed (Karma), I am the heir to my deed, the womb of my deed, the kinsman of my deed, I am he to whom my deed comes home. Whatever deed I shall do, be it good or bad, of that I shall be the heir' (10)

he is careful not to commit what is wrong in the sense of harmful, only doing what is wholesome and beneficial. All this is based upon the Compassionate One's words:

> 'All beings are afraid of pain (duḥkha), all beings are afraid of death. Recognizing (lit. comparing) oneself in others, one should neither kill nor cause to kill.' (11)

In this way Buddhists understand that to practise ahiṁsa results in happiness arising for themselves and comfort for others, immediately, later in this life, or in a future state of birth.

A second doctrine deeply connected with karma is that of Conditioned Co-production (the most accurate rendering of Pratitya-Samutpāda). This teaching states that all 'things'—events, places, beings; every thing from the cosmic formation of galaxies to the components of a single thought—arise due to conditioning factors (pratyāya) of varying types and differing strengths. Thus, there are no events, beings (etc.) arising from nothing. Nor is there anything arisen or produced from one cause (see Ch. 1, II, A3). This teaching is not that of cause and effect but rather of complexes of conditioning forces operating on each other throughout past, present and future, giving rise through this interaction to phenomena. Studying this teaching, one becomes aware that all phenomena, including, of course, what I call 'my self', are dependently related, more or less remotely, to all other phenomenal events. To hurt others is thus to hurt oneself and to do injury to oneself is to harm all others, for here our idea of a separate personality, being, self, is seen to be

10. AN, Dasa Nipāta, Ch. V, sutta viii.
11. Dhp 129.

false, and the artificial barriers between 'self' and 'other' are broken down. All men wish for their own happiness, a good man is glad both in his own happiness and in that of others, the wise man rejoices that through knowledge of interdependence he may be of benefit to all, acting without thought of self. Those who have realized what Pratitya-Samutpāda means through the growth of their wisdom are incapable of any violence since they no longer distinguish between 'I' and 'not-I' (see Ch. 1, IV). Fundamental to the Dharma as a path of progress is the balanced development of Prajñā and Karunā (Wisdom and Compassion). In outlining ahiṁsa from the Buddhist standpoint, both these factors have been related to it. Ahiṁsa as a quality is the expression of Karuṇā, whereas, going deeper into the doctrine, Prajñā is necessary for initial understanding, and grows as the mind is sharpened to penetrate the nature of Saṁsāra, the realm of birth and death, and of Nirvāna, the Undying.

So it is to the wise and compassionate Buddha (also to Mahāvīra) that we must trace the spirit of non-violence in Indian history. The above excursus into the origins of ahiṁsa, though long, is necessary to account for the presence of tolerance. Having now traced to their roots the opposing tendencies of persecution and toleration, one can better understand the varying degrees of them which are found in different ages.

While Indian states and empires were governed under Buddhist influence then tolerance prevailed (see Ch. 2, I), but when Brahminism arose in reaction against the unorthodox teachings of the Buddha there followed greater or lesser intolerance. This is so since Brahminism supports its claims dogmatically (the Vedas are the *authoritative* scripture given by God), and so cannot bear any serious rivalry. New scriptures were written in the name of God, such as the Bhagavad Gīta (*c.* 200 B.C.–A.D. 200) and the fabulous Purānas which gave support both to the firm establishment of Brahminism, with its oppressive social code, as well as to the persecution of Dharmas not in accord with orthodoxy. Indeed, the Purānas openly incite to violence for the destruction of heterodox teachings (Buddhism, Jainism, Ajivikism, etc.).

The fruit of this campaign to rouse hatred and ignore tolerance can be seen briefly in the following extract:

'King Pushyamitra who adored and sacrificed to the Devas, destroyed in the second century B.C. many Saṅghārāmas (monasteries) and killed

the bhikshus who dwelt therein. A century after Kanishka, Vikramāditya, King of Śrāvasti, became a persecutor of the Buddhists. Mihirakula, a worshipper of Śiva, slaughtered countless followers of the Buddha. Sasānka, Rāja of Bengal, proved in the middle of the seventh century C.E. an inveterate enemy of Buddhism and endeavoured a number of times to uproot the Bodhi Tree. In Kashmir, Kshemagupta and Shri Harsha were ruthless in their dealings with the Buddhists. At the instance of Kumārīla Bhatta, the Buddhists were driven out of Kerala. According to the *Śankaravijaya*, King Sudhavan issued the following injunction to his people, "from the bridge (of Rāma, in Ceylon), to the Himālayas, who does not slay the Buddhists, both old and young, shall be slain". The mere fact of entering a Buddhist sanctuary is reckoned in the *Vrihannāradiya Purāna* as a sin for which there is no forgiveness. Sūlapāni, the founder of the Bengal school of law, made the very sight of a Buddhist atonable by the most severe penances. According to the *Anubhāgavatā*, an Upapurāna, specially devoted to the subject of Kalkiavatāra—the coming avatāra of Vishnu—the first expedition of Kalki will be against the Buddhists in Kikata. Even the Jains, who have been noted for their ahimsa doctrine, have been intolerant to the Buddhists. Through the instrumentality of Akalankadeva, a Jain is said to have persecuted the Buddhists, subjecting them to personal tortures and banishing them from the country.' (12)

So much for the chequered history of tolerance within India. In evaluating it, one must point out that though these disgraceful episodes occurred, they are nothing compared with the wholesale massacres and vile persecutions practised by Christianity in nearly every area in which it succeeded in gaining power, by Islam likewise to 'unbelievers', and by the Zoroastrian hierarchy within the bounds of the Persian empire. Such frightful and persistent persecution did not exist in India since the moderating influences of Jainism and Buddhism combined to soften men's hard-heartedness, so bringing about a spirit of gentleness. Outside India, the same mildness spread inseparable from the teachings of the Compassionate Buddha—in truth it is, as the poet has said:

'That wisdom which hath made our Asia mild.' (13)

However, in this Introduction we have not been so concerned to show what tolerance as a quality *means* in Buddhism. To understand the unique approach of Buddhadharma to this topic a fairly detailed examination of various teachings of the Buddha

12. *The Essence of Buddhism*, pp. 30–40.
13. *The Light of Asia*, Book VIII.

will be necessary. Though many doctrines might be chosen to illustrate the Buddhist attitude, four approaches have been selected as particularly relevant. The first, the Noble Eightfold Path, occurs commonly as a Way in the scriptures of both Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna, whereas the second is a psychological presentation of tolerance based on the mental factors of the Theravāda Abhidhamma. The third approach is through the Pāramitā (Perfections), especially that of Patience (Kśānti)—this is common to the Pāli Jātaka and late Pāli works as well as in Mahāyāna texts, where indeed its cultivation is much stressed. Kśānti in its deepest sense then leads us to consider the fourth doctrine—that of Anātman (No-self) and its relation to tolerance.

I

THE RELATION OF FOUR BUDDHIST DOCTRINES TO TOLERANCE

I. THE NOBLE EIGHTFOLD PATH AND TOLERATION

The Path of Eight Factors is a well-known formulation of the Buddha's teaching in countries where the Hīnayāna Canon of scriptures is found. Some of the eight limbs have a significance for our present study. The order in which these are given has a very real meaning: First come two factors which are classed under Prajñā (wisdom), the first of which is Perfect View. After the wisdom factors follow three concerning Śīla (morality). Of the last two concerning meditation (Samādhi), the one of interest here is Perfect Mindfulness. How do the six factors relevant here* under their headings of Śīla, Samādhi and Prajñā affect our topic?

To appreciate the qualities of the Buddha's teaching one must have some initial and quite mundane wisdom. Having then taken up Buddhadharma, to make any progress on this Path one has to practise morality. When morality is pure, the mind becomes settled, mindfulness becomes less of a struggle and much more natural, and one finds that it is then comparatively easy to attain to states of concentrated absorption (dhyāna). It is most important to note Perfect View comes first,† and last also in the

* Two factors not relevant are Perfect Aims and Perfect Meditation. These are omitted from this account.

† See MN iii, 71 ff.

sense that with the mind's powers of concentration developed it is possible to augment wisdom for true seeing of Saṁsāra and Nirvāna.

The Buddha is quite definite (but, as will be shown, not dogmatic) about having Perfect View* to start with and this means holding with faith to what the Enlightened Ones have taught, until such time as, with supermundane wisdom, it is 'realized by the wise each for himself'† that these teachings are the Truth. The Buddha would not wrangle about whether other teachers had or had not realized the Truth (see Subhadra's Question in the Mahāparinirvāna Sūtra) but He certainly emphasized:

'Indeed the Truth is one, there is not another.' (14)

If one has not Perfect View—at least an intellectual knowledge of the Buddha's Dharma to start with—the remaining stages of the Path become difficult; truly, without such a view it is impossible to develop supermundane wisdom and thus pass beyond the realm of Saṁsāra. When one has gone beyond, Perfect Views are No-views, there being only unshakable knowledge of Truth. No formulations of it can be ultimately correct. Knowing this, those who have gained this state have no quarrel with anyone.

So, in the beginning, one holds Right Views, those leading towards liberation, and while firm in the faith that the Path of the Buddhas is unexcelled, one cultivates appreciation and tolerance of others' ways; after knowing for oneself what the Buddhas have realized, toleration for all creeds becomes a natural

* Of Right Views (Sammāditthika); hence:

'(i) adhering to the Dharma of the Buddha as formulated in the stereotype formulae such as the Four Noble Truths and the Three Characteristics (tilakkhana) without inclining either to the extreme of Eternalism (sassatavāda), or to the extreme of Nihilism (ucchedevāda); opposed to wrong views (micchāditthi), both in the wider sense of the erroneous beliefs of non-Buddhists and a narrower one of a misunderstanding of the Dharma by one who has taken the Three Refuges; as (in the phrase), "an orthodox bhikkhu";

(ii) according to, or congruous with, the scriptures common to all schools of Buddhism, especially as expressed in the stereotype formulae such as the Four Truths and Three Characteristics which are found in both the scriptures which are, and in the scriptures which are not, common to all schools; as (in the phrase), "an orthodox opinion, book, etc.".' From *The Meaning of Orthodoxy in Buddhism*, by Ven. Sangharakshita Sthavīra.

† Pacattaṁ veditabbo viññūhi.

14. Sn 884.

part of one's character, while at the same time one beats the Drum of the Dharma proclaiming to all that this indeed is the True Way.

Since all Buddhadharma is a way of training, it is natural that great stress is laid upon ethical conduct. One is expected to train one's speech, tame one's actions—and follow an occupation in which neither killing nor hurting of any beings is involved. These three trainings comprise the Śīla section of the Eightfold Path.

The tongue is to be trained. How?

'Our conduct in speech must be perfectly pure, clear, open, without defects, controlled.' (15)

Towards this ideal the Buddhist trains himself, and:

'He who speaks words which bring him no grief and which will do no harm to his neighbour, speaks well.' (16)

That such speech will encourage the spirit of toleration may be seen from a longer passage of Buddha-word:

'. . . he is reconciler of those who are at variance and one who brings closer those who are friends. Concord is his pleasure, concord his delight, concord his joy, harmony is the motive of his speech. Abandoning harsh speech, he is restrained from harsh speech. Whatever speech is gentle, pleasing to the ear, affectionate, going to the heart, urbane, pleasant to the multitude—such speech does he utter.' (17)

Such gentleness should also characterize the written word, for this as well as speech has great powers capable of arousing mobs to fury or of promoting peace. In writing about doctrines, the Truth must be presented clearly—which may not be pleasant to some; there should never be, in any case, elements of maliciousness, despising or ridiculing others' views, beliefs and practices.

The body and its actions too must be tamed. How much misery has come from unrestrained actions in time of persecution? History is full of records of killings, plunderings and rape, committed against those whose beliefs differ from one's own. Restraint of the body, enjoined on all Buddhists in the first three of the Five Precepts (training oneself not to hurt or kill, not to take what is not given, not to commit any sexual offences), has resulted

15. MN i, 278. 16. Udv, Ch. VIII, verse 12.
17. MN i, 288.

in the *peaceful* conquest by Buddhism of most of East Asia. Peacefully conquering through the might of the Tathāgata's Word, Buddhists have expressed their tolerance towards others by their controlled bodily ways.

Certain occupations are not consistent with tolerance for beings. These are avoided by Buddhists who seek to have Perfect Livelihood. This means work that does others no injury. Therefore intolerant ways such as those of the Catholic inquisitors or Court of the Star Chamber judges, and like persecutors in our present day, could never be followed by a Buddhist. For instance, he would find such occupations as a brain-washing expert or political indoctrinator incompatible with his profession of Buddhism.

Nor can Buddhists ever adopt the attitudes of missionaries of dogmatic religions.* Many are the methods used to ensnare people into abandoning 'heathenism' and 'idol-worship', to become believers in one of the many 'True Doctrines'. The writer knows of numerous cases (even in the present 'enlightened' age, not to speak of the past) of unwelcome attempts at 'conversion', by: subtly educating children of other faiths, kidnapping, money-lending, inveigling with the promise of land or money, ensnaring by sexual entanglements, forcible conversion by marriage, crooked presentation of doctrines, political pressure—this horrific list knows no end.† It is presumably held by such missionaries that the means are justified by the ends. The ends are the conversion of everyone anyhow to whatever sect or religion the missionaries belong. All such activities to convert the 'heathen' are pursued regardless of the wishes of the latter. It is fortunate that missions are usually unable now to use force in conversion—'the sword in the right hand and the Q'uran (or Bible) in the left!' Since intolerance is at the root of dogmatic religions, Buddhists should not be deceived into thinking that missionaries' attitudes are now improved. No—for they now use cunning and deceit, but would, given half a chance, again revert to the bloody intolerance characteristic of their activities in the history of all the world's continents. Such actions which have brought suffering to so many in the past, and not a few in the present, can never have the support of tolerant and gentle Buddhists. They would rather support the words, written so long ago in a Europe torn with religious strife, of Sir Thomas More who, if he

* See Appendix I.

† See Additional References 14.

did not practise exactly as he wrote, had at least the right ideas:

'Firste of all he made a decree, that it should be lawfull for everie man to favoure and folow what religion he would, and that he mighte do the best he could to bring other to his opinion, so that he did it peaceablie, gentelie, quietlie, and soberlie, without hastie and contentious rebuking and invehing against other. If he could not by faire and gentle speche induce them unto his opinion yet he should use no kinde of violence. . . .' (18)

The last factor to be considered here is in the section of the Path concerning the controlling and calming of the mind. Throughout the Buddha's teaching we find Him emphasizing the necessity of mindfulness (here Samyak Smriti). Without this quality of awareness it is impossible to go along the Way He taught. Indeed, any sort of mental discipline and control requires the presence of mindfulness. In developing this Path-factor in conjunction with Perfect Views and the section or Śīla, Buddhists maintain in themselves the perfection of toleration which has so pervaded their history.

* * *

The Eightfold Path is also called the Middle Way. This is because it avoids the extremes of rigid discipline and laxity which are common in every age. But its 'middleness' does not mean mere compromise. It is a middle in the sense of a razor-edge ridge rising between two deep valleys. Most prefer the easy routes through these valleys of extreme opposites (they will not come in these ways to Truth), a few try climbing the razor-edge but many of these slip down the precipices of dogmatic beliefs one side or the other (they will not be able to understand either). The few remaining carefully climb higher and higher on this ridge of the Middle Path. It is they who gain true understanding, not falling into opposites and extreme beliefs.

It is thus that the Middle Way avoids the extremes of universalism (all-is-oneism) and violent intolerance. The first tendency has had many representatives in the past in the form of eclectic religious movements which have attempted to incorporate all teachings into their fold. Now this course has its attractions since it makes for feelings of universality and brotherhood. But there

18. *Utopia*, by Sir Thomas More.

are also dangers. Firstly, it is idle to pretend that all religions lead to the same goal. If one reads intelligently the scriptures of each, the descriptions given of their various aims show quite conclusively that these are different ways to different goals. To try to steamroller every religion into the concept of basic sameness or 'all-is-oneism' is to ignore facts in favour of a preconceived ideal. But this has been popular in all ages and in all countries, especially so with the syncretistic Chinese mind, and so in the following passage we find a famous Meditation-Master of Buddhadharma rectifying matters:

'It is said that the three religions (Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism) should be identified. It is also said that the three are so many legs of a tripod, which will tumble if one of its legs is gone. This is the greatest folly. It is so absurd that it cannot be compared to anything. Those who utter such words should not be admitted as followers of Buddhism. . . . However, Buddhism is unique, think of the time when it appeared (The Enlightenment at Buddha Gaya)—do not make a mistake by forgetting. The phrase "the identity of the three religions" is inferior to the babble of babies. Those who use it are the destroyers of Buddhism; they are legion however.' (19)

If this is said of three religions in a single country, is not the Buddhist attitude to world-wide all-is-oneism justified? And Buddhists are quite able, with the Enlightenment of a Samyak Sambuddha to guide them, to stand on their own legs, and see no need at all for two or more other legs to support them.

A second danger of such movements is that in trying to believe in everything, one does in fact neither believe anything sincerely nor understand anything thoroughly. Faith is the foundation, the first footstep, without it there is no progress along any way. No progress may mean that one has only an arid intellectual knowledge of all these ways and in fact goes along none of them.

Buddhist toleration avoids this extreme, illustrated in our day by Theosophy, Bahai'-ism and other Universalist movements. Buddhists appreciate such efforts for they bring with them breadth and understanding and knowledge of others' ways—and thus peace and harmony. But Buddhists do not agree that their Dharma can be completely fitted into these patterns—as anyone who makes an unbiassed study of it can see for themselves.

It is interesting in this respect that within Buddhism all other

19. 'Shobogenzo' of Dogen, The Book of the Existence of All, *The Young East* (see also Additional References 13).

religions can be contained accurately. It is thus possible to plot with precision the various levels to which Hinduism, Christianity and Islam rise within the all-embracing thought of the Enlightened One. It is not possible to fit Buddhism into the range of thought of others without distortions, prunings, abuse or persecution. Buddhists thus respect others' religions since understanding them while certainly not agreeing that they are basically all the same. (See also the Buddha's answer to the last but one question of Sakka, King of the Gods, in Sakkapañhasutta, Dīgha Nikāya.)

Merging into other creeds has great dangers, Buddhists consider, and this is confirmed from the history of their religion. Other Dharmas not proceeding from the Sambodhi of a Buddha are incorrect in some respect—they are, as Buddhists say, Mithyā Drishti—with Wrong Views. Buddhadharma is Samyak Drishti, hence the Buddha's teachings cannot be diluted with others having different goals, or they will be tainted and their value destroyed. Precisely this occurred in India, the Khmer Empire and in Indonesia in former times. A compound of diluted Buddhism with much Hinduism still exists in the Isle of Bali. Another example is found amongst the Shin Buddhists in the U.S.A. who, it is said, are slowly being absorbed into Christianity.* Why? Because they are doctrinally weak, since Perfect Views have been neglected and prominence given to the power of salvation by faith alone. This is the effect of over-tolerance or, rather, lack of wisdom, which is avoided by the perfect Middle Path.

Also avoided is the second extreme of intolerant persecution. In the Middle Way, Buddhists find encouragement only to peace, harmony and loving kindness towards their fellow-creatures. Neither the Buddha nor the Great Sages who have followed Him have taught persecution by religious wars, burnings at the stake, massacres, forced conversions, etc. But, it may be objected, this has been mentioned before. Yes, and in different aspects it will be shown again, for it is an outward sign of the spiritual maturity of Buddhism, marking it off from teachings both dogma-bound and harm-producing.

Writing upon the Middle Way doctrine from the standpoint of Avataṁsaka Buddhist philosophy and its effect on tolerance in the Dharma, a hermit-yogi of the present day, who also steadfastly upholds Samyak Drishti, states:

* *Maha Bodhi Journal.*

'Also included here should be the manner in which Buddhists view and interpret other religions. I think there are three ways.

1. Sectarianism—This group includes most neophytes who are controlled by their guru and are forbidden to read the scriptures, doctrines, magazines, booklets and tracts of other religions (this very rarely happens within Buddhism either concerning other schools' teachings or those of the other world faiths). Both gurus and disciples in this class are narrow-minded persons. They lack knowledge and are foolish.

2. Syncretism—In this group are what seem to be scholars of wide attainments. They are like an encyclopaedia of similarities and resemblances. They are fond of bringing about harmony between various positions in philosophy and theology in spite of the basic differences between the philosophies considered. Because of this they lose the essence of their own philosophy *and* that of others, being thereby neither a true scholar in their own religion nor in any other.

I, myself, dare to say that there are no two things alike, not even two eggs. A person's fingers may seem alike until the evidence of fingerprints is closely considered, when they are seen to be very different.

3. The first approach to other religions is too narrow, the second too wide and confused, but the third is the most reasonable for the practical Buddhist yogi. Such a person knows the Avataṁsaka Sūtra where it says that everything has the six characteristics of being, in three pairs: Wholeness and specialization, similarity and differentiation, integration and disintegration. He is skilled in learning the former three marks—wholeness, similarity and integration—and how they apply to the doctrines of both Buddhism and other religions (this is called the gate of samatā, sameness). With this skill he discerns truly the similarities between Buddhism and non-Buddhism, and being free from sectarianism sometimes has reason to agree with other religions. Again, he has learnt well the latter three characteristics—specialization, differentiation and disintegration (together known as the gate of nānātva, difference), and their application to the Dharma and to outsiders. Such a yogi is sure to recognize without bias the differences existing between Buddhism and the other teachings in the world. Through his insight in this matter, he will ultimately get the essence of Buddhism, and putting this into practice will attain the special goal of Buddhist liberation, Nirvāna, which is quite different from the goals of other religions.

This third mode of approach is that of the Buddhist, an ideal way free from both sectarianism and syncretism. We should all follow it.' (20)

That the Middle Way is one of tolerance, meaning, besides breadth of view, depth of understanding, is shown as well in a number of places in the Pāli scriptures. The Exalted One's

20. *Discriminations between Buddhist and Hindu Tantra* (in MSS), Ch. 27, pp. 9–10, by Chien Ming Chen.

advice to Mahāpajāpati can hardly be equalled for tolerant breadth of mind. He told her:

'Of whatsoever teachings, Gotamid, you can assure yourself thus: "These teachings conduce to passions, not to dispassion: to bondage, not to detachment: to increase of worldly gains, not to their decrease: to covetousness, not to frugality: to discontent and not to content: to company, not to solitude: to sluggishness, not energy: to delight in evil, not delight in good," of such teachings you can with certainty affirm, Gotamid: "This is not the Dharma. This is not the Discipline. This is not the Master's Message."

But of whatsoever teachings you can assure yourself (that they are the opposite of these things that I have told you)—of such teachings you may with certainty affirm: "This is the Dharma. This is the Discipline. This is the Master's Message." ' (21)

Also famous is the Buddha's advice to the doubtful Kālāmas. It seems as though many different teachers passed through their village preaching doctrines which each said was 'true', at the same time abusing the 'truths' preached by others. In such a welter of confusing teachings the Kālāmas, who were obviously intelligent, wished to know what *was* the truth? The Lord then preached to them ten things not to be believed—these are, briefly summarized, not to believe in: reports, tradition, widespread rumour, the recorded teaching of sages, one's own fancies and preferences, guesses and groundless speculations, false analogies, habits and prejudices, the exterior appearances of persons and the authority of teachers and masters—believing and practising what they believe and practise.

'I tell you, when you know for yourselves, these teachings are evil, they are blameworthy, they are censured *by wise men*—belief in these will bring no advantage to anyone, but will only cause sorrow, then knowing this—reject them.' (22)

The Buddha then preached the reverse that teachings which are wholesome, praised *by wise men*, bringing advantage to all, causing happiness—such teachings are to be practised diligently.*

He did not say, 'My teachings alone are true', as had the dogmatic sectarian teachers. He did not encourage persecution of them in favour of His own Dharma, nor did He state that all

21. Vin Pit, II, 19. 22. AN i, 188.

* For a Mahāyāna expression of what is and what is not the Word of the Buddha, see Additional References 21.

teachings are the same. This latter is emphatically denied by the Buddha, see for instance the First Suttanta of Dīgha Nikāya where sixty-two wrong views are demolished. What He said was: 'Make a trial, find out what leads to your happiness and freedom —and what does not, reject it. What leads on to greater happiness —follow it.' This practical and sure way of distinguishing truth amidst falsehood was meant by the Lord to be applied to His own teachings as well (as above in the tenth point of doubt). This is the Middle Way in action—as something practicable, as leading between blind dogmas and vague eclecticism, and as unparalleled among the world's religious teachings.

* * *

II. MENTAL FACTORS OF THE ABHIDHAMMA AND TOLERANCE

As compared with the previous section, which was of a general nature, this approach to tolerance by way of the Abhidhamma is psychological. The Abhidhamma (Pāli, or Abhidharma, Sanskrit) comprises a vast amount of material claiming to be the higher and systematic teachings of the Buddha and His disciples. Various Abhidhamma systems are extant, and since these differ considerably from each other and are by their various traditions considered to represent the Buddha's teachings on ultimate matters, the position is quite complex. However, all are agreed in presenting similar lists of mental factors which in varying combinations form what is often rather vaguely called the 'mind'. There is no place for vagueness in Abhidhamma, which is meant as an analysis for meditation purposes of all that I think of as 'myself'. This analytic process and the meditations connected with it are necessary to eliminate ideas of 'I' and 'mine' and so develop wisdom.

We are here concerned with finding out which factors of mind are associated with a tolerant attitude and which give rise to intolerance. The lists examined here are those found in the Pāli Abhidhamma, hence all terms will be quoted in that language.

A. FACTORS GOVERNING INTOLERANCE

1. Delusion

One of the three roots of the unwholesome is Moha (delusion, dullness). Buddhaghośa the great Theravāda commentator says of it:

'Delusion has the characteristic of blindness or it has the characteristic of unknowing. Its function is non-penetration, or its function is to conceal the individual essence of an object. It is manifested as the absence of right theory or it is manifested as darkness. Its proximate cause is unwise (unjustified) attention. It should be regarded as the root of all that is unprofitable.' (23)

It is the factor strongly present in a person who just cannot understand. It may be seen in the case of others with whom one is discussing something. It frequently happens that even with all the subject-matter of the discussion presented systematically the other party fails to comprehend, becomes puzzled, as though something blocked his way to understanding. There is such a block—it is called moha. This factor is, like others described here, of varying strength. In different persons and at different times it is shown by everything from small 'blind-spots' in understanding to general stupidity. It prevents not only deep comprehension but also the assimilation of a wide range of knowledge. Those suffering from excessive moha tend to be bigoted, since this factor makes for a small, limited mind. Such a mind is able to understand little and what is beyond its understanding tends to be rejected as false. Bigotry is essentially based on 'I cannot understand it so it is not true', such is the disease of delusion. Arising from bigotry comes the sectarian spirit. Unable to comprehend the profundity of original visions by founders of movements both religious and secular, the small mind, understanding little, declares his little understanding to be the truth; so another sect or movement comes into existence. The small mind, the bigoted mind, has been responsible for much persecution and, not being able to appreciate widely, it cannot adopt a tolerant attitude towards others.

2. Conceit

Another unwholesome mental constituent is Māna (conceit, pride). This sense of 'I-ness' and 'my-ness' finds three expressions as when we regard someone as inferior, an equal, or superior to ourselves. All such egocentric comparisons are really incompatible with tolerance of others. This factor is associated with Lobha (greed), since one is trying to gain something for oneself. Either, others' good opinions of oneself are looked for, or at least one hopes to strengthen the false notion of self by flattering comparisons. (Thinking of oneself as inferior leads to a lack of

23. Vis Mag, p. 530, para 163.

initiative and increase of despair and frustration—this way of thinking is not true humility.)

Conceit extends to what is thought of as belonging to oneself. For instance, *My* religion very easily becomes a support for the ego. One thinks of it as the best, as the true way, the only road to salvation—of course, because it is MINE, MY Way, etc. The emphasis is wrongly put upon the 'MY' instead of upon the 'WAY'. This also applies to a number of other aspects: the superiority of MY education, culture or tradition of religion. 'I am from such and such a country, OUR tradition of Dharma is correct, pristine, orthodox,' etc.

> *'And when proficient in some ultra view*
> *He's puffed with pride and deems himself elect,*
> *Himself anoints himself "the master-mind",*
> *So perfect are those views of his indeed!'* (24)

It seems as though the Buddha has summed up very neatly in this verse all those religious authorities who make pronouncements about irrefragable dogmas. From this egoistic standpoint criticism and even persecution of others frequently proceeds. Buddhadharma points in the opposite direction:

> 'It is wonderful, sir! It is marvellous! Here is no trumpeting of one's own creed, no depreciation of another's creed, but just teaching of Dharma in its proper sphere.' (25)

In truth, though, no criticism can be completely just and tolerant unless the one making it has removed māna (conceit) from his mind. Criticisms by Fully Enlightened Ones are of this nature and they are directed only towards destroying the unwholesome, furthering the wholesome and crossing Saṁsāra.

3. False views

The holding of views (Ditthi), religious, philosophical, political, etc., is typically an example of falling into extremes. The mind not balanced by adherence to the Middle Way will tend to lean towards an extreme of view which agrees with what one holds true already, or is comforting to one's ego, or offers one additional advantage in this world (or the next).

Views are intellectual suppositions which are incapable of

24. Sn 889. 25. AN i, 218.

proof by testing their validity in one's own life. They are formed in the unenlightened mind which is swayed by the powers of Greed, Hatred and Delusion. Also included are the 'God-given' doctrines of the various theistic religions which are accepted by their followers out of craving (tanhā) and delusion (moha).

Buddhaghośa has something to say on these points:

'The origin of this wrong view called ditthigatā (resorting to views, theories, groundless speculations) should be known as due to these reasons: the hearing of false doctrine, evil friendship, the desire not to see Ariyans (Buddhist sages), and unsystematic thought. In other words: of those doctrines which are associated with erroneous views, such hearing is preceded by much vain imagining; evil friendship is said to be the companionship of evil friends who have failed in the true doctrine; the desire not to see Ariyans is not seeing the Buddhas and other good men; and unsystematic thought is explained by want of centrality of mind and lack of scrutiny.'

'Micchāditthi is wrong view; or, from being held amiss, a false view is a wrong view. A view loathed by the wise as bringing disadvantage is also a wrong view. . . . It has unwise conviction as characteristic; perversion as function; wrong conviction as manifestation; the desire not to see Ariyans as the proximate cause. It should be regarded as the highest fault.' (26)

Note particularly his emphasis on and explanation of 'unsystematic thought'—which accounts for all the woolly thinking to be found (more or less of it) in all religious systems not stemming from Complete Enlightenment. The Buddha shows elsewhere* that the basis of false views is in fact incomplete knowledge.

Ditthi are, however, more associated with lobha—greed—than with delusion. Greed is the root of views and their widespread prevalence reflects the fact that greed and grasping are deeply rooted in the unenlightened man. They are also responsible for much suffering, both mental and physical, occurring in the world.† As the Happy One says:

'Whatever a man filled with micchāditthi performs or undertakes, or whatever he possess of will, aspiration, longing and tendencies, all

26. Atth II, pp. 330–1, slightly rearranged.

* MN iii, 207 ff. And in many other Suttas where the Buddha instructs outsiders.

† See Additional References 6.

these things lead him to an undesirable, unpleasant and disagreeable state, to woe and suffering.' (27)

'No other thing than micchāditthi do I know, O monks, whereby to such an extent the unwholesome things not yet arisen, arise, and the unwholesome things already arisen are brought to growth and fullness. No other thing than false views do I know whereby the wholesome things not yet arisen, are hindered in their arising, and the wholesome things already arisen, disappear. No other thing than evil views do I know, whereby to such an extent human beings at the dissolution of the body, at death are passing to a way of suffering, into a world of woe, into hell.' (28)

But contrast this woe arising from views with the state of one who has gone beyond them:

'Each of these views is a thicket, a wilderness, a tangle, a bondage and a fetter of views, attended by ill, distress, perturbation, fever, and does not conduce to disregarding, to dispassion, to stopping, to tranquillity, to super-knowledge, to awakening, to Nirvāna. I, Vaccha, seeing this as a peril, therefore avoid all views. Views are discarded by a Truthfinder (Tathāgata).' (29)

It is evident from these quotations that the Buddha knew all such views as most serious faults. To be for one thing is to be against its opposite—a clear source of intolerance. Later teachers were well aware of the danger of wrong views, for instance Buddhaghośa, after describing the Purifications of Śīla (morality) and Samādhi (meditative absorption), follows these with the Purification of Views.* No penetrating wisdom leading to True Knowledge can be developed until one's views point in the right direction. Wrong views are essentially those which do not point out a path to Nirvāna and will only lead one astray upon religious sidetracks. Or they may point in the right direction but do not give sufficient instructions so that, the course being incomplete, it will be impossible to reach to the end—Nirvāna. For those who hold such views (deriving from intellectual reasonings or at best from incomplete insight) it is better to be nominal followers of their religions. In such people wrong view has not yet become firmly established; but it is most unfortunate for those who have great knowledge and faith in these beliefs—they are seriously astray from the Way to Enlightenment.†

27. AN i, 23. 28. AN i, 22. 29. MN i, 483–6.

* Vis Mag, Ch. XVIII, and MN i, 145 ff.

† See Additional References 9.

As to what the Exalted One thought of those proclaiming a doctrine founded upon the sands of views, and of all views themselves:

'When man confined by views, holds in the world
A thing in worth and as the yondermost,
Then doth he say all else is lacking worth,
And hence he hath not passed beyond disputes.

When profit in assumption he beholds,
Be it from things seen, heard, felt, rule or rite,
'Tis by acceptance of just all therein
That he doth see all else as lacking worth.' (30)

What to do with these dogmatists? How well the Lord shows their inadequacy when compared with His own viewless Enlightenment:

'When party men start wrangling, each convinced that his party is in the right, tell them bluntly that you are not interested.

But they who fare on, never offering any theory of their own in opposition to your theories—what can you say to them, Pasura, for they do not maintain any views?

Full of confidence in your own theories you came here; you sought to match a Perfect One, but failed to keep the pace!' (31)

Those acquainted with literature relating to the ways of Ch'an (Zen) Masters will notice that their attitude towards pupils full of reasonings and ideas is the same as that shown here.

A puzzled enquirer asks about truths and views and the Lord says in effect that where the latter exist Truth cannot be found:

'(The Buddha) "There is but one Truth so the wise find nothing to debate. But since each of these disputants has his own version of the truth, their arguments are never-ending."

(Enquirer) "But how is it that each of these 'experts' sees his own version of the truth as Truth? Can it be said that their truth was ever Truth?—or do they merely invent their theories?"

(The Buddha) "*Indeed there are not many divers truths,*
Save from surmise on 'lasting' in the world:
They formulate a reason for their views
And so claim two things: Truth and lies." ' (32)

30. Sn 796–7. 31. Sn 832–4. 32. Sn 884–6.

The Buddhist ideal is given in contrast to baseless philosophies and religious dogmatism in the following verses:

'(Enquirer) "The philosophy that some call the highest, others call worthless. They all claim to be experts: Which of them is right?"

(The Buddha) "It is simply his own philosophy which each calls highest, while all term other methods worthless, so they dispute.

Their practice of their philosophy is as extravagant as their talk of it; but all their views add up to the same thing. . . .

Having expelled imperfections without acquiring new ones, having abandoned desire, being independent of dogma and no longer influenced by philosophical views, he (the tranquil sage) pursues his own way, unimpressed by the world, never given to self-reproach.

The tranquil sage, free from all views based on things seen and heard, being relieved of his burden, is no longer subject to time, is beyond abstention, is beyond desire." '(33)

If further proof is wanted of the Buddha's disapproval of views it may be seen in the fact that the first Sutta (discourse) of Dīgha Nikāya is devoted to showing the falsity of sixty-two systems variously held as Truth in the Buddha's day. It is said that all the religious speculations and dogmatic assertions existing in India at that time are here refuted.*

Later developments of various systems of thought in India caused Buddhist philosophers to maintain strongly what was Right View and criticize clearly what was imperfect or muddled thinking. Some further examples of the sort of thought they combated as essentially unhelpful to Enlightenment are given below. Though these refutations are many centuries old, some are still valid against the Wrong Views of the present age:

'In a conversation with Anāthapindika, the Buddha is said to have argued the question thus: "If the world had been made by Ishvara (Creator God) there should be no change or destruction, there should be no such thing as sorrow and calamity, as right or wrong, seeing that all things, pure and impure, must come from him.

(2) If sorrow and joy, love and hate, which spring up in all conscious beings, be the work of Ishvara, he himself must be capable of sorrow and joy, love and hatred, and if he has these, how can he be said to be perfect?

(3) If Ishvara be the maker, and if all things have to submit silently to

33. Sn 903–5 and 913–14.

* See also references in the Pāli Canon: DN 1, 15, 23, 24, 28; MN 11, 12, 25, 60, 63, 72, 76, 101, 102, 110; SN XXI, XXIV, etc.; AN II 16, III 61, X 93.

their maker's power, what would be the use of practising virtue? The doing of right and wrong would be the same, as all deeds are his making and must be the same with their maker.

(4) But if sorrow and suffering are attributed to another cause, then there would be something of which Ishvara is not the cause. Why, then, should not all that exists be uncaused too?

(5) Again, if Ishvara be the maker, he acts either with or without purpose.

(a) If he acts with a purpose, he cannot be said to be all-perfect, for a purpose necessarily implies satisfaction of a want.

(b) If he acts without a purpose, he must be like the lunatic or a suckling babe.

(6) Besides if Ishvara be the maker, why should not people reverently submit to him, why should they offer supplications to him when sorely pressed by necessity?

Thus the idea of Ishvara (the Creator) is proved false by rational argument, and all such contradictory assertions should be exposed." (34)

(7) "If, as theists say, God is too great for man to be able to comprehend Him, then it follows that His qualities also surpass our range of thought, and that we can neither know Him nor attribute to Him the quality of a creator." (35)

(8) Said the Blessed One to Anāthapindika: "If by the absolute is meant something out of relation to all known things, its existence cannot be established by any reasoning (hetuvidyashāstra). How can we know that anything unrelated to other things exists at all? The whole universe, as we know it, is a system of relations: we know nothing that is, or can be, unrelated. How can that which depends on nothing and is related to nothing produce things that are related to one another and depend for their existence on one another?

(9) Again, the absolute is one or many.

(a) If it be only one, how can it be the cause of the different things which originate, as we know, from different causes?

(b) If there be as many different absolutes as there are things, how can the latter be related to one another?

(10) If the absolute pervades all things and fills all space, then it cannot also make them, for there is nothing to make.

(11) Further if the absolute is devoid of all qualities (nirguna), all things arising from it ought also to be devoid of qualities. But in reality all things in the world are circumscribed throughout by qualities. Hence the absolute cannot be their cause.

(12) If the absolute be considered to be different from the qualities, how does it continually create the things possessing such qualities and manifest itself in them?

(13) Again, if the absolute be unchangeable, all things should be unchangeable too, for the effect cannot differ in nature from the cause. But

34. Buddhacarita of Aśvaghoṣa. 35. Bodh.

all things in the world undergo change and decay. How then can the absolute be unchangeable?

(14) Moreover, if the absolute which pervades all is the cause of everything, why should we seek liberation? For we ourselves possess this absolute and must patiently endure every suffering and sorrow incessantly created by the absolute." ' (36)

Then again:

' "(1) We cannot maintain the creatorship of God logically.

(2) If He is Lord of the world, He leads men to the practice of unrighteousness also.

(3) If He is the authority for religious scriptures, how can His contradictory language be authoritative?

(4) If He is only the agent for the virtuous, then He is not infinite, not being all.

(5) Has He in creation any end in view, any self-interest in the matter? If He has, He is imperfect; if He has not, why did He trouble about creation at all? Does He undertake to do that which is profitless? If His activity be a mere diversion, He seems to play like a little child.

(6) The existence of a God makes man helpless, for being unavoidably impelled by Him, he goes to heaven or to hell.

(7) What is the good of suggesting that people are tortured for the pleasure of the Lord?

(8) If He is free to bestow boons, He may do so even upon the wicked and the vicious, and it is open to Him to send the virtuous to hell.

(9) If He bestows gifts according to the karmas of the individuals, then all men are lords like Him. Being devoid of freedom in the matter of granting gifts, why is He to be called the Lord of all?" ' (37)

From the many refutations given above—and there are many more not mentioned here—followers of theistic religions with a Creator God will find themselves labelled 'Micchā-ditthikas'—those holding Wrong Views. These are supported by artificial contentions intended to uphold each particular view as correct and condemn all other views as false. Thus comes the wrangling and quarrels, intolerance and persecution characteristic of the history of these creeds.* In calling others micchā-ditthikas, are not Buddhists guilty of just this same wrangling? This question, well answered in the Sutta-Nipāta, is based on the false assumption that Buddhism too is founded on the sands of speculation and

36. Buddhacarita of Aśvaghoṣa.
37. Sarvasiddhāntasārasaṁgraha iv, 23–38.
* See Additional References 7.

dogma—but it is not. It is unshakably secure upon the foundations of the Perfect Enlightenment of the Exalted One. Those who, like Him, wish to attain this, endeavour to avoid all views—all 'for' and 'against', and eventually even being 'for Buddhism'. As Āryadeva has said:

> *'If you have attachment to your own party (thesis, theory)*
> *And if the other's party (thesis, theory) is disliked by you,*
> *You will not attain Nirvāna, for the Summum Bonum*
> *Is not for him who fares in terms of opposites.'* (38)

4. Hatred

Perhaps the mental factor most important for maintaining and increasing intolerance is hatred (Dośa—Skt. Dvesha). In one sense hatred is a secondary unwholesome root—manifesting when the fulfilment of desires is thwarted. In this case the desire is to affirm one's feeling of self through religious or political ideologies. *My* beliefs, truths, revelation, God, Saviour, Book, are the one and only, the supreme, the perfect, etc. Therefore *I* am right since *I* believe what is right. This is, so far, a straightforward case of ditthi and māna (both greed-factors) plus, inevitably, delusion.

The trouble is that others are always found holding differing opinions—this leads to the arising of hatred. Differing opinions contradict *my* view and must therefore be destroyed. The excuse for this is always that *my* view (that is, *my* God's, Saviour's, etc., view) is correct and these others are wrong. The corrective which has often been applied in the past by hate-seared dogmatists is drastic torture, this being preferred for 'heretics', rather than a quick death.

Hatred's power to destroy the happiness of all is well shown when the Lord says:

> 'Through hate, by hate overwhelmed, fettered in mind, one leads an evil life in bodily deeds, words or thoughts, and understands neither one's own welfare, nor the welfare of others, nor the welfare of both sides, according to reality. If, however, hatred is overcome, neither in bodily deeds, words nor thoughts, does one lead an evil life, and according to reality one knows one's own welfare, the welfare of others and the welfare of both sides.' (39)

38. Āryadeva. 39. AN iii, 55.

The persecutors of all ages have not only made life miserable for their victims but also for themselves. Hatred of others proceeds from the mind and one who acts in this way brings harm upon himself:

'The Buddha said: "An evil man may wish to injure the virtuous Ones and, raising his head, spit towards heaven, but the spittle, far from reaching heaven, will return and descend upon himself. An unruly wind may raise the dust, but the dust does not go elsewhere; it remains to contaminate the wind. Virtue cannot be destroyed, while evil inevitably destroys itself." ' (40)

Hate is a factor which if encouraged naturally becomes stronger—torment of others leads to more mental hatred-potential, leading to further persecution. The inquisitors of the world have never been happy.

Dośa manifests itself as intolerance in two ways. Firstly, as speech which is violent, abusive, ridiculing, mocking, sarcastic or destructively critical.* The Buddha and His disciples have never approved of this and always counselled its opposite:

'The fool who is angered and thinks to triumph by the use of abusive language is always vanquished by him whose words are patient.' (41)

A fuller description of what speech is contemptible and what is spoken by the wise (ariyans) is given by the Exalted One in this beautiful poem:

'They who talk angrily, full of wrath and proud,
Carp at each other's failings when they meet,
And take delight in blame and finding fault,
And in their rivals' fall. But Ariyans
Will never follow practices like these.
If there be one, a wise man, fair of speech,
He knows the proper time, and speech concerned
With righteousness and practice of right talk.
Thus speaks a sage, not angry, well-restrained
With humble mind, not laying down the law,
Not curious; but wisely speaks fair speech,

40. S42S.
* See Additional References 5.
41. Udv.

Welcomes the kindly word, rejects the cruel,
Knows no resentment, does not carp at faults,
Does not retort nor crush his rival down,
Nor from the issue speak. O true it is
That Ariyans' words alike instruct and please!
Thus Ariyans speak, such is the Ariyan talk:
And knowing this the wise should humbly speak.' (42)

Indeed the Lord said on another occasion:

'I quarrel not with the world, bhikshus, it is the world that quarrels with me. No preacher of Dharma, bhikshus, quarrels with anyone in the world.' (43)

What wealth of meaning lies in this! How well this explains Buddhists' tolerance of others' beliefs. The Buddhist method has ever been to lay before others their Lord's teaching in the form of their own controlled and gentle actions, mild and wise speech, both evidence of the mental cultivation of wisdom and compassion—and let others judge the worth of these. The Truth is there to accept and experientially confirm if one wishes to do so. Quarrelling with weapons of the tongue has never and can never spread Saddharma (the True Teachings). It is as the great Sixth Patriarch of the Ch'an School says:

'*With those who are sympathetic*
Let us have discussion on Buddhism.
As for those whose point of view differs from ours
Let us treat them politely and thus make them happy.
But disputes are alien to our School,
For they are incompatible with its Doctrine.
To be bigoted and to argue with others in disregard of this rule
Is to subject one's Essence of Mind to the bitterness of mundane existence.' (44)

Criticism and fault-finding are closely linked to intolerance, and in this connection both the Venerable Wei Lang and the Dhammapada have similar things to say:

'Easily seen is the fault of others, one's own, however, is difficult to see. Like chaff one winnows others' faults, but one's own one hides even as a crafty fowler hides behind sham branches.

42. AN i, 199. 43. SN iii, 94.
44. SWL, Ch. X, p. 116.

He who sees others' faults and is ever irritable, his defilements grow; he is far from the destruction of defilements.' (45)

'Provided we keep constant eye on our own faults
We cannot go astray from the right path . . .
He who treads the Path in earnest
Sees not the mistakes of the world.
If we find fault with others
We ourselves are also in the wrong.
When other people are in the wrong, we should ignore it,
For it is wrong for us to find fault.
By getting rid of the habit of fault-finding
We cut off a source of defilement.
When neither hatred nor love disturb our mind
Serenely we sleep.' (46)

These types of unwholesome words are rooted in the hateful mind and are commonly found linked to intolerance. This evil grows in any situation where there is conflict, even if this is only one-sided, tension mounting until persecution passes beyond the stage of vile words and becomes violent actions. This is hatred in its completely exteriorized form—and at its worst. The words of the Dhammapada show first how the ordinary worldling reacts to such treatment, and the result of his action:

' "He abused me, he struck me, he overpowered me and he robbed me"; those who harbour such thoughts do not still their hatred.' (47)

Then is given the way the wise, which includes sincere Buddhists, should take such rough handling:

' "He abused me, he struck me, he overpowered me and he robbed me"; those who do not harbour such thoughts still their hatred.' (48)

In the last verse the general and profound truth is taught. Here indeed is a teaching for anxious humanity—but how many will be courageous enough to apply it?

'For hatred is never appeased by hatred in this world; by non-hatred alone is hatred appeased. This is the Law Eternal.' (49)

45. Dhp 252–3. 46. SWL, Ch. II, p. 37. 47. Dhp 3.
48. Dhp 4. 49. Dhp 5.

5. Faith

So far, the mental constituents described as bases for intolerance have been themselves unwholesome (akusala)—that is, productive of results unpleasant, unsatisfactory or downright painful. The fifth factor in this list is classified as healthy (kusala) and when properly cultivated becomes a great blessing. Why, then, is this factor, Faith, placed with the unwholesome?

In Buddhadharma, Saddhā (faith, devotion, confidence) comes as the first step along the spiritual path. No saddhā—no decision to follow doctrines as yet unproved to oneself. But for the Buddhist, this essential quality is balanced by wisdom which must also be present in order to appreciate initially the truths of the Dharma. Practising this Dharma in his daily life and finding that it works, the Buddhist comes to have greater faith in the Lord and His Teachings. More faith means greater power to practise. To practise means to awake understanding, and this leads on to greater faith. Thus faith and wisdom go hand in hand —one helping the other. It is like a strong blind man (faith) who carries for his guidance the sharp-eyed cripple (wisdom). Faith without wisdom is blind and degenerates into belief in superstitions and ignorant practices.

It is as Jetsun Gampopa says:

'Strength of faith combined with weakness of intellect are apt to lead to the error of narrow-minded dogmatism.' (50)

Since many systems of salvation stress faith while neglecting wisdom, believers in them frequently develop this blind and narrow outlook. This is not true faith, for it is unbalanced—it is merely a stunted tendency towards faith. Not that it will be a complete obstruction to spiritual progress, with it one may go a long way but not along that Path leading to liberation, to Nirvāna.

It is with this unbalance of faith that we are concerned here. Those people in whom the tendency towards faith is strongly developed in their character (saddhā-carita), have to be very careful. If their teacher and their meditations emphasize this aspect they are in danger of developing blind acceptance. This blindness leads to a narrow zealousness, unguided by wisdom. And this is fertile soil for the seeds of intolerance.

Blind faith, which is very un-Buddhist, must be corrected as,

50. PG, X, 2.

for instance, Buddhaghośa advises.* The faithful must have subjects of meditation which sharpen their wisdom—there are plenty of these in Buddhadharma. Faith is thus only mentioned here when it is onesidedly developed, resulting in uncritical acceptance of doctrines and thereby superstition and bigotry, leading in turn to intolerance and persecution.

But faith may be also of another kind considered to be just as dangerous by Buddhists, and this variety, while not leading to persecution, is so pernicious a wrong view and so prevalent, especially in India, that it ought at least to receive a mention here. It is the faith (falsely called 'Tolerance') which causes a person to say, 'All the great Teachers, avatāras, etc., have given the same teaching in different forms', or, more simply, that 'all religions are the same' (in India, the same as Hinduism). Where this sameness is identified with one's own religion, more than a little conceit becomes evident.

This is not a blinkered, neither-right-nor-left-seeing faith as is the preceding, but a broad and woolly outlook determined by lack of precision, of clear judgement, of any ability to distinguish; in short it is an undeveloped critical faculty which would, with encouragement, develop into wisdom, a quality so much taught in Buddhism.

By contrast again with the rigidities of blind faith, this is comforting, it is a position of relaxation where there appears to be no need to think, no need indeed to do anything except to proclaim how tolerant one is! It is a sad mistake to identify tolerance with fuzziness of thinking but one extremely common and undoubtedly popular as an Indian attitude.

Its origin may be traced to many charitable (and sometimes conceited) souls who pronounce in innumerable books that all religions are the same and all teachers have taught more or less the same thing. What is the basis of these two related dogmas, for dogmas they are unless supported by the firm ground of one's own undeluded spiritual experience? Usually an authority is quoted for such statements, knowledge at first-hand not being available, and very often in these days it is Rāmakrishna. He is, in India and wherever his movement has spread, the modern proponent of this messy 'all-is-oneism'. Seeing a few visions of religious teachers which may in any case occur at a relatively low level, and the supposed practice of Christian and Muslim 'sādhana' for a short time, does not qualify one to pronounce all religions the

* See Vis Mag, Ch. III, p. 102 ff.

same. In his character we may easily see that not only was the predominant factor faith but that this tendency was developed almost to the exclusion of the necessary counter-balance of wisdom; from these two, tendency and practice, he became a thorough-going 'bhakta' and therefore a good example of unbalanced spiritual development.

What he has said, and his words have now acquired infallibility in some quarters, faithful fuzzy writers put down in books, and from what these lords of print acclaim as the truth the mass of people, blinder even than their writers, lap up with satisfaction.

All those indulging themselves with this rich and sticky diet should pause to consider this point. If the oft-repeated slogan on the sameness of religions is true, then all religious teachers of the world must be shown not only to have preached the same things but also have given the same emphasis to individual factors in the ways they taught. A *fair* study will convince one that this is not so, though such thorough sifting of evidence will be too great a task for the idle-minded, too difficult for the dullard, and requiring too much intellectual effort—indeed wisdom—than can be expected of the blind devotee. Unbiassed minds on taking up this matter will soon perceive that in Buddhism alone are found fully developed wisdom teachings.

Thus the Buddhist, through wisdom combined with his faith, can here discriminate; separate milk from water, and sheep from goats. He sees that there *is* a common basis to all religious teachings which, to borrow a term from the Chinese, is called 'heaven-and-man-dharma'. 'Have faith in your teachings, whatever they are, do good deeds, speak well and think purely, and after this life dwell in heaven'; such is this universal teaching found in all religions, including Buddhism. Just so far are Rāmakrishna and other all-is-oneists correct. But a sincere Buddhist can go along his Master's Way much further, for he learns that such common dharma is worldly and will not suffice to carry him out of saṁsāra. In 'heaven-and-man' faiths one finds the practices of morality and meditation: in Buddhism alone one finds fully expounded in the Āgama Sūtras (Nikāyas), Abhidharmas and the Prajñāpāramitā, that Wisdom needed for crossing over saṁsāra, that Wisdom for the cutting-off even of the subtle defilements such as false views.

To clear the air and show where Buddhists stand in regard to faith is quite easy, but difficult for many people to understand

because the tendency is always, as explained in the Middle Way section, to swing to extremes.

Every day, in their pūja, Buddhists say with devotion: 'Natthi me saranaṁ aññaṁ, Buddho (Dhammo, Saṅgho) me saranaṁ varaṁ [No other Refuge do I seek, the Buddha (Dhamma, Saṅgha) is my true Refuge] . . .'

In saying this they do not err towards either extreme. They are not denying thereby the benefits to be obtained by following other faiths, nor the (limited) truths which they contain—there is no intolerance here. On the other hand, they do affirm the Triple Gem as their only secure, highest and authoritative-since-provable Refuge (Dhp 192); this is called Right View—there is no room for woolliness here.* The Buddhist's faith rests upon the fact that if he practises, he proves, with no chance of delusion or wrong faith blinding him; and this faith, unique as it is among the world's teachings, will take him wisdom-guided to the supreme goal, Nirvāna. From faith unhealthy, since incomplete, we have now turned to consider faith wholesome since aligned with reality. This is the Buddhist faith, being both the first steps of the unsure infant and the certainty of the wise man, the one who *knows* from his own experience, unhindered by dogmas, that Gautama was a Samyak Sambuddha, a Perfectly Enlightened One.

* * *

B. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS FROM THE ABOVE

In the previous section analysis of individual elements, producing in combination the phenomena of intolerance, have been examined. To balance the account of these factors, one must now consider them in a synthetic and more general way. There are definite patterns of thought which contribute to the arising of persecution and some of these provide material for this section.

1. Dogma

What does this mean? According to Webster, one finds under 'Dogmatic': 'Based upon or proceeding from *a priori* truths or assumptions rather then empirical evidence', and under 'Dogmatism': 'Positiveness of assertion in matters of opinion', and 'Philosophy based upon first premises whose truth can be

* See also Additional References 1.

doubted: specifically philosophy which assumes that neither experience nor reason can corroborate.'

With this we must agree, though it is only a definition of words. What of the process? In religions this is building, often upon slender or contradictory evidence, a towering structure of statements binding on the faithful, to be believed by them as *true*. The beginning of this process lies in explaining away, in a manner acceptable to both faithful and unbelievers, awkwardly conflicting facts. In time these explanations become arranged in a logical sequence for the purposes of disputation with supporters of other systems. Thus arise creeds and dogmas, one from the other without end. Any departure from truth, even if unintended, has then to be covered with a dozen lies so as to bury the original facts which are thus conveniently forgotten beneath the superimposed mass of explanatory material.

A second question to answer is, 'Why do people crave for dogmas?' Primarily, this is out of a desire for security. This world is full of insecurity yet most people crave security, this world is ridden by uncertainty yet vainly people here seek certainty. The Buddha teaches that all we experience (saṁsāra) is anityā—impermanent, flowing on and never the same for two moments together. To grasp after certainty is really trying to get permanence. Where a stable situation is established it will be characterized by just this permanence. Unfortunately, saṁsāra is not like this and to seek for the unchanging here while still desire-ridden is as useless as searching for the horns of a hare—even if one wishes to hang on to something (person, place or experience) it is impossible, for all is changing. Now, it is the desire of most beings to cling to whatever is pleasant and, they think, promises permanence and security. Here is the attraction of dogmatic assertions: they seem to give permanence.

By dogmas are meant all pronouncements concerning God the Creator, his attributes, his inspired prophets and messengers, scriptures of divine origin, and any definitions of points of doctrine made by the heads of ecclesiastical bodies; all of which *must* be believed by the faithful. All such statements and scriptures which are held as unquestionably 'True' seem to give security. The blind and faithful, as also the theologians' words leading them, are well-described in the following simile:

'Bharadvaja, it is like a string of blind men holding on to one another —neither does the foremost one see, nor does the middle one see, nor

does the hindmost one see. Even so, methinks, Bharadvaja, do the words of the brahmin turn out to be a string of blind men: neither does the foremost one see, nor does the middle one see, nor does the hindmost one see.' (51)

Substitute 'dogmatic theologian' for 'brahmin' in the above and we see again the Buddha condemning groundless and empty speculations, for the attitude is the same, though time and detail differ. To another, the Lord distinguishes between dogmatic systems and experience of transcendental knowledge:

'Grasping after systems, imprisoned by dogmas, for the most part is this world, Kaccāyana. But he who does not go in for this system-grasping, for this mental standpoint, for this dogmatic bias, who does not take it up, does not take his stand upon it, thinking: "It is not myself; it is just ill uprising that uprises, ill being stopped that is stopped"—he neither doubts nor is perplexed; by not depending on others, knowledge herein comes to be his own. To this extent, Kaccāyana, there comes to be Right View.' (52)

A second attraction of dogma lies in the weakness of not wanting to think for oneself. The great mass of inert followers of dogmatic religions are content to let others think for them. 'Others' here means dictatorial religious leaders and their systematizing lackeys—the theologians. (One might bring forward a very valid excuse for being contented with the pronouncements of these 'experts': those who thought for themselves in the past frequently ended their days in prison, excommunicated, tortured or burnt alive!)

However, now it is not so often fear which prevents original thinking, as idleness and apathy. This slothfulness, which might at one time have been welcomed as a mark of 'toeing the line', now presents the dogmatists with difficulties, since it has spread from being unthinking idleness regarding doctrine to apathy regarding all teachings and religious activities, and results in fast-emptying places of worship. It seems that an ideal follower of a dogmatic religion thinks a little (to get himself and family to church, mosque, synagogue . . . and to organize its activities). But he does not think *too much* (to question unquestionable dogmas, for instance).

Again, non-thinking may arise from excess of faith. This is very widespread especially among the less educated faithful for

51. MN ii, 170. 52. MN ii, 17.

whom there is some excuse. The typical attitude is 'I *believe*', the emphasis here is on the belief in whatever is held to be true doctrine. This excessive faith is deliberately encouraged in religions defined by dogmatic creeds. Compare the illiteracy and ignorance of medieval Europe or Hindu India in the last century with the close association of education and the Buddhist Saṅgha in such countries as Burma and Thailand where even a majority of villagers were literate a hundred years ago. Education, developing the mind, and so making possible individual thought—this has been the Buddhist attitude, quite opposed to leading the faithful masses along in ignorance.

Most people desire to settle down undisturbed: thinking for oneself is a disturbing and sometimes painful process. Rather than do this, many would prefer to sleep even if their bed of ideas is a stinking heap of dung. This is, of course, another aspect of desiring security plus idleness of mind. The Buddha with vigour perfected does not encourage any of these attitudes. As He said to those undertaking intensive practice of His Teachings:

'And what, Bhikkhus, is there further to be done? Thinking, "We must be intent upon vigilance; during the day pacing up and down, sitting down, we must cleanse the mind from obstructive mental objects; during the first watch of the night, pacing up and down, sitting down, we must cleanse the mind from obstructive mental objects; during the middle watch of the night, we must lie down on our right side in the lion posture, placing one foot on the other, mindful, clearly conscious, attending to the thought of getting up again; during the last watch of the night, rising, pacing up and down, sitting down, we must cleanse the mind from obstructive mental objects"—thus, bhikkhus, must you train yourselves. But it may occur to you, bhikkhus: "We are endowed with modesty and fear of blame, our bodily conduct is perfectly pure; our conduct in speech . . . in thought . . . our mode of living is perfectly pure,* we are intent upon vigilance, to this extent there is enough" . . . up to this point you may come to find contentment. I protest to you, bhikkhus, I declare to you, bhikkhus: While you are aiming at recluseship, fall not short of the goal of recluseship if there is something further to be done.' (53)

There is always something further to be done until all beings have entered the Great Peace of Nirvāna, so the Lord has not encouraged slothfulness in body or mind—nor that his followers should settle down as blind believers:

* 'Perfectly pure', in these four clauses referring to refraining from harming, both of oneself and of others (see Śīla section at Ch. 1, I).

53. MN i, 274.

'Be a lamp unto yourself, be a refuge unto yourself, without another refuge, the Dharma as a lamp, the Dharma as a refuge, without another refuge.' (54)

The Buddhadharma is a lamp bringing light to all the dark corners of the mind wherein lurk superstitions, blind beliefs, apathetic acceptance and all tendencies to intolerance. Far from non-thinking acceptance is this Dharma, far from it for any reason. The following quotation radically expresses the Buddhist position:

'One must not rely upon anyone else's opinion; nor say, such is the opinion of a sthavīra,* or of the Buddha, or of the Saṅgha; one must not abandon truth in itself; one must be autonomous. Obedience to a tradition, to an authority, can have no value by itself. To attain knowledge, instruction is necessary, but this instruction should be corroborated and assimilated by personal experience.' (55)

A third reason why dogma is welcomed may be found in its support for the ego. It can be made a bolster for one's feeling of self, '*I* know and believe the *true* teachings'. This aspect has already been explained under Māna (conceit). It is interesting to note that this same attitude of authoritarianism, so prevalent now, was present in the Buddha's day and was always combated by Him. The statement then was, 'This alone is Truth, all else is falsehood.'† Those who made this dogmatic declaration were, of course, the brahmins—the priests among the other castes. Priesthood all over the world and in all religions has maintained this inglorious tradition of upholding their own 'truths' and defaming those of others. Significantly, there are no priests or priesthood in Buddhism (in its uncorrupted traditions). Whether priest or layman, anyone making a statement of this sort does so egotistically, strengthening thereby the all-pervading sense of the importance of 'myself'.

A recent treatise by a famous Burmese bhikshu places all dogmatic beliefs under two categories:

'Abhinivesa means dogmatic belief, i.e. strong belief set in the mind as firmly and immovably as door-posts, stone pillars and monuments, so

54. DN, sutta 16.

* See Glossary; Sthavīra, Thera, meaning Elder monk.

55. Bodhisattvabhumi.

† 'Idaṁ eva saccaṁ, moghaṁ aññaṁ', as at AN i, 188 f and many other places.

that it cannot be moved by any means or expenditure of effort. It is of two different kinds, to wit:

1. Tanhābhinivesa—dogmatic belief induced by craving.
2. Ditthābhinivesa—dogmatic belief induced by wrong views.' (56)

As a simple exercise, it might be interesting for believers in 'abhinivesa' to explore their minds and decide into which category their views fall.

After accounting for the popularity of unsupportable beliefs, as well as for their mental roots, a small digression seems indicated to show the weakness of dogma. It is generally assumed by religious bodies that the points insisted upon as 'truth', to be believed by the faithful, are their strength. Actually, though, dogmas are a weakness and have great dangers.

If a doctrine is held strictly to be 'truth' and this becomes part of a creed, then others holding different views and interpretations will tend to break away from the parent body. The more rigid the system compelling belief, the greater is the danger of the formation of splinter-groups. This is well illustrated in the histories of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. A similar force acting more upon the social plane has produced the multitudinous castes of Hinduism.

Besides rigidity, dogma has another weakness: its attempt to be permanent. Dogma tries to be permanent amidst impermanence, it tries to go against the observable nature of all in this universe. This is a great foolishness, for everything, even the various irrefragable doctrines given out by the various 'Absolute Gods' (together with these same Gods), are subject to the law of constant change. What happens to a man who attempts to cross a fast-flowing river by swimming against the current? To draw a simile from recent history: the first Firth of Tay bridge was constructed with piers of hollow cast-iron. This material has great strength in compression but is weak under tension. Thus, when a storm arose, due to strength of wind and force of water, the cast-iron piers being rigid snapped apart, pitching a whole trainload of people to their death. Dogma is the inflexible cast-iron and wind and water are here symbols of the impermanence which sweeps all away. Those relying upon cast-iron do not reach the Deathless—they come only to death time and time again. Buddhadharma is like a bridge well built of flexible steels, it gives a little to wind and water, it adapts itself to changing

56. *Manual of Insight* (Vipassanā Dīpanī), p. 12.

circumstances, but at the same time it has secure foundations (Samyak Drishti), and offers a safe way to the Deathless, to Nirvāna.

2. Generalizations and fixed concepts

Another manifestation of the unwholesome factors relating to intolerance is the widespread use of generalizations and fixed concepts. These are two extremes which are very common and, both being founded upon ignorance, very harmful.

How common is it to hear someone make sweeping statements about all Americans, all Socialists, all Buddhists, all intellectuals, all poor people and so on? The sorts of prejudice exhibited in these pronouncements are the result of incomplete and undetailed knowledge of the subjects discussed. They are damaging to the many, since usually true of a few. A selection of generalizations is given above and such statements are frequently propounded with dislike and condemnation in the mind.

Fixed concepts, unshakable even by a clear presentation of truth, are often found particularly in connection with any firmly believed ideals, whether these are social, political or religious. Those tenaciously holding them just *will not* see clearly. This indicates a rigidity of mind for which Moha is responsible. A flexible mind does not cling to fixed ideas as it is able to learn and accommodate new concepts, relating them to the old ones and, if necessary, abandoning the latter in favour of the former.

3. Subordination of truth

Another fault which does not favour clear thinking is the forced fitting of new facts into established systems, or, where the facts refuse to fit, the rejection of the true knowledge in favour of the existing systems of belief. All this is the subordination of truth to conceptual ideas (or dogmas) about it. Let us first take a present-day example: Christianity claims to be *The Way* to Salvation for all human beings, through Jesus Christ, Son of God. The question now arises, did Christ save only those on this earth, or is his way of salvation valid also for beings on other planets? Would it be meaningful for the supposed inhabitants of Mars and Venus?* It is necessary, according to Roman theologians, to find an answer to this pressing question. The system—

* Wherever there is existence (saṁsāra), there must automatically be the suffering (duḥkha) of birth and death (at least), hence Buddhadharma's *universal* application.

God, Christ, Christian dogmas, et al—is already there, but here are new circumstances—how to fit them in? Usually a bludgeoning is necessary, for the facts, not for the dogmas, which treatment ought to make us realize that fitting square pegs into round holes is an awkward proceeding and not the correct way at all. On another level also the suppression of truth has been all too common. Meditational experiences of great saints sometimes go beyond the set beliefs of religious bodies, even as far as contradicting them. If such mystics then tell others of their experiences they may find themselves in great trouble. For example, Sufi saints, because of their own inner culture, came to interpret the Q'uran in very unorthodox ways. In some cases they differed quite openly from the divinely inspired scripture. The orthodox, the blind followers of the letter, thought it best to persecute and kill such heretics*—their knowledge did not fit into the system of Islamic theology.†

An outstanding case of the same thing in Christianity is the submission of St. Theresa to the authority of the Church. Being a great mystic (it seems with access to all four rūpa-dhyānas), she had experiences which were, by orthodox dogmas, inexplicable. Was she to trust her own experience or be guided by the theologians, the majority of whom had probably never sat down for five minutes' meditation let alone attained concentrated absorptions? Being a good Catholic nun, she realized that Holy Church was *right*, her own knowledge was *wrong*, inspired of course by the Devil! So mystical truths are crushed to conform to textbook theology.‡

More striking still is the example of Meister Eckhart, whose unorthodox sermons sadly angered his superiors and finally came to the ears of the Pope. He ordered an ecclesiastical trial in which the heresies contained in Eckhart's words might be exposed. Eckhart was one who had gone a long way in spiritual cultivation, one might say in spite of Christian dogma rather than because of it. What he said was often very much at variance with the accepted theology of his day. He is said to have died somewhat mysteriously . . . some say poison . . . his truths just did not fit in. . . .

When religions were in a position to pronounce on scientific questions, and fortunately this becomes increasingly difficult for them nowadays, the progress of ideas was greatly hindered by the established 'truths' approved by the various dogmatic systems.

* See, for instance, the crucifixion of the Sufi saint Hallaj.
† By contrast to this rigid adherence to words, see pp. 70–1, 99–100 of SWL.
‡ See, for instance, Ch. 22, 23, etc., *The Life of St. Theresa*.

How long, for instance, did Rome uphold the theories of the earth's flatness and its central position in the universe, and how many suffered for their convictions that neither of these propositions were true?

Turning to modern times and a new religion—Communism. In this doctrinal system Lysenko expounded Genetics to harmonize with Marxist dogma so effectively that it became the party line on this science, and so the orthodox belief, and finally a dogma. Other geneticists from experimental evidence disagreed with Lysenko's theories. As befitted heretics, they were silenced and their findings denounced as 'bourgeois degenerate Western science', etc. The facts do not agree with what Lysenko taught, though his teachings agreed with the Communist views current at that time. The latter were, of course, held as True. . . .

We see that this tendency to subordinate fact to dogma is of long standing and, with sufficient space and patience of the reader, it could be traced back just as long as there have been formulations of 'absolute' truth which, though not taking account of the conditional nature of all that can be expressed, must nevertheless be believed. It is obvious that this aspect of dogma must be a serious obstacle to the advance of all thought let alone to spiritual cultivation. Such has never been the case in Buddhadharma which has not known such artificial checks to knowledge, either mundane or transcendental. It is only religions which fear clear thinking and the resultant knowledge that apply repressive measures. A Dharma proceeding from Sambodhi has nothing to fear from any source—such is Buddhadharma. The Fearless One, the Truthfinder, has preached His Way of freedom and truth leading all to the Greatest Freedom and the Sublimest Truth. He has indeed taught the spiritual way par excellence.

4. Interpretation of words

Finally, a general consideration of much importance, for it is frequently at the root of intersectarian strife. This is concerned with words and our understanding of them. A scriptural passage means one thing to a fundamentalist and quite another to a student of symbology. Those who hold that their scriptures are from God are immediately in difficulty for the pronouncements of a Creator must be taken as authoritative. He can mean only one thing by the 'Truths' he has revealed. It is very necessary for salvation, according to this view, to know which is The Truth he meant, amongst the welter of varying interpretations.

By contrast, Buddhists are in no such dilemma. Their scriptures are not given by any Creator but are regarded as aids along the Way taught by the Enlightened One. The written word is to be trusted just so long as it leads to that Supreme Enlightenment known by the Lord Buddha. An investigation of all that is implied here is necessary to bring out fully the unique Buddhist attitude to scripture.

For the Buddhist, there are two distinct levels at which words are understood, as an unenlightened worldling or at the stage of the fully illumined ones. The attitudes of worldling Buddhists towards scripture may seem similar to the ways common to followers of dogmatic religions, with the difference that the former should be striving towards Enlightenment. Worldlings generally, whether Buddhist or otherwise, tend to regard the words of the scripture as sacred, unalterable and as containing in some way Ultimate Truth. To use a Ch'an phrase, they let the scriptures 'turn them round'. A reverent acceptance of the words and interpretations of sacred writings is good for the development of faith but less so for the increase of wisdom. The unenlightened Buddhist in striving to penetrate the meaning of texts by their application to his own life thereby develops his wisdom, his understanding of the scriptures' message gradually deepening until suddenly, with Transcendental Wisdom, he 'turns round the scriptures'.

Many Ch'an (Zen) teachers have been particularly concerned that their meditating disciples should not become confused by the numerous differing interpretations of the mass of Sūtras, so concerned, in fact, that they have forbidden the reading and study of these texts to prevent the disciples as yet unenlightened being 'turned round' by them. Hence this dialogue:

'A monk asked, "Why do you not allow us to recite the sūtras which are regarded as recording other people's words?"

The master explained. "It is like a parrot repeating human language without understanding what it means. The sūtras transmit the thought of the Buddha; if you read them without understanding the sense this is just repeating his words. This is why the sūtra-reading is not permitted."

The monk asked again, "Can the meaning be expressed by other means than words and letters?"

The master said, "What you say is again repeating another's words."

"Words are the same everywhere, and why are you so prejudiced against me?"

"You listen, O monk, for I will tell you. In the sūtra it is distinctly

stated that 'What I teach contains words full of meaning and not mere words; but what ordinary people talk are mere words and have no meaning. Those who know the meaning have gone beyond senseless words; those who have an insight into Wisdom have transcended the letter. The teaching itself is more than words and letters, and why should we seek it in numbers and phrases?' This being so, he who is awakened to Bodhi attains the meaning and forgets words, has an insight into Wisdom and leaves the teaching behind. It is like a man's forgetting the creel when he has the fish, or his forgetting the noose when he has the hare." ' (57)

Both in past times and in the present day there have been some so deluded as to dispense with the sūtras before they had even studied them, as bad an imbalance if not worse than just adhering to the letter. A sharp rebuke to such people was given by a scholar of the T'ien-t'ai school and will serve today also as medicine to cure this ill:

'When Buddhist philosophy changes it becomes Zen; when Zen grows worse it turns devilish; when the devil is allowed to prosper, there is perversity of nature. The harm from depending too much on the sūtras and philosophical treatises is slight compared with the harm from positively ignoring them—an attitude which is a great hindrance to following properly the Buddhist life.' (58)

From these two quotations one may gain a balanced idea of the very great but relative importance of the scriptures until one has insight into their meaning beyond the ordinary.

This attitude to what in other religions is 'Sacred', may seem startling, but is certainly the mainstream Buddhist tradition. It is much pronounced in schools of Buddhism emphasizing practice rather than philosophizing or formal observances. Sayings of Ch'an Masters and scriptures revered by that school are especially important here. In one sūtra we find:

'The teaching of the sūtra is like a finger pointing at the moon which, when it is seen, is not in fact the indicator. Likewise, all words and expressions used by the Tathāgata to teach bodhisattvas are only pointers.' (59)

Here is a compact statement of what has been said regarding

57. The Discourses of Hui Hai.
58. *The Orthodox Transmission of the Sakya Doctrine.*
59. SCE, section 6.

the Buddhists' appreciation of their own texts. We shall find this theme recurring, as, for instance, in the Parable of the Raft, but it is mainly to Mahāyāna treatises that one has to turn for warnings about adhering to the letter while neglecting the spirit, since these writings are correctives to Hīnayāna tendencies in this direction. Traces of this very important doctrine can however be found in Pāli works.* In one of these the excessive regard of the worldling for the names of things is emphasized. In reading a scripture or hearing a doctrine, words are clearly understood through the mediums of eye and ear; words, names, bring about concepts; and by concepts the mind is bound, not freed. But let the Lord speak upon this point:

'What is it that all things doth over-ride?
Nought is in greater number found than this?
And what is it above all other things
That bringeth everything beneath its sway?

Name is it that all things doth over-ride,
Nought is in greater number found than name;
And name it is above all other things
That bringeth everything beneath its sway.' (60)

'Men, 'ware alone of what is told by names,
Take up their stand on what is so expressed.
If this they have not rightly understood,
They go their ways under the yoke of death.' (61)

It is but a step from this to the Lankāvatāra passage already quoted (see Introduction). There the warning is against this attachment to words which cause the scriptures to turn round or master the reader. If one permits texts to master one, then one is, according to the practical thought of Buddhism, a fool:

'A single significant word suffices for him who is wise; all the teaching of the Buddha would not suffice for the fool.' (62)

A fool may repeat a text all his life but still not taste the Dharma as a spoon does not taste the soup (Dhp 64) and this because an attachment to words brings about a related evil: a literal

* See Additional References 8.

60. SN i, 38. 61. SN i, 9. 62. Udv., Ch. VIII, 12.

belief as to those words and their accepted meanings. The following passage is typical of a text in which a warning against this is given paradoxically:

'It is also a deed of Māra, if after one has written down the Perfection of Wisdom, one should think either that it is the Perfection of Wisdom which is written down, or that it is not the Perfection of Wisdom which is written down, or if one should adhere to the Perfection of Wisdom either in the letters or as something not in the letters.' (63)

Thus the unenlightened Buddhist is warned of names, attachment to literal interpretations and scriptures generally. If this was the full substance of the Buddha's teaching very little progress could be made for sceptical doubt would reign supreme. Faith to counteract and balance the latter is assured from a practice of the Lord's discourse on His Dharma as a raft, for only with faith will one even make a start on the journey from the entanglements of this present state to the Freedom of the Other Shore. For our journey the Raft of Dharma is necessary. But then the Lord says:

'Even so, monks, in the parable of the Raft, is Dharma taught by me, for crossing over, not for retaining.' (64)

Now this has two applications: one is for the worldling still using the Dharma for crossing the river of unsatisfactory conditions to the Peace beyond. Dharma for him is something useful, quite invaluable, and all the moral precepts, methods of meditation, ways to insight, together with all scriptures—Sūtras, Tantras, Abhidharmas and Shāstras, all these are aids, they are methods to be used skilfully—as one would punt a raft skilfully. That they must be employed with skill means that they are to be viewed as provisional, without being attached to their substance, and to be abandoned when they have served their purpose. When this attitude is not adopted then the truth becomes evident in the old Ch'an sage's famous saying:

'*The Buddha has playfully let words escape His golden mouth;*
Heaven and earth are ever since filled with entangling briars.' (65)

This is yet another warning against taking up scriptures unquestioningly, formulating dogmas upon them, and thus coming to sectarian squabbles over mere opinions.

63. Asta 240. 64. MN i, 135.
65. *On Zen*, by Dai-o Kokushi.

The second application of Dharma as a raft is to one who has crossed Saṁsāra and reached Nirvāna or the Other Shore but not yet developed the wisdom of a Buddha. Such a one is advised by the Shākyamuni not to carry the raft on his head but to abandon it. Only by doing so can Sambodhi be achieved.

Sarahapāda the Buddhist Tantrika sings of the same thing in one of his verses. The first two lines refer to the word-bound world of birth and death, while the second couplet indicates the outlook of the Enlightened Ones:

> '*The whole world is tormented by words*
> *And there is no one who does without words.*
> *But in so far as one is free from words*
> *Does one really understand words.*' (66)

Only for those Enlightened is this possible. Hui Neng, in order to free others from attachment to the enormous mass of Buddhist scriptures, is reputed to have torn them all up. It must be noted that he did this *after* Enlightenment and *after* thoroughly understanding their contents. The skill of one Illumined is also shown in a Pāli passage summing up his attitude to words:

> '. . . (he) does not concur with anyone, he does not dispute with anyone. He makes use of the common phrases of the world without adhering to them.' (67)

Concurring with the unenlightened means agreeing with their views which from the standpoint of Perfect Wisdom must necessarily be perversions (due to avidyā-trishnā). Setting up one's viewpoint against those of others is called disputing. Presenting the Truth without adhering to its formulations is the way in which the Buddha taught—with a teaching not *against* others because ultimately beyond all opposites. Such teaching cannot truly be set down in the languages of the world, yet it is in these languages that scriptures must be written. One should recognize the limitations of conventional ways of expression and that, for describing the Transcendental, they are quite inadequate. Language expressing worldly thoughts is unavoidably limited to the worldly. However, the Buddhas use worldly language for the guidance of the unenlightened while knowing its limitations

66. Dohākośa of Sarahapāda, verse 88.
67. MN i, 500.

How long, for instance, did Rome uphold the theories of the earth's flatness and its central position in the universe, and how many suffered for their convictions that neither of these propositions were true?

Turning to modern times and a new religion—Communism. In this doctrinal system Lysenko expounded Genetics to harmonize with Marxist dogma so effectively that it became the party line on this science, and so the orthodox belief, and finally a dogma. Other geneticists from experimental evidence disagreed with Lysenko's theories. As befitted heretics, they were silenced and their findings denounced as 'bourgeois degenerate Western science', etc. The facts do not agree with what Lysenko taught, though his teachings agreed with the Communist views current at that time. The latter were, of course, held as True. . . .

We see that this tendency to subordinate fact to dogma is of long standing and, with sufficient space and patience of the reader, it could be traced back just as long as there have been formulations of 'absolute' truth which, though not taking account of the conditional nature of all that can be expressed, must nevertheless be believed. It is obvious that this aspect of dogma must be a serious obstacle to the advance of all thought let alone to spiritual cultivation. Such has never been the case in Buddhadharma which has not known such artificial checks to knowledge, either mundane or transcendental. It is only religions which fear clear thinking and the resultant knowledge that apply repressive measures. A Dharma proceeding from Sambodhi has nothing to fear from any source—such is Buddhadharma. The Fearless One, the Truthfinder, has preached His Way of freedom and truth leading all to the Greatest Freedom and the Sublimest Truth. He has indeed taught the spiritual way par excellence.

4. Interpretation of words

Finally, a general consideration of much importance, for it is frequently at the root of intersectarian strife. This is concerned with words and our understanding of them. A scriptural passage means one thing to a fundamentalist and quite another to a student of symbology. Those who hold that their scriptures are from God are immediately in difficulty for the pronouncements of a Creator must be taken as authoritative. He can mean only one thing by the 'Truths' he has revealed. It is very necessary for salvation, according to this view, to know which is The Truth he meant, amongst the welter of varying interpretations.

By contrast, Buddhists are in no such dilemma. Their scriptures are not given by any Creator but are regarded as aids along the Way taught by the Enlightened One. The written word is to be trusted just so long as it leads to that Supreme Enlightenment known by the Lord Buddha. An investigation of all that is implied here is necessary to bring out fully the unique Buddhist attitude to scripture.

For the Buddhist, there are two distinct levels at which words are understood, as an unenlightened worldling or at the stage of the fully illumined ones. The attitudes of worldling Buddhists towards scripture may seem similar to the ways common to followers of dogmatic religions, with the difference that the former should be striving towards Enlightenment. Worldlings generally, whether Buddhist or otherwise, tend to regard the words of the scripture as sacred, unalterable and as containing in some way Ultimate Truth. To use a Ch'an phrase, they let the scriptures 'turn them round'. A reverent acceptance of the words and interpretations of sacred writings is good for the development of faith but less so for the increase of wisdom. The unenlightened Buddhist in striving to penetrate the meaning of texts by their application to his own life thereby develops his wisdom, his understanding of the scriptures' message gradually deepening until suddenly, with Transcendental Wisdom, he 'turns round the scriptures'.

Many Ch'an (Zen) teachers have been particularly concerned that their meditating disciples should not become confused by the numerous differing interpretations of the mass of Sūtras, so concerned, in fact, that they have forbidden the reading and study of these texts to prevent the disciples as yet unenlightened being 'turned round' by them. Hence this dialogue:

'A monk asked, "Why do you not allow us to recite the sūtras which are regarded as recording other people's words?"

The master explained. "It is like a parrot repeating human language without understanding what it means. The sūtras transmit the thought of the Buddha; if you read them without understanding the sense this is just repeating his words. This is why the sūtra-reading is not permitted."

The monk asked again, "Can the meaning be expressed by other means than words and letters?"

The master said, "What you say is again repeating another's words."

"Words are the same everywhere, and why are you so prejudiced against me?"

"You listen, O monk, for I will tell you. In the sūtra it is distinctly

stated that 'What I teach contains words full of meaning and not mere words; but what ordinary people talk are mere words and have no meaning. Those who know the meaning have gone beyond senseless words; those who have an insight into Wisdom have transcended the letter. The teaching itself is more than words and letters, and why should we seek it in numbers and phrases?' This being so, he who is awakened to Bodhi attains the meaning and forgets words, has an insight into Wisdom and leaves the teaching behind. It is like a man's forgetting the creel when he has the fish, or his forgetting the noose when he has the hare." ' (57)

Both in past times and in the present day there have been some so deluded as to dispense with the sūtras before they had even studied them, as bad an imbalance if not worse than just adhering to the letter. A sharp rebuke to such people was given by a scholar of the T'ien-t'ai school and will serve today also as medicine to cure this ill:

'When Buddhist philosophy changes it becomes Zen; when Zen grows worse it turns devilish; when the devil is allowed to prosper, there is perversity of nature. The harm from depending too much on the sūtras and philosophical treatises is slight compared with the harm from positively ignoring them—an attitude which is a great hindrance to following properly the Buddhist life.' (58)

From these two quotations one may gain a balanced idea of the very great but relative importance of the scriptures until one has insight into their meaning beyond the ordinary.

This attitude to what in other religions is 'Sacred' may seem startling, but is certainly the mainstream Buddhist tradition. It is much pronounced in schools of Buddhism emphasizing practice rather than philosophizing or formal observances. Sayings of Ch'an Masters and scriptures revered by that school are especially important here. In one sūtra we find:

'The teaching of the sūtra is like a finger pointing at the moon which, when it is seen, is not in fact the indicator. Likewise, all words and expressions used by the Tathāgata to teach bodhisattvas are only pointers.' (59)

Here is a compact statement of what has been said regarding

57. The Discourses of Hui Hai.
58. *The Orthodox Transmission of the Sakya Doctrine.*
59. SCE, section 6.

the Buddhists' appreciation of their own texts. We shall find this theme recurring, as, for instance, in the Parable of the Raft, but it is mainly to Mahāyāna treatises that one has to turn for warnings about adhering to the letter while neglecting the spirit, since these writings are correctives to Hīnayāna tendencies in this direction. Traces of this very important doctrine can however be found in Pāli works.* In one of these the excessive regard of the worldling for the names of things is emphasized. In reading a scripture or hearing a doctrine, words are clearly understood through the mediums of eye and ear; words, names, bring about concepts; and by concepts the mind is bound, not freed. But let the Lord speak upon this point:

'What is it that all things doth over-ride?
Nought is in greater number found than this?
And what is it above all other things
That bringeth everything beneath its sway?

Name is it that all things doth over-ride,
Nought is in greater number found than name;
And name it is above all other things
That bringeth everything beneath its sway.' (60)

'Men, 'ware alone of what is told by names,
Take up their stand on what is so expressed.
If this they have not rightly understood,
They go their ways under the yoke of death.' (61)

It is but a step from this to the Lankāvatāra passage already quoted (see Introduction). There the warning is against this attachment to words which cause the scriptures to turn round or master the reader. If one permits texts to master one, then one is, according to the practical thought of Buddhism, a fool:

'A single significant word suffices for him who is wise; all the teaching of the Buddha would not suffice for the fool.' (62)

A fool may repeat a text all his life but still not taste the Dharma as a spoon does not taste the soup (Dhp 64) and this because an attachment to words brings about a related evil: a literal

* See Additional References 8.

60. SN i, 38. 61. SN i, 9. 62. Udv., Ch. VIII, 12.

belief as to those words and their accepted meanings. The following passage is typical of a text in which a warning against this is given paradoxically:

'It is also a deed of Māra, if after one has written down the Perfection of Wisdom, one should think either that it is the Perfection of Wisdom which is written down, or that it is not the Perfection of Wisdom which is written down, or if one should adhere to the Perfection of Wisdom either in the letters or as something not in the letters.' (63)

Thus the unenlightened Buddhist is warned of names, attachment to literal interpretations and scriptures generally. If this was the full substance of the Buddha's teaching very little progress could be made for sceptical doubt would reign supreme. Faith to counteract and balance the latter is assured from a practice of the Lord's discourse on His Dharma as a raft, for only with faith will one even make a start on the journey from the entanglements of this present state to the Freedom of the Other Shore. For our journey the Raft of Dharma is necessary. But then the Lord says:

'Even so, monks, in the parable of the Raft, is Dharma taught by me, for crossing over, not for retaining.' (64)

Now this has two applications: one is for the worldling still using the Dharma for crossing the river of unsatisfactory conditions to the Peace beyond. Dharma for him is something useful, quite invaluable, and all the moral precepts, methods of meditation, ways to insight, together with all scriptures—Sūtras, Tantras, Abhidharmas and Shāstras, all these are aids, they are methods to be used skilfully—as one would punt a raft skilfully. That they must be employed with skill means that they are to be viewed as provisional, without being attached to their substance, and to be abandoned when they have served their purpose. When this attitude is not adopted then the truth becomes evident in the old Ch'an sage's famous saying:

'*The Buddha has playfully let words escape His golden mouth;*
Heaven and earth are ever since filled with entangling briars.' (65)

This is yet another warning against taking up scriptures unquestioningly, formulating dogmas upon them, and thus coming to sectarian squabbles over mere opinions.

63. Asta 240. 64. MN i, 135.
65. *On Zen*, by Dai-o Kokushi.

The second application of Dharma as a raft is to one who has crossed Saṁsāra and reached Nirvāna or the Other Shore but not yet developed the wisdom of a Buddha. Such a one is advised by the Shākyamuni not to carry the raft on his head but to abandon it. Only by doing so can Sambodhi be achieved.

Sarahapāda the Buddhist Tantrika sings of the same thing in one of his verses. The first two lines refer to the word-bound world of birth and death, while the second couplet indicates the outlook of the Enlightened Ones:

> '*The whole world is tormented by words*
> *And there is no one who does without words.*
> *But in so far as one is free from words*
> *Does one really understand words.*' (66)

Only for those Enlightened is this possible. Hui Neng, in order to free others from attachment to the enormous mass of Buddhist scriptures, is reputed to have torn them all up. It must be noted that he did this *after* Enlightenment and *after* thoroughly understanding their contents. The skill of one Illumined is also shown in a Pāli passage summing up his attitude to words:

> '. . . (he) does not concur with anyone, he does not dispute with anyone. He makes use of the common phrases of the world without adhering to them.' (67)

Concurring with the unenlightened means agreeing with their views which from the standpoint of Perfect Wisdom must necessarily be perversions (due to avidyā-trishnā). Setting up one's viewpoint against those of others is called disputing. Presenting the Truth without adhering to its formulations is the way in which the Buddha taught—with a teaching not *against* others because ultimately beyond all opposites. Such teaching cannot truly be set down in the languages of the world, yet it is in these languages that scriptures must be written. One should recognize the limitations of conventional ways of expression and that, for describing the Transcendental, they are quite inadequate. Language expressing worldly thoughts is unavoidably limited to the worldly. However, the Buddhas use worldly language for the guidance of the unenlightened while knowing its limitations

66. Dohākośa of Sarahapāda, verse 88.
67. MN i, 500.

(as opposed to the worldlings who use it and do not know it as limited). Hence little regard is given by true Buddhists to the mere letter but much to what results from its practice.

In treating on Buddhist scriptures and how they are regarded, it is hoped that the divergence has been clearly shown between Buddhist and dogmatic attitudes. A religion teaching that words are only authoritative in so far as they lead to Enlightenment is unlikely to have a history of intersectarian feuds and persecution of others. Just so is Buddhadharma.

Under the headings Dogma, Generalizations and fixed concepts, Subordination of truth and Interpretation of words, the worst tangles associated with intolerance and its root-factors have been described, together with the distinctive viewpoints of Buddhadharma on these matters. More pleasant realms are yet to be explored which will further explain the true nature of tolerance.

* * *

C. FACTORS MAKING FOR TOLERANCE

After the gloom of Māra's realm, for the intolerant are under his sway, we come into the bright and pleasant pastures illumined by the sun of tolerance. Factors basic to tolerance are by their nature those which lead away from Māra—they lead one from the inevitable conflicts of Saṁsāra unto the Peace of Nirvāna.

1. Mindfulness

If indeed we wish to tread this path one mental factor is to be cultivated without which no progress can be made—this is mindfulness (Satī—Skt. smriti). Lack of mindfulness results in carelessness, in the mind being flooded with the poisons of Greed, Hate and Delusion, all of which are good potential for the dislike, and then persecution, of others. The great Buddhist poet Aśvaghośa clearly shows the importance of mindfulness:

> 'A mind which is not protected by mindfulness is as helpless as a sightless man walking over uneven ground without a guide. Loss of mindfulness is the reason why people engage in useless pursuits, do not care for their own true interests, and remain unalarmed in the presence of things which actually menace their welfare. And, as a herdsman runs after his scattered cows, so mindfulness runs after all the virtues, such as morality

etc., wherever they can be found. The Deathless is beyond the reach of those who disperse their attention, but is within the grasp of those who direct their mindfulness on all that concerns the body. Without mindfulness no one can have the correct holy method; and in the absence of the holy method he has lost the true Path. By losing the true Path he has lost the road to the Deathless; the Deathless being outside his reach, he cannot win freedom from suffering.' (68)

Mindfulness, especially of the body's actions, which here includes that of speech, warns us away from what will harm both others and ourselves. Where mindfulness is constantly tended there abundant fruits of other helpful virtues ripen and the weeds of the passions wither. Where this sort of progressive mind-training is found how can intolerance exist?

In greater detail, mindfulness means for the Buddhist:

'There, Ānanda, the disciple respecting the body keeps watch upon the body, earnestly, intently, clearly conscious, having put away all worldly cares and desires. As respects sensations . . . mind . . . phenomena, he keeps watch over the (mental) phenomena, earnestly, intently, clearly conscious, having put away all worldly cares and desires.' (69)

If even a tithe of this perfect mindfulness has been developed how can thoughts of hatred arise, let alone intolerant speech or active persecution? With mindfulness all the unwholesome factors mentioned can be checked, giving the wholesome factors the chance to grow.

2. Conscience and fear of blame

These two factors inducing conscientiousness are called the Guardians of the World and are found associated with all moral mental states. Buddhaghośa well defines them:

'It has conscientious scruples (hiriyati) about bodily misconduct etc., thus it is conscience (hiri). This is a term for modesty. It is ashamed (ottappati) of those same things, thus it is shame (ottappa). This is a term for anxiety about evil. Herein *conscience* has the characteristic of disgust at evil, while *shame* has the characteristic of dread of it. *Conscience* has the function of not doing evil and that in the mode of modesty, while *shame* has the function of not doing it and that in the mode of dread. They are manifested as shrinking from evil in the way already stated. Their proximate causes are self-respect and respect of others.' (70)

68. Saundarananda Kāvya of Aśvaghośa.
69. DN, Sutta 16 (Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta III).
70. Vis Mag, Ch. XIV, para. 142.

By conscience here is not meant any sort of entity or function of a 'soul'—it is just one factor of consciousness among many others. Nor is conscience something which can be manipulated just as one desires. Some people have been conscientious enough not to kill a mouse but quite cheerfully ordered an act of genocide. This is a false conscience based upon a twisted set of values, for where Śīla is warped, Hiri and Ottappa cannot come to perfection.

Those having conscience and shame would find the persecution of others impossible. These factors truly guard the world from unrestrained hatred and its consequences. They make people scrupulous and so bring peace between disputants. A Sūtra translated from the Chinese has the following:

'The clothing of conscience, among all finery, is the very best. Conscience is like an iron goad which can control man's unrighteousness. Therefore, brethren, you must always be conscientious. You must not be able, even for a moment, to ignore it. If you depart from conscience you lose all merit. He who has shame has that which is good. He who has no shame will not be different from birds and beasts.' (71)

3. Wisdom

'As, monks, the lion, king of beasts, is reckoned chief among animals, for his strength, speed and bravery, so is the faculty of wisdom (Paññā —Skt. Prajñā) reckoned chief among mental states helpful to Enlightenment. . . .' (72)

So greatly was wisdom esteemed by the Exalted One, and His followers through the ages have continued to respect it. To understand what this wisdom is and why it is thought so valuable, Buddhaghośa may be again consulted:

'Non-delusion (=wisdom) has the characteristic of penetrating (things) according to their individual essences, or it has the characteristic of sure penetration, like the penetration of an arrow shot by a skilful archer. Its function is to illumine the objective field, like a lamp. Its proximate cause is non-bewilderment, like a guide in a forest. The three (non-greed, non-hatred and non-delusion) should be regarded as the roots of all that is profitable.' (73)

71. *Sūtra of the Teachings left by the Buddha*, II, 4.
72. SN, v. 227.
73. Vis Mag, Ch. XIV, para. 143.

Three forms of wisdom are distinguished (see DN, Sutta 33) and are explained as follows:

'*Based on thinking* is that knowledge which one has acquired through one's own thinking without having learnt it from others. *Based on learning* is that knowledge which one has heard (read) from others, and thus acquired through learning. *Based on mental development* is that knowledge (or wisdom) which one has acquired subsequent to the practice of meditation in this or that way. . . .' (74)

One who possesses wisdom, either of the first two kinds which are worldly, or of the last which is Transcendental, is greatly regarded in the Buddhist tradition, the more so, the greater the wisdom. Regarding the wise man, the Lord has said:

'These, monks, are the three marks of a wise man, signs of a wise man, stamps of a wise man. What three? As to this, monks, a wise man is one thinking right thoughts, speaking right words, and a doer of deeds rightly done.' (75)

Now that we have some information about the nature of this wisdom as chief mental state for winning Enlightenment, its clarity and penetrating quality, the different sorts of wisdom and what constitutes a wise man, we must turn our attention to the relation between wisdom and our subject. A Buddhist, wise through his own thinking or store of knowledge, will certainly not do others harm. How could he when the wisdom of his Master advises mindfulness, shame, humility, loving kindness and patience? If through systematic application of Buddhadharma to his whole life he gains Transcendental Wisdom—then only the welfare of others, not their persecution, becomes his concern. For with this Wisdom he sees how unsatisfactoriness pervades the lives of all in Saṁsāra and seeing this Compassion arises. Compassion with all beings is exactly opposite to an intolerant attitude towards them.

The Buddha has constantly encouraged His followers to cultivate wisdom. Initially, this is the ability to question things: 'Is this correct or false?' etc. Now the Lord required that those faithful to His Way should also question that Way (see Kālāma Sutta). Going even beyond this, He told the bhikshus to examine thoroughly Himself:

74. Vis Mag, Ch. XIV, para. 14.

75. MN iii, 170.

'Monks, an enquiring monk, learning the range of another's mind, should make a study of the Tathāgata, so as to distinguish whether He is a Fully Awakened One or not.' (76)

No blind faith is encouraged here! Faith is guided by wisdom and the latter blossoms watered by faith—the result is:

'Monks, in anyone in whom faith in the Teacher is established, rooted, supported by these methods (by enquiries as to the Teacher's Enlightenment) . . . that faith is called reasoned, based on vision, strong; it is indestructible . . . by anyone in the world. Thus, monks, does there come to be a study of the Tathāgata's Dharma, and thus does the Tathāgata come to be well studied in the proper manner.' (77)

The balance of wisdom with faith matures a mind incapable of persecution, whereas blind faith alone results in bigotry.

A pair of complementary factors already mentioned are wisdom and compassion. In this vital combination are the roots from which spring the unique tolerance of Buddhadharma. Wisdom is necessary both to recognize and practise True Dharma, and, finally, inseparable from its attainment. Excessive development of the tendency towards real wisdom results only in dry and dusty intellectualism while leaving the emotions to rampage as they will. Compassion, the product of refined emotional urges, is essential, as this is the mother of all skilful means in guiding others. Wisdom lighted by Compassion avoids the dead-end of mere factual knowledge exemplified by numerous dogmatic pundits. Such one-sided characters tend to intolerance as with them principles are divorced from practice. The writer has noted several eminent Hindus, also Christians of this type, who are quite ready to pronounce upon, and condemn, Buddhism; and all this is done from their shallow store of twisted facts. The dangers of a misdirected intellect are mentioned by Jetsun Gampopa:

'Great zeal without adequate religious instruction (and practice) is apt to lead to the fault of going to erroneous extremes (or following misleading paths).' (78)

Such is avoided by the Buddha's wise preaching of a Middle Way.

Wisdom in quite a mundane sense is required both by Buddhists and the followers of other religions on three counts. They

76. MN i, 317 (Sutta 47). 77. MN i, 320. 78. PG X, 3.

will understand their various teachings in a spirit of tolerance, only:

(a) When they are able to take into account the influence of historical background. Racial and cultural conditions as well as the events of history can bring great changes to a teaching. Lack of understanding frequently gives rise to mistaken attitudes and disputes between different branches of the same Dharma. Witness the controversy between the early Roman and Greek Churches—neither understood the other. Neither realized that apparent differences (dress, ritual, iconography, etc.) reflected cultural and social forces of differing peoples. Much the same confusion exists in the minds of some Theravāda Buddhists when suddenly confronted with the Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna. Many centuries of isolation and varying influences have given quite a different appearance to these traditions. An attitude of 'It cannot be Buddhism—it's not what I'm used to' merely reflects lack of this mundane wisdom.

(b) When they can appreciate present-day conditions. It is more excusable to fail to recognize facts buried in history but little excuse can be found for not seeing what is now before one's eyes. Present conditions do, in fact, often give us clues to understand the past, but if we are so blind and narrow in our present outlook, neither the one nor the other will become clear to us. Those clinging to their prejudiced conceptions limit their own mental growth and spiritual comprehension; there is little hope for their development of wisdom in this life.

(c) When they can account for all the various formulations of religion which exist within each teaching. The two previous points touch upon tolerance rather indirectly, whereas this third point is directly related. Accounting for sects, views or schools of differing thought within any one religion means gaining a knowledge of them. The ignorant sectarian is often more biassed against another sect than against those following a different religion! Ignorance breeds narrow intolerance: knowledge brings wide appreciation.

Returning to wisdom and the Buddhist. There will always be difficulties in the correct formulation of the Dharma preached by the Buddha, since really it goes beyond all formulations and conceptions. In order to aid those on this path, many different presentations exist, many stems arising from the same root—Transcendent Wisdom. This true Wisdom is also a signpost pointing the Way between all views extreme and therefore undesirable.

Buddhists have to take care that they do not merely hang on to the letter of the Law, as this is only keeping up appearances and shows the deathly touch of dust-dry formalism. The Sūtra warns the bhikshus (Hīnayāna particularly) against this evil, but it is truly a path of Māra which all who profess to be Buddhists have to beware of treading:

'Mahākāśyapa Bodhisattva said to the Buddha: "All Bhikshus should rely on four things: on the Dharma but not on men; on the meaning but not on the words (and phrases); on wisdom but not on consciousness and on the whole truth but not on incomplete truth." ' (79)

These four clauses mean reliance should be placed upon wisdom so that we rely upon our own realization of wisdom to guide us, not upon other men who may be deluded; that with our own wisdom we directly perceive the meaning of the Sūtras, etc., and do not rely upon the authority of accepted interpretations; that we develop the faculty of wisdom leading to insight, not relying upon the ordinary functions of consciousness; and so are able to get at the whole truth and place no reliance upon conceptual half-truths. The path of formalistic observance and ritualistic action (when this does not correspond to any aspect of reality) has nothing to do with Buddhism because unconnected with the unfolding of wisdom. Any who are in the grasp of this Māra have to realize that they do not benefit themselves as they can make no progress along the path; and that they are in danger of harming others since formalism is a good source of intolerant behaviour.

By reason of Buddhadharma's subtlety there is another extreme against which to guard. This is vagueness, or lack of forthrightness, the result of ignorance or confusion. We should remember that the Buddha said that His Dharma was for the precise, not for the imprecise.* In the hands of the latter a sort of tolerance is practised, but a wrong sort. It leads to statements like this: 'Buddhism and the Bhagavad Gītā teach the same thing'; and, 'Of course, Jesus Christ really taught the same as the Buddha'; or the oft-repeated, 'There is nothing in Buddhism not found in Hinduism'. And so on, leading eventually to the extinction of Buddhadharma and the loss of the True Way (see also Ch. 1, II, A5).

From wisdom arises real tolerance, it springs from undeluded

79. Mahāparinirvāna Sūtra.
* AN, Attha Nipata, Ch. 3.

experience. The more delusion present in a mind, the lower and meaner are its attitudes and less the tolerance found in it. The greater the wisdom, the less becomes the tendency to accept (greed), or reject (hatred):

'Where there is no accepting, no grasping and no rejecting, there is the practice of the Perfection of Wisdom. Not to stay with anything is the practice of this wisdom. Not to think and not to conceptualize is the practice of this perfection.' (80)

Wisdom brought to such a pitch will not bicker about the external differences which so often bring about intolerance. On the contrary, the greatly wise of any Buddhist tradition will not even see these matters but appreciate both the good points of other religions and the fact that their Dharma's many schools are united in their goal—Enlightenment.

To conclude this section on wisdom its objective may once again be stressed, from a different angle:

' "Whatever, Rāhula, is material shape, past, future, or present, subjective or objective, gross or subtle, low or excellent, distant or near, all material shape should be seen as it really is by means of perfect intuitive wisdom, thus: 'This is not mine, this am I not, this is not myself.' "

"Only material shape, Lord, only material shape, Well-farer?"

"Material shape, Rāhula—and feeling, Rāhula—and perception, Rāhula—and habitual tendencies, Rāhula—and consciousness, Rāhula." ' (81)

After making such a thorough self-analysis it is found that our precious ideas of 'self, soul', etc., are founded upon false conceptions of ourselves, a prideful feeling of 'I-making'. With the 'self' realized as false, and all self-centred ideas rooted out, how could intolerance arise when no distinction between 'self' and 'others' is made? But this is trespassing on material for the fourth approach to tolerance.

4. Flexibility

This factor concerns ability and willingness to learn, obviously an important aspect of the tolerant mind. When Mudutā (flexibility, malleability) is present, then also comes humility. A humble mind is flexible or malleable, so that with this valuable

80. Saptaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra.
81. MN i, 421.

quality one's views are liberal and one's outlook unprejudiced. As Buddhaghośa says:

'They (malleability of both mind and mental factors) have the characteristic of quieting rigidity in both mind and mental factors. Their function is to crush unwieldiness in both. They are manifested as non-resistance. . . . They should be regarded as opposed to the defilements of views, conceit (pride) etc., which cause stiffening of the mind and mental factors.' (82)

Nothing can be done with the stiff mind—it is certain that such a mind will hold extreme views, be narrow, unshakably dogmatic and intolerant of others' ways. With flexibility comes appreciation of others' teaching together with our virtue—tolerance.

5. Amity-compassion

As Paññā is the cultivated intellect, so these Brahma-vihāras are the cultivation of the emotions. As the intellect has to balance in development emotion, so wisdom is complemented by friendliness and compassion (Metta-karunā—Skt. Maitrī). What this 'friendliness' means to a Buddhist is defined in the luminous passage which follows:

'If one has developed love truly great, rid of the desire to hold and possess, that strong, pure love which is untarnished with lust of any kind, that love which does not expect material advantage and profit from the act of loving, that love which is firm but not grasping, unshakable but not tied down, gentle and settled, hard and penetrating as a diamond but unhurting, helpful but not interfering, cool, invigorating, giving more than taking, not proud but dignified, not sentimental yet soft, the love which leads one to the heights of pure attainment, then, in such a one there can be no ill-will at all.' (83)

Both this altruistic love and compassion are widely recommended to both monks and laymen throughout the Buddhist world where their development is one of the most popular and fruitful meditations. Buddhist tradition holds that not only are one's friends and acquaintances to be regarded with friendliness but also that one's enemies should be treated with loving kindness:

'Then, again, house-holder, the monk abides having suffused the first quarter with a mind of friendliness, likewise the second, the third and

82. Vis Mag, Ch. XIV, para. 146.
83. Dharmapradīpika of Gurulugomi, IV.

the fourth; just so above, below, across, he abides, having suffused the whole world everywhere, in every way, with a mind of friendliness that is far-reaching, widespread and immeasurable, without enmity, without malevolence.' (The same formula also applies to compassion.) (84)

Looking at Buddhist history one may say that Buddhists have usually lived up to the high standard of conduct which this passage implies. They have never had such perverted views of friendliness and compassion for others which led John Locke to write:

'Now I appeal to the consciences of those that persecute, torment, destroy, and kill other men upon pretence of religion, whether they do it out of friendship and kindness towards them or no.' (85)

Buddhists have not disgraced themselves and their Dharma by dressing up persecution in the guise of regard for others' spiritual welfare. On the contrary, their attitude has been:

'To the man that foolishly does me wrong, I shall return the protection of my undying love (mettā); the more evil that comes from him, the more good shall go from me.' (86)

A Buddhist regards friendliness as the medicine for the disease of hatred:

'For hatred, friendliness is the antidote, and not to see unpleasant people; or by encouraging the pleasure that comes from association in such matters as common meals. Friendliness means to have hopes for the welfare of others, to long for it, to crave for it, to delight in it. It is affection unsullied by motives of sense-desire, passion or hope of a return.' (87)

Three Precepts of the Gurus expressing this teaching as it is to be applied practically are:

'The thought of helping others, howsoever limited one's ability to help others may be, is not to be avoided.

Having resolved to attain the Highest Goal (Buddhahood), abandon selfishness and devote thyself to the service of others.

If only the good of others be sought in all that one doeth, no need is there to seek benefit for thyself.' (88)

84. MN i, 349–52.

85. *A Letter Concerning Toleration*, by John Locke (written 1689 C.E.).

86. S42S. (Quoted by Narasu from Beal(?). Not found in the most recent translation by Chu Cha'n.

87. Sikṡāsamuccaya 212.

88. PG V, 10; VII, 8; XXIII, 10.

This altruistic spirit is the outcome of the Buddha's preaching on the great value of Mettā. It is not surprising, then, that such teaching inculcated over the centuries by hundreds of Buddhist texts and thousands of exhortations bears its fruit in a broad-minded tolerance of others' views.

So far it is mostly Mettā which has been described, though Karunā is obviously closely linked to it. Compassion for others, a feeling with others' misery with a desire for their weal, is highly regarded in Buddhadharma;* indeed, together with Paññā, it forms a dyad indispensable for the attainment of Full Enlightenment. Since sympathy with the sufferings of others is so much stressed, it would be surprising if Buddhism in its institutional forms or if individual Buddhists had gone out of their way deliberately to cause misery by persecution. Beings have enough duḥkha already without doing anything which would increase this. Buddhists, firm believers in the continuity of the life-process (popularly called 'rebirth') due to the fruition of volitional actions plus ignorance, develop great compassion seeing that all beings, at whatever level they may experience, suffer in one way or another:

'All living beings pass through the six paths of existence—(birth in the hells, among brutes, hungry ghosts, demons, human beings and among gods), like unto a wheel revolving without beginning and without end. And they become by turns fathers and mothers, males and females, and through generations and generations one is in debt to others. Therefore, it is proper to regard all beings as our fathers and mothers, although the mystery of this truth can be realized only by one who has mastered the Good Law. All men are our fathers; all women are our mothers. Instead of discharging towards them the debt of love contracted by us in our previous births, is it right to harbour, with a heart averse, feelings of enmity towards them? Let our thoughts be riveted on love; let us strive our utmost to do good to one another; stir not enmity up through quarrels and evil words.' (89)

It is fitting to end this section with some quotations from the well-beloved Mettā Sutta:

'This is what should be done by a man who is wise, who seeks the good, and who knows the meaning of the place of peace. . . . Let him do nothing that is mean or that the wise would reprove. May all beings be happy and at their ease! May they be joyous and live in safety! All

* See Additional References 25.

89. Bodhisattva Hridaya Bhūmi Sūtra.

beings whether weak or strong—omitting none—in high, middle or low realms of existence, small or great, visible or invisible, near or far away, born or yet to be born—may all beings be happy and at their ease! Let none deceive another, nor despise any being in any state! Let none by anger or ill-will wish to harm another! . . . So let him cultivate a boundless goodwill towards the entire world, uncramped, free from ill-will and enmity . . . abandoning false views, having a clear (spiritual) vision, free from sense appetites, he who is made perfect will never again know birth.' (90)

* * *

III. THE PERFECTION OF PATIENCE AND TOLERANCE

From the last quotation above it is understandable that patience (Kshānti) and its perfection (Pāramitā) have been extolled in Buddhist literature. From the Buddha, from the lines of eminent teachers who followed Him, down to the present time, this virtue has been highly valued. There are numerous references to it in the Pāli Canon, though it is not mentioned there as one of a number of Perfections to be fulfilled by aspirants to Buddhahood —the Bodhisattvas. It is true that the Pāramitās are described in the Cariya Pitaka and Buddhavaṁsa, but these are late Pāli words and seem to have imported some ideas from other schools' literature. Buddhaghośa, in his Visuddhi Magga, makes only very brief reference to the Pāramitās. It is in the texts of the Mahāyāna that one finds a developed teaching of the Perfections, with the factors well arranged in a progressive series of either six or ten. Usually Patience is listed third after the Perfections of Giving and Morality.

Before proceeding further it would be well to define not only patience but tolerance also, thus making clear the relation between them. While tolerance might be generally defined as 'Allowing others to hold opinions on religious, political and other matters differing from oneself or from whatever the dominant authority, and allowing their free expression in speech or by bodily acts provided that these do not cause harm to others in any way either mentally or physically', patience may be described as 'The quality of equanimity and steadily bearing with ourselves and others even in the face of intense provocation which interferes with one's beliefs, speech or body'. Briefly, tolerance applies

90. Karaniya Mettā Sutta.

to ideas, doctrines and institutions established upon these, whereas patience may be practised towards all the ills which afflict us, internal or external, of mind or of body.

Patience is certainly a passive quality, impossible without a well-established power of friendliness, and is indispensable to those who would truly be tolerant.

And so besides patience we shall here consider the related virtues of forgiveness, forbearance and endurance. These qualities are a sure foundation of tolerance and have been praised by all the Buddhas. This much may be seen in the teachings on Discipline of Vipassi Buddha, preserved for us in the Dhammapada:

'Not to do evil, to cultivate good, to cleanse one's mind—this is the teaching of the Buddhas.

Forbearance is the highest austerity. "Nibbāna is supreme" say the Buddhas. Verily he is not a monk who harms another, nor is he a recluse who oppresses others.

Not despising, not harming, restraint according to the Discipline . . . this is the teaching of the Buddhas.' (91)

If with faith one accepts the traditional account attributing this to Lord Vipassi, then, in that inconceivably remote time, patience and gentleness were the practices recommended by Him as qualities of self-purification—for this is the meaning of austerity (tapo) in Buddhadharma.

Of the last Buddha's teachings, there are many places where the Sage of the Sākyas has taught on this subject. In one of the most popular of His discourses where thirty-eight blessings are given, one verse runs thus:

'Patience in provocation, pleasant speech,
The sight of those who lead the Holy Life,
And talk about the Truth in season meet.
This is the most auspicious sign of all.' (92)

It is noteworthy that patience and kind words are mentioned together, as we shall see below. One possessed of these is fit for instruction by religious teachers, and, as the third line tells us, is prepared also for fruitful discussion on Dharma—a talk which will truly go forward and so increase one's wisdom. As this Sutta

91. Dhp 183–5.
92. Maṅgala Sutta—translated by the Ven. Sangharakshita Sthavīra.

contains a complete course of Buddhist training, it is interesting to see that not until the eighth verse is our quality given—only three verses follow it. This indicates the deep meanings and importance of patience which texts quoted below will illustrate.

Buddhists always begin by training themselves first, and in this respect patience is no exception. What is expected of a devoted monk is seen from this text:

> 'And what, monks, are the cankers (āsava) to be got rid of by endurance? In this teaching, monks, a monk wisely reflective is one who bears cold, heat, hunger, thirst, the touch of gadfly, mosquito, wind and sun, creeping things, ways of speech that are irksome, unwelcome; he is of a character to bear bodily feelings which, arising, are painful, acute, sharp, shooting, disagreeable, miserable, deadly. Whereas, monks, if he lacked endurance, the cankers which are destructive and consuming might arise. But because he endures, therefore these cankers, destructive and consuming, are not.' (93)

In this extract notice that three types of endurance are mentioned. There are first listed all sorts of exterior conditions of the world—from temperature to creeping things. Then follows endurance of others' speech when that is harsh, sarcastic, abusive or full of intolerant hatred. Then, most personal and difficult to endure, are painful states of the body which may sometimes be the result of physical persecution. These three form a progressive course of endurance beginning with exterior conditions more easily borne but ending with those interior and most difficult to bear.

A monk in the Saṅgha at the time of the Lord could hardly expect luxuries of life—many texts, particularly the Sutta Nipāta, point out time and again that he was not expected even to desire them (this apart from the numerous later restrictions of the Vinaya Pitaka). For instances of patience in the face of harsh words, there are many examples in the Pāli Canon of the Exalted One abused by brahmins.* But He was in no way affected—no answering abuse came from His lips, nor even could it have been present in His infinitely compassionate mind. In the distant past the same bearing up under abuse is found in the Buddha Kakusandha's advice to monks reviled by householders.† But the greatest test of patience is when one's body is attacked by disagreeable sensations either from within or without. The famous

93. MN i, 10.
* See Sn 19.
† See MN i, 334–5.

Simile of the Saw is introduced by another passage from the same Sutta showing the lengths to which a well-trained monk should maintain patience:

'Wherefore, Phagguna, even if anyone should give a blow with his hand, should give a blow with a clod of earth . . . with a stick . . . with a weapon, even so should you, Phagguna, get rid of those desires which are worldly, those thoughts that are worldly, and you, Phagguna, should train yourself thus: "Neither will my mind become perverted, nor will I utter an evil speech, but kindly and compassionate will I dwell with a mind of friendliness and void of hatred." It is thus that you must train yourself, Phagguna.' (94)

'Monks, as low-down thieves might carve one limb from limb with a double-handed saw, yet even then whoever sets his mind at enmity, he, for this reason is not a doer of my teaching. Herein, monks, you should train yourselves thus: "Neither will our minds become perverted, nor will we utter an evil speech, but kindly and compassionate will we dwell, with a mind of friendliness void of hatred; and beginning with him, we will dwell having suffused the whole world with a mind of friendliness that is far-reaching, widespread, immeasurable, without enmity, without malevolence." This is how you must train yourselves, monks.' (95)

The Venerable Śāriputra, speaking to other monks, uses this simile to show that the body, being of a nature to experience painful sensations, should not react to them with hatred but with patience, even gratitude, for having been presented with the chance to practise this teaching and so try the strength of patience developed.*

Though all these quotations are addressed to 'monks', it must not be thought that the quality of patience in adversity is to be cultivated by them alone. Laymen, too, should practise this; they also experience much in their lives where patience will be a blessing. In the Guru's Precepts it is written:

'Should various misfortunes assail thee, persevere in patience of body, speech and mind.' (96)

Developing the endurance aspect guided by the above examples, patience comes to be a strong part of one's character. The Buddha has often encouraged this strength, saying:

94. MN i, 123–4.
95. MN i, 129.
* MN i, 186.
96. PG VIII, 8.

'Who blameless, bears blows, abuse, well-armed
With strength of patience, brahmin him I call.' (97)

Brahmin is here used in the Buddhist sense of one having attained the highest or at least striving for this. Such as he knows the spiritual gain so picturesquely spoken of in a Jātaka verse:

'No royal force, however vast its might,
Can win so great advantage in a fight
As the good man by patience may secure.
Strong patience is of fiercest feuds the cure.' (98)

Having cultured such a strength of patience in oneself, it is then possible to have great patience with others. Being unselfishly patient is the cultivation of Kshānti as a Pāramitā:

'To exercise patience for merely selfish ends, rather than doing good to others, is like a cat exercising patience in order to kill a rat; and this is a grievous failure.' (99)

Bodhisattvas do not cultivate the Perfections in this spirit; their mental attitude is shown in the following:

'The Bodhisattva and Mahāsatta develop loving kindness for all beings. For the sake of benefiting all beings, they practise, they fulfil the Perfection of Patience.' (100)

And again:

'The Bodhisattva is firmly grounded in the power of patience when his attitude towards all beings is free from ill-will and a desire to harm them.' (101)

Elaborating this and stressing that no patience exists in the hateful mind is the theme of the Venerable Śāntideva, who nobly says:

'All the generosity, reverence to the Happy One, and such virtues performed in the passage of a thousand aeons, are repelled by hatred.
No evil is the equal of hatred, no penance is the equal of patience.

97. Sn 623. 98. Jātaka 552. 99. PG XIII, 8.
100. Vim Mag, Fasc 8, Ch. 8.
101. Śatasahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra, X, 1460.

Therefore he (the Bodhisattva) practises patience by self-restraint in many ways.

As long as the dart of hatred remains in the heart, the mind has no calm, no happiness, no exultation, no sleep and no stability.' (102)

In another place we have the story of the Bodhisattva Sadāparibhuta who, though constantly taunted for his humility and desire to become a Buddha, nevertheless invariably replied to his tormentors:

'I revere you all, and will not insult you, however base you may be, for all of you will walk in the truth and become Buddhas.' (103)

A Bodhisattva entering upon the Enlightenment of a Buddha brings the Pāramitās to the heights of perfection. Some examples of the Lord's patience have already been mentioned, and whether He was upbraiding wayward monks, instructing householders, bearing with envious brahmins or refuting the wrong views of other wanderers—in all, He never showed impatience. And always His mighty power of patience conquered opponents, even fierce, non-human beings as in the story of Ālavaka the Yakkha.*

The greatness of the Awakened One shows always in His ability to give instruction in suitable methods to attain the goals He recommended. In plain terms He always said 'how' any desired result may be achieved. The wise teachers following Him have ever been ready with skilful means (upāya), and for the perfecting of patience a treatise by one ācarya lays down five ideas to be cultured:

'Patience is said to be developed by fostering the five ideas of

(i) favouring a harmful person
(ii) following only the (Buddha) Dharma
(iii) impermanence
(iv) misery, and
(v) gathering all beings around oneself.

The first means to show patience by being favourably inclined to a harmful person because in former lives such a man may have been our father or mother, brother or sister, or teacher. Since the benefit I have derived from them cannot be assessed, it is not fit that I now retaliate for the harm they do.

The second means that this harmful person does evil because of certain conditions and is bent on doing harm due to these circumstances, and

102. Bodh, Ch. VI, 1-3. 103. Sad Pun, Ch. XX.
* See Sn 30.

therefore it is only proper to be patient because there does not exist some absolute entity such as a Pure Ego (Ātman, soul, etc.), a mental substance, a life principle or a personality that is abusing, beating, reviling or finding fault.

The third is that sentient beings are transitory and subject to death and that the worst harm is to deprive them of their lives. Therefore, since sentient beings by their very nature must die it is not proper to kill them. Hence we have to show patience.

Misery means that all sentient beings are affected by its three types (of birth, old age and death; of transitoriness; and of conditioned existence). Not wanting them to experience the brand that ought to be removed, I must, because of this reflection on misery, have patience with the harm they do.

The fifth idea means to accept all sentient beings as my wife, thinking that I shall work for their benefit in developing an attitude directed towards enlightenment. When we accept them in this way we show patience, because we reflect that it is not proper to retaliate for the smallest harm done.' (104)

It is surely quite plain that one mindful of these thoughts, strengthening them by meditation and by practice in one's life, comes through considerations of compassion and wisdom to a deep patience resulting in perfect toleration. A mind so well developed is compared in a Sutta* to the earth—it has then an equanimity not upset by any untoward circumstances. Nor is it disturbed by the eight Lokadharmas (worldly conditions): not by gain or loss, good or ill fame, praise or blame, happiness or affliction. Uncultivated minds are constantly rejoicing in or perturbed by these factors, impossible for the earth-like mind. The Buddha advises His followers even:

'If therein others denounce and abuse a Truth-finder . . . it must be the same with you.' (105)

How many can exercise patience when their religion and especially their teacher are being harshly criticized? On another occasion, concerning wider issues, the Lord from His great wisdom advised the monks:

'Monks, if outsiders should speak against me, or against the doctrine, or against the Order, you should not on that account either bear malice,

104. Bodhisattvabhūmi, quoted in the Jewel Ornament of Liberation.
* MN i, 414 ff.
105. MN i, 140.

or suffer heart-burning, or feel ill-will. If you on that account should feel angry or hurt, that would stand in the way of your own self-conquest. If, when others speak against us, you should feel angry at that and displeased, would you then be able to judge how far that speech of theirs is well said or ill?' (106)

Both the Buddha and enlightened Masters had more to offer than negative injunctions. The Buddhist tradition usually insists that many adverse conditions are to our advantage, provided that we know how to use them:

'Let the ignorant criticize and abuse the Dharma if they like but they will tire themselves helplessly in trying to scorch that which cannot be destroyed. When I hear of their criticism and insult, this to me is the nectar that helps me to enter into the inconceivable in a finger-snap, for I can turn their offensive words to my own advantage by digesting them and thereby attain the compassionate endurance of the uncreate. Therefore, they are my helpful friends and their abuse and slander are really blessings in disguise.' (107)

Another approach to the relationship of tolerance and Kshānti is found in Mahāyāna works where three sorts of the latter are distinguished. According to various Sanskrit texts, a Bodhisattva's *Forbearance* is such that he:

'. . . forgives them (those who persecute him) everywhere, in secret and in public. He forgives at all times, in the fore-noon, at noon, in the afternoon, by day and by night. He forgives them for what has been done in the past, what is being done at present, and for what will be done in the future. He forgives them in sickness and in health. He forgives them with his body as he never thinks of striking them with his hands or with stick or stone; he forgives them with his speech as he never utters harsh words; and he forgives them with his mind, as he harbours no anger or evil thoughts against them. Even if his body is destroyed and cut up into a hundred pieces with swords and spears, he does not conceive an angry thought against his cruel persecutors.' (108)

'He forgives them without exception, his friends, his enemies, and those who are neither. He forgives even weak and socially inferior persons who may insult or injure him. He forgives wicked and cruel persons, who may have inflicted terrible or unendurable pain and loss on him for a

106. DN i, I, para. 5.

107. Yung Chia's Song of Enlightenment, commentary and paraphrase of Lu K'uan Yu.

108. Sikśāsamuccaya.

very long time. Being reviled, he reviles not again; being beaten, he beats not again; being annoyed, he annoys not again. He does not show anger towards one who is angry. He is like a dumb sheep in quarrels and squabbles. In a word, his forgiveness is unfailing, universal and absolute, even as Mother Earth suffers in silence all that may be done to her.' (109)

The second of these three aspects is that of *Endurance*. This has already been outlined from Pāli texts. Here it means more and is elaborated to include:

—Endurance of hard work, hardship out of love for all who suffer in the world.

—Endurance of inflicted pain as a means to send thoughts of love to all beings, also as a way of realizing that the body is not a 'self'.

—Endurance of loss of all perishable worldly possessions.

—Endurance of exertions and toil for the Buddha, Dharma, Saṅgha, and Teachers, for the study of the Dharma, its dissemination, the hardships of solitary meditation and the cultivation of calm (samatha) and insight (vipasyanā).

—Endurance of the strict rules of the Saṅgha—of celibacy, poverty, mendicancy, ugliness of face and head after shaving, the robe of peculiar hue, and the abstention from all amusements and social amenities.

A Bodhisattva endures all these as they variously affect him.

A full explanation of the third type of patience would take us too far from our subject of tolerance. However, it is defined as 'the patient acceptance of all dharmas (phenomena) as illusory, non-existent, unproduced and undifferentiated'. (110)

This means that Wisdom-beings not only have faith in the doctrines which they have not yet realized for themselves, not rejecting the deep teachings when these are being expounded, but also at the time of realization they are not afraid and so do not refuse to accept the truth concerning dharmas. This is the highest and most difficult form of kshānti.

It is evident that Buddhadharma was persecuted at different times both in spreading through India and outside its homeland. Such underlining of the power to endure blows and abuse would otherwise have been hardly necessary. The attitude of the Dharma-preacher to hostile peoples is shortly given in a famous Sūtra:

109. Bodhisattvabhūmi.
* ibid. (condensed and selected items).
110. Daśabhūmika Sūtra.

'The strength of charity (maitrī, mettā) is my abode; the apparel of forbearance (kshānti) is my robe; and voidness (śunyatā) is my seat: let (the preacher) take his stand on this and preach. When clods, sticks, pikes, or abusive words, or threats, fall the lot of the preacher, let him be patient thinking of me.' (111)

So much for theory. Few examples of the practice of patience have so far been mentioned. Now we must turn to accounts given of some occasions when this Buddhist virtue was practised:

An account of a dharmadūta* bhikshu—Punna—is found in the Pāli Canon.† A slightly different version occurs in the Sanskrit Divyadāna from which the following is taken:

' ". . . Lord, I wish to live and take up my abode in the districts of the Shronāparāntaka people."

"The Shronāparāntaka people, Pūrna, are passionate, they are violent, cruel, reviling, furious and abusive. If they meet you with evil, false, harsh speech and revile and are furious and abuse you, what will you think?"

"If so, Lord, I shall think, 'Really the Shronāparāntakas are good, really they are kind that they meet me with evil, false, harsh speech, and are reviling and furious, and abuse me, and do not strike me with their hands or with clods.' "

"The Shronāparāntakas, Pūrna, are passionate. . . . If they strike you with their hands or with clods, what will you think?"

"If they do so . . . I shall think, 'Really they are good, really they are kind that they strike me with their hands or clods, and not with sticks or knives.' "

"The Shronāparāntakas, Pūrna, are passionate. . . . If they strike you with sticks or knives, what will you think?"

"If they do so . . . I shall think, 'Really they are good, really they are kind that they strike me with sticks or knives, but do not entirely deprive me of life.' "

"The Shronāparāntakas, Pūrna, are passionate, they are violent, cruel, reviling, furious and abusive. If they entirely deprive you of your life, what will you think?"

"If the Shronāparāntakas do entirely deprive me of life, I shall think, 'Really they are good, really they are kind, who free me with such little trouble from this foul corpse.' "

"Good, good, Pūrna, equipped with that patience and goodness you can live in the districts of the Shronāparāntakas and take up your abode

111. Sad Pun.

* See Glossary, meaning 'Dharma-messenger'.

† See MN iii, 267 ff.

there.* Go, Pūrna, being released, release (others); having crossed over take others across; being consoled, console; and having won Nirvāna, cause (others) to win Nirvāna." ' (112)

The story relates, both in the Sanskrit and Pāli, how Pūrna's patience stood him in good stead, how in fact, besides erecting numerous vihāras and turning many minds towards Saddharma, he himself attained the status of Arahat—the worthy stainless saint.

Another example of strong patience in adversity is found in the tale of Kunāla, the son of Emperor Ashoka, and when his eyes were put out by his lecherous stepmother he could say to his father, who was full of wrath with the queen and her terrible deed:

'O King, I am not troubled with pain at all. Despite the terrible wrong (inflicted on me), there is no burning anger in me. My heart is full of love for my mother who put out my eyes.' (113)

Most famous of all, and a wonderfully inspiring story well loved in all Buddhist lands, is the example of the Buddha in a former birth, when, as a hermit living in the jungle, he always practised himself and preached to others the virtue of patience. Thus the Jātaka (Birth-story) is called Kshāntivāda—the story of the Way of Patience. No justice can be done to the nobility of this birth-story by its abbreviation, nor is space available for the whole to be quoted.† Suffice it to say that even when the sage's body was being chopped into pieces he forbearingly preached on patience and uttered sincere wishes for the welfare of the enraged monarch responsible for his dismemberment.

This extraordinary account of patience supreme is referred to in a number of other works. Through the story and references to it, those who were unable to understand the value of patience from philosophic explanations and learned treatises came to appreciate its worth and power. In this way the importance of this quality gradually impregnated the minds and lives of

* From here the Pāli text merely continues: 'You, Punna, now do whatever you think it is the right thing to do.' It thus says nothing of the Lord's inspiring exhortation beginning: 'Go, Pūrna . . .'

112. Divyadāna. 113. ibid.

† It may be read in the PTS editions, both in Pāli and in the English translation (Jātaka No. 313), or in the Sanskrit of Āryasura's Jātakamāla, or in its English translation by Kern in SBB, Vol. I.

ordinary Buddhists so that it now forms a part of the culture recognized as distinctively Buddhist. One reference to the Kshāntivādin, though scarcely of 'popular' appeal, is found in the Diamond Sūtra, a work of great profundity. The quotation below must be the last in this section, while leading on to the subject of the next.

'The Lord: "A Tathāgata's perfection of patience is really no perfection because, Subhūti, even when the King of Kalinga cut my flesh from every limb, at that time I had no notion of a self, or of a being, or of a soul, or of a person, nor had I any notion nor non-notion. And why? If, Subhūti, at that time I had had a notion of self, I would also have had a notion of ill-will at that time. If I had had a notion of being, of a soul, of a person, then I also would have had a notion of ill-will at that time. And why? By my superknowledge I know the past five hundred births, and how I have been the Rishi, 'Preacher of Patience'. Then also, I have had no notion of a self, or a being or a soul, or a person. Therefore then, Subhūti, a Bodhisattva, a great being, should, after he has got rid of all notions, raise his thought to the supreme enlightenment." ' (114)

IV. NO-SELF AND TOLERANCE

'After he has got rid of all notions' (of self, being, soul, person)—a significant phrase indeed! Normally we are bound up with notions, conceptions and views relating to what is 'I' and do not realize the evils which stem from this:

'Virtuous man, since the time without beginning, all living beings have been thinking wrongly of the I and of the one loving the I. As they do not know that they are just the rise and fall of consecutive thoughts, they give rise to love and hate and indulge in the five desires' (arising from the objects of the five senses). (115)

The 'I' to many people is the grossest of the components of a human being—the body, or the feelings which result from internal and external contact. Those given more to intellectual activity, especially to introspective thought, may determine the mind or one of its aspects to be the 'self', and some go so far as to distinguish various varieties of 'selves' in an ascending order from 'self' to 'Self' to 'SELF'. It is not without significance that

114. Vajracchedika Sūtra, 14e.

115. SCE, section 6.

this particular word is used, though the meaning of mineness attached to it, however subtle, is most un-Buddhistic. In any case, the unenlightened person, Buddhist or not, is bound to seize upon something and believe, in spite of possible verbal disclaimers, it to be himself, the inmost essence of his person: by contrast, all other beings are rejected as 'self'—they are 'other', 'not-I'. Inevitably, where an 'I' is identified, also things which do and things which do not 'belong' to that 'I' are discriminated. One hears of my house, my family and, most strange, my body.

Now, with wisdom, it should be recognized that all this 'I-making' (ahaṁkāra) and 'mine-making' (mamaṁkāra) is bound up with craving, with desire, or, to translate the Buddhist term literally, with thirst (trishnā, tanhā). This is all selfishness, all egocentric activity. To the Buddha it was quite clear that this is the greatest source of trouble in the world:

'(The Buddha): "If there were no finding of support by anything, anywhere, of anyone, from anyone, as follows: finding of support in sensual objects, finding of support in views, or in ceremonial observances, or in theories of the self, if there were no finding of support in any respect, with the cessation of finding of support, would there be the process of life?" (=saṁsāra)

(Ānanda): "No, Bhante."

(The Buddha): ". . . this is the root, source, origin, foundation of finding support, namely craving." (The Lord speaks similarly of feeling as the foundation of craving, relating feeling to the five physical organs of sense and to the mind, and then continues):

"Thus, Ānanda, feeling determines craving, craving determines pursuit, pursuit determines acquisition, acquisition determines judgement and discrimination, judgement and discrimination determine the urge of attachment, the urge of attachment determines attachment, attachment determines the taking-up of possession, the taking-up of possession determines selfishness, selfishness determines protection, and as a consequence of protection, sticks, swords, disputes, strife, lies and a variety of evils are produced." ' (116)

Here is the way all wars and quarrels, including intolerance, are produced. The Sutta from which this is taken shows this process step by step with the great precision of a Buddha's all-penetrating wisdom. Approaching self-ideas and selfishness from the viewpoint of a discriminated duality is the theme of another quotation:

116. DN, Sutta XV.

'When there is a self, one knows something other from it,
From I and Thou arises belief (in independent existence)
and antagonism (to everything that threatens this belief);
From the union (of these two)
All evil comes about.' (117)

Discrimination of independently existing beings and the hatred arising from opposition to egocentric urges have clear bearing upon our subject and are paralleled in the last Pāli passage quoted. What then is to be done about this situation? In Pāli the Lord gives very clear directions:

'Whatever, Rāhula, is material shape (or feeling, perception, habitual tendencies and consciousness), past, future, present, subjective or objective, gross or subtle, low or excellent, distant or near, all material shape (feeling etc.) should be seen as it really is by means of perfect intuitive wisdom thus: "This is not mine, I am not this, this is not myself."' (118)

One is not to identify any 'thing' as self or belonging to self. When this attitude has thoroughly permeated one's whole existence so that selfish desires are first calmed and then destroyed by wisdom; then, as the Lord says to Ānanda, where there is no protection of any sort, there are no sticks, swords, disputes, strife and a variety of evils . . . where there is no selfishness, there is no protection—and so on, reversing the whole process to the absence of support-finding for craving itself—in particular, as far as we are concerned, no support sought in views (Mithyā-drishti) or in theories of self (Ātma-drishti). Thus again we find the roots of Buddhist tolerance in this perfect unselfishness.

No selfishness means selflessness. Selflessness is usually recognized as a noble quality but the Enlightened One taught that it is ultimately true. No-self should be identified because no-self can be found either in the constituent heaps of our being, the skandhas, which are processes ever-changing, or somehow outside these. As the famous teacher Nāgarjuna says:

'The I and the Mine exist
" This is contrary to reality.' (119)

117. Pramānavarttika.
118. MN i, 421.
119. Ratnāvalī.

Here is the fundamental difference between Buddhadharma and all other religious teachings. All schools of Buddhism staunchly uphold the doctrine of the non-existence of a permanent, unchanging entity known as a self, soul, ātman, etc. Here for universalism is the difficulty with this Dharma, for it refuses to be easily digested into the insipid messy statement—'all Dharmas teach the same thing'. Are Buddhists justified in proclaiming this fact, or is this really only I and Mine-making on a grand scale, just a strengthening of Buddhists' own pride? Buddhist doctrines have never been formulated for any other reason than the attainment of Enlightenment and the many ways of Buddhism lead just to this. Enlightenment requires complete abandonment of all selves and theories concerning them (and, of course, finally of the theory of No-self). But meanwhile, basic to all these ways is the uprooting of all 'self' and establishing the truth of selflessness (anātman) and of voidness (śunyatā).

It follows that where there is no grasping at a self and no selfish acquisitiveness and where greed, hate and delusion have been transmuted to compassion and wisdom, how could there be a tendency to persecute or any form of religious intolerance? It is the wisdom of no-self and the compassion for others in both of which Buddhists train themselves that exclude all possibility of persecution. This was quickly perceived even by early Western writers on Buddhism. Here is one of them, a Bhikshu, who says:

'Let not the student imagine we are concerned here merely with a dogma, with a view of life important but in men's imagination or belief. In the Anattā Doctrine, or, as it might be rendered, the Teaching of Selflessness, we have the statement of a fact so profound, so true, that every action of the man who holds it must needs be modified from what he otherwise would have done. On it depends the whole of Buddhist Teaching (its threefold practice of Śīla, Samādhi, Prajñā);* to it once more is due that perfect Buddhist tolerance and freedom from all persecuting or denouncing spirit.' (120)

A Sūtra emphasizing the union of wisdom and compassion and its practical results gives this enlightened instruction:

'A lore of great magical power (mahā-vidyā), is this perfection of wisdom, a lore of utmost power, a lore of unequalled power. The son and

* Amended from the author's 'Śīla, Dāna and Samādhi', which here appears to be a mistake.

120. *The Religion of Burma*, p. 71.

daughter of good family, who are trained in this lore, do not set their hearts on disturbing their own peace, nor that of others. For one who is trained therein perceives nowhere a self, nor a living soul, nor a creature, nor a person, nor a personality, nor a man, nor one who acts, nor one who feels, nor one who generates, nor one who sees. Thus unperceiving, he does no harm to himself or to others.' (121)

This balance of wisdom and compassion as the ultimate basis of Buddhist tolerance is emphasized by an Ācarya writing recently. He has clearly answered the question he raises, and indeed in the following long extract summarizes excellently well the topic of this section:

'Why was it that Buddhists, who believed in the truth of their religion as ardently and as uncompromisingly as any Christian bigot or Muslim fanatic, did not imitate them in the employment of political power to enforce religious conformity?

The answer to this question lies in one of the most beautiful words to be found among all the riches of Buddhist vocabulary: Karūna—Compassion. We have already pointed out that violence springs always from hatred, and that persecution is simply the kind of violent behaviour which results from that form of hatred we call intolerance, which is a feeling determined not only not to bear, but even to destroy, the object of its aversion. The root of hatred, as of desire, is ignorance. This ignorance is not merely intellectual, but spiritual, and consists in the erroneous conception of "things" and "persons" as mysteriously ensouling an unchanging principle of individuality by which they are irreducibly differentiated from all other "things" and "persons" in the universe. The realization that concepts such as "things" and "persons" are in reality empty of such a principle, and exist instead in a state of "unimpeded mutual solution", destroys not only egoism but also the false views and wrong emotions which are begotten by egoism. Ignorance is transformed into wisdom, and hatred, the emotional complement of ignorance, into compassion, the affective counterpart of wisdom. False views such as those upheld by Christianity, Islam and other religions can issue in violence, since egoism has not been destroyed, and until egoism has been destroyed ignorance and hatred will continue to spring up as luxuriantly, and to spread as rapidly, as weeds do when the root has not been torn out from the ground and burned. Buddhism, since it annihilates the erroneous conception of unchanging separate selfhood, stifles as it were ignorance, lust and hatred in the womb, and permanently precludes any possibility of violence being used even for the advancement of its own tenets. . . .

Instead, it presents us century after century with the magnificent

121. Śatasahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra xviii, 130.

spectacle of compassionate activity, with an ever-changing panorama of missionary enterprise whereon, as the scene shifts from country to country and as races, cultures, religions and languages succeed each other with bewildering rapidity, there gleams unchangeably the steadfast light of love. That which shines forth to Western eyes, or to Eastern eyes wearing Western spectacles, as the much lauded modern virtue of tolerance, is in truth what Buddhists call *upāya*, or skilful means, the radiant offspring of the embraces of prajñā (wisdom) and karunā (compassion). The strength which fills the "messenger of the Dharma" is not the restless and tumultuous energy of hate, but the placid and serene power of love. The light which guides him on his way is not the flickering marsh-fire of dogmatic religion, which entices to betray, but the clear and steadfast radiance of Perfect Wisdom. Compassion saves him from the extreme of fanaticism, intolerance and persecution; wisdom delivers him from the opposite extreme of "universalism" and indifference. Without compassion, he would sin, like Christians and Muslims, against man; without wisdom, he would sin with humanists and secularists, against Truth. Possessing both, he follows in the footsteps of the Supremely Wise and Boundlessly Compassionate One, treads the Middle Path and, practising the Perfection of Skilful Means, continues to pose to the modern world the problem of how a "religion" which does not even possess a word whereby to translate "tolerance" should yet be more "tolerant" than many which do.' (122)

122. 'The Nature of Buddhist Tolerance'—Ven. Sangharakshita Sthavira, *Maha Bodhi Journal*, March 2497/1954.

2

BUDDHIST TOLERANCE: EVIDENCE AND CRITICISMS

I. EVIDENCE OF TOLERANCE

Four teachings of Buddhadharma and their bearing on tolerance have been set forth. Mostly their exposition and that of related matters has been theoretical. It is now necessary to investigate whether or not Buddhist practice has been according to its theory. In this section the positive evidence of widespread tolerance will be outlined and in the next the occasional lapses into atypical intolerance have been listed. Thus, this section is short, as only outstanding instances of the tolerant spirit are noted, while it must be borne in mind that at most times, in most places, the predominant, indeed usual, note sounded by the Drum of the Dharma was one of harmony both within the Buddha's Way and with those outside it. If the following section is longer this is because it has been felt worth while to expose the few putrescent sores of intolerance scattered upon the body of Buddhist practice unto the sun of investigation, thereby aiding, it is hoped, recovery from this disease. First, however, the evidence for the subject must be reviewed.

The character of the founder teacher of a religion is imprinted on his teachings and marked more or less strongly upon the systems springing from them.* As we are interested in toleration, what evidence of this do we find in the days of the Buddha? Does He encourage others to tolerance?

* See Appendix II.

One day the Lord was approached by an ardent Jaina layman whose name was Upāli. He had set out from the Jīna Mahāvīra's company with the intention of refuting the Buddha, though warned not to try this by a Jaina muni (ascetic). Coming to the Exalted One, he saluted Him and sat down upon a lower seat. The discussion proceeded courteously even though the layman disagreed, so the Lord put several examples to him showing the confusion in his argument. The layman then said that he was quite convinced—and that even the first example given gave him confidence in the teaching of the Buddha. Upāli then took the Triple Refuge* and asked to be accepted as a lay-follower. The Great Sage said:

'Now, householder, make a proper investigation. Proper investigation is right in the case of well-known men like yourself.' (123)

This greatly pleased Upāli, who said that other sects would parade a banner all round Nālanda if he joined them: by contrast, the Buddha says, 'Investigate, think what you are doing, are you doing the right thing?' The Lord then asked Upāli to continue to give alms to his former teachers, the Jaina ascetics—and this pleased Upāli even more. A narrow mind would have ruled that now you are *my* disciple, you must give alms only to *me*.† But the Enlightened One by no means thought in this way, and this occasion and that when General Sīha‡ became a devoted Buddhist, are but two illustrations of the broad-minded compassion resulting from Enlightenment.

Moving on in time to the great Aśoka's reign, this pen need not picture the magnificence of his imperial court. His magnificence is better described in what many scholars believe to be his own words. One of the mightiest monarchs of India, he truly aspired to rule his empire according to the Buddha's teachings. A Buddhist himself, he sought to rule justly as a Chakravartin, the ideal ruler described in Buddhist texts. This ideal included, of course, tolerance . . .

'King Priyadarshi, the Beloved of the gods, shows reverence to people of all (religious) sects, whether (wandering) ascetics or house-holders,

* Refuge in the Three Precious Gems: The *Buddha*, His *Dharma*, and His Enlightened followers, the *Saṅgha*. See also Glossary.

123. MN i, 372.

† See Additional References 4.

‡ Vin Pit i, 233–8.

with gifts and various kinds of reverence. But (the King) the Beloved of the gods, does not consider so much for gifts and reverence as that—what is it?—there should be a growth in the essence of all sects. But this growth of the essence has many aspects. But this is the root of that (growth)—namely, restraint of speech. What is that? That there should not be reverence (by overrating) to one's own sect and disparagement (by underrating) of others' sects when no topic or occasion arises, or they should be small (indeed) when this or that occasion arises. As all the other sects deserve reverence for this or that reason (or, in different manners). By doing thus one promotes one's own sect and at the same time does good to other sects. That (person) again by acting thus injures very greatly his own sect. So contact, however, is a good thing. How so? So that (people belonging to different sects) may hear and willingly hear the Law (of piety as adopted) by another. For thus, the desire of the Beloved of the gods is—what is it?—that men belonging to all sects may become versed in many lores and do only virtuous deeds. Whoever are faithful to particular systems should tell the others that the Beloved of the gods does not so much care for gifts and (forms of) reverence—how so?—as there should be a growth of the essence in all sects and that to a large extent also. . . . And this is the fruit of such an arrangement—namely, the growth of one's own sect and the illumination of the Law of piety.' (124)

This translation, a rather literal one, retains some of the peculiarity of expression which may have been characteristic of this great man. The liberal thoughts he expresses have remained outstanding features of the Buddhadharma.* Restraint of harshly critical speech is enjoined upon sincere followers of the Lord. They truly wish to see all religions co-existing peaceably and would be delighted if Christianity and Islam abandoned their militant ways. They feel, with the good emperor, that religions truly spread and flourish if they rely upon their merits, if, in other words, they are propagated peacefully without any reliance upon dogmatic and exclusive assertions, let alone violence. As to praising one's own sect, a Buddhist feels bound, out of compassion for the blind world, to blazon abroad the splendours of his Dharma. But he does not do so at the expense of other religions, usually preferring the merits of the Dharma of Enlightenment to make their own appeal. He would also agree with Dharmaśoka that other faiths have their good points: a Buddhist can admire many of the sayings of the great sages of Hinduism, likewise some of Jesus's; also the strictness of Jainadharma; the

124. Rock Edict XII of the Emperor Aśoka.

* See Additional References 16–20, on Tolerance in Thailand.

triple purity of thoughts, speech and action in Zoroastrianism; the charity incumbent upon Muslims; the fine ethical teachings of Confucius and the near approach of profound Taoist thought to some aspects of his Dharma. In sympathizing thus, he acts at one with his Teaching in which education is encouraged and knowledge of other religions thought fruitful. This pious and tolerant emperor, by the practical application of Buddhadharma within his state, has truly set a high standard for Buddhists of all ages to follow.

Later rulers of large areas of India have also aspired to rule as Chakravartins—both Kaniśka and Harśavardhana—while Buddhist themselves, had great tolerance for other faiths—Jaina and many branches of Hindudharma which flourished in their realms. The same must be said of many of the kings of the Pāla Dynasty reigning in Eastern India, who were much influenced by Buddhist ideals. Some of the medieval Kings of Ceylon gave support impartially to the various Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna schools which existed in the island at that time. One must not forget that the 'tolerance' of kings is often dictated by political motives, an expedient to satisfy conquered peoples and rival faiths. In the case of Dharmaśoka, tolerance was certainly not merely the result of imperial considerations, it was surely a genuine desire to promote most effectively the reign of goodwill of Dharma over adharma.

'Contemporary with Harsha, many Buddhist pilgrims came to India to visit the Holy Places. Some came from China and a few have left records of their journeys. One of the best known is Hsuan Tsang who not only journeyed in India but also studied at the Buddhist University of Nālanda, rightly called Mahāvihāra (Great Monastery). While he generally observed that the adherents of different schools of Buddhist thought had their own vihāras, he also noted, as Dutt records:

"But some great monasteries of his time had developed into universities like the Mahāvihāra at Nālanda and they were common resorts of learners and teachers of different schools and sects." ' (125)

Buddhists of many differing persuasions were thus able to learn together peacefully and by contact and discussions to appreciate each other's point of view.

With the establishment of the Dharma in Chīna, this process went one stage further. At first, schools sprang up each based on one or more texts. But such is the all-pervading spirit of

125. *Buddhism and Five Centuries After*, p. 136.

toleration in Buddhism that very soon syncretic movements arose. These were aided by such texts as:

'Those schools will be the repositories of twelve diversified fruits (aṅgas) of my scriptures without priority or inferiority—just as the taste of sea-water is everywhere the same—or as the twelve sons of one man, all honest and true, so will be the exposition of my doctrine advocated by these schools.' (126)

The Confucian spirit also aided a liberal outlook, for it is reported of the fine teacher:

'Confucius denounced (or tried completely to avoid) four things: arbitrariness of opinion, dogmatism, narrow-mindedness and egotism.' (127)*

The process of amalgamation between Chinese Buddhist schools has continued up to the present when the (apparently contradictory) Ch'an and Ch'ing-tu† practices are both found in the same monastic establishment.

Thailand, too, is an interesting example of harmony‡ between traditions which many suppose to be in opposition. While the Theravāda school is strong and widespread, Chinese and Vietnam Mahāyāna traditions also have monasteries and lay-followers. This is the only Theravāda country where the Mahāyāna is also represented: may there be a fruitful cross-fertilization!

As regards Tibet, we may understand something of the Buddhist spirit prevailing there (until recently) by an extract from the writings of a learned Lama:

'The Tibetan,' who is highly individualistic, therefore recognizes and respects innumerable forms of religious practice and devotion: and, in fact, there are many different schools of Buddhism in Tibet—as different from each other as the various Christian churches and sects—but there is no enmity or sense of competition between them. They live peacefully side by side and recognize each other's validity. By accepting a teacher from one school one does not preclude those of other schools. Indeed,

126. *Indian Antiquities* ix, p. 300—1880, trans. Beal.

127. *The Wisdom of Confucius*.

* But see Arthur Waley's account of the Great Persecution in China (C.E. 845) on pages 154–5 of *The Real Tripitaka*.

† Zen and Shinshu in Japanese.

‡ See Additional Reference 2.

very often the teachings or methods of different schools complement and help each other in the most effective way.

The individualistic attitude in religious matters is expressed in a well-known Tibetan proverb:

"*Lung-pa re-re ka-lug re,*
Lama re-re cho-lug re."
"*Every district has its own dialect,*
Every Lama his own doctrine."

According to this principle, people are free to accept or reject beliefs or practices according to their conviction and to express their opinions freely and fearlessly. Religious discussions are always welcomed, and people who can give convincing expression to their ideas are highly respected. . . .

Tibetan teachers always stress the fact that ultimate truth cannot be expressed in words, but only realized within ourselves. It is therefore not important what we believe, but what we experience and practise, and how it affects us and our surroundings. Whatever leads to a state of greater peace and harmony leads us on the right path.' (128)

This is the authentic voice of a living tradition of Buddhism proclaiming in an intolerant world the practical blessings of perfect tolerance.

What of Buddhism in the West? While Buddhadharma is becoming more widely known in the United States, it is difficult to assess the degree of tolerance among American Buddhists. This is because the Dharma there has been propagated mostly from Japan by Japanese and, until recently, largely for Japanese. Other schools have hardly got a foothold as yet.

In Germany, after disturbances due to sectarian tendencies (a Christian legacy perhaps), greater amity between different groups has now been attained organizationally with the formation of a German Buddhist Union, and doctrinally through a deeper and more complete understanding of the whole Buddhist tradition.

Of all groups of Western Buddhists known to the writer, it seems that the old-established Buddhist Society of London, ably led by Christmas Humphreys, Q.C., has most preached and practised tolerance. Mr. Humphreys has many times declared that he believes the various Buddhist traditions are complementary. On such a firm basis, this Society encourages both

128. 'A Tibetan Buddhist's Attitude towards Christianity', by Lama Anagarika Govinda, *Maha Bodhi Journal*, May 2506/1962.

Theravāda and Mahāyāna schools. Some find that one tradition alone supplies all their requirements but most English lay-Buddhists wish to compare, analyse and finally try to synthesize for themselves a practical Way out of material from all schools.

This latter attitude, which must, of course, be firmly based upon a combination of scholarship and insight, is continued in the Saṅgha established in the West. Though their ordination has been up till now from the Theravāda lineage they do not consider themselves necessarily bound to Theravāda doctrine. They are, in fact, just *Buddhist* monks, who are faced with the enormous and complicated task of welding together Buddhism's diverse manifestations into an integrated Way compatible with Western ways of life and thought. In India, this uniting tendency is known as the Triyāna and shares its name with the vihāra where it started and gains its inspiration from the Ācarya who founded it.

All these young shoots of tolerant understanding of the *Whole* Dharma, by being watered with sympathy and nourished by wisdom, will come in the future to bear fresh fruits of the Buddhadharma—a food fit for a world starved of compassion, a medicine meet for this unwise world.

II. SOME POSSIBLE CRITICISMS OF THE BUDDHIST POSITION

A. Atypical Behaviour among Buddhists

So much has been said in praise of the tolerance of both Dharma and its exponents that it must arouse questions in some minds. Have, in fact, Buddhists always been paragons of toleration? After all, most Buddhists were just ordinary men and women—few of them attained to states of transcendental sainthood—did all these followers live up to the high standard set by their Master? Such are the questions which one seems to hear. They are legitimate questions and only a biassed account of this subject could ignore them. Here, then, are the principal lapses, firstly those committed by the upholders of the Theravāda school, then Mahāyāna errors together with some other considerations appropriate here.

The past of Theravāda is much bound up with the history of Ceylon and we are fortunate in having the chronicles of that island kingdom translated into English. They are written very much from a Theravāda Buddhist viewpoint and are strongly opposed to other Buddhist traditions. When they were written,

schools other than Theravāda also flourished in Ceylon. These other traditions, both Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna, had monasteries of their own. The Theravādins, being first established in Ceylon, objected to schools introduced later, whose doctrines differed somewhat from those accepted as the true teachings by the Theras. One monastery in particular was the home of many teachings 'unorthodox' to the Theravādins—this was Abhāyagiri Vihāra. After a prolonged period of rivalry between the 'established church' and the Abhāyagiri monks (who persisted in importing doctrines, not so much novel in themselves, but old ones dressed in new ways) tension mounted between them until, at the instigation of the Theravāda monks, the king seized Abhāyagiri Vihāra. And worse, he burnt the Abhāyagiri books.* In the present day these books (Mahāyāna Sūtras and Shāstras), when described by Theravādin authors, are often denied any Buddhist authority and even called 'heretical'—an ugly word. This is the case of a bad deed made worse by an unfortunate word.

This attitude is, unfortunately, common among the more rigid followers of Theravāda. The more intolerant Bhikkhus and laymen condemn out of hand all Buddhism which they do not recognize as conforming to their own pattern, while their Dharma is 'pristine Dhamma', 'pure Buddhism', etc. What is this 'pristine Buddhism'? It consists of the special Theravāda interpretation of the Pāli Canon offered by the Commentaries (Atthakathā) of Buddhaghośa and his near contemporaries, the much later sub-commentaries (Tīkā) upon them, together with the specifically Theravāda Abhidhamma. Other interpretations of the Canon (Nikāya-Āgama), Abhidharmas of other schools and of course all Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna works, are by these bigots rejected as 'unauthentic', 'unorthodox', 'not Buddha-word', etc. One must be fair and add that an increasingly wide appreciation is given to these latter works as they become better known in Theravāda lands. One of these is the Lotus of the True Law, containing much very early material of the Mahāyāna, and providing us with evidence from its numerous defensive statements of Hīnayāna antipathy to its teachings. The Bodhisattva's attitude to this is shown towards the end of this quotation. The Hīnayānists are quoted as saying such words as these:†

* See Nikāya Saṁgraha: but note, the king did not burn Abhāyagiri monks!

† See Additional References 3.

'"*All these bhikshu-fellows* (*bhikshus following the Mahāyāna*),
Because of love of gain,
Preach an heretical doctrine;
Themselves have composed this Sūtra
To delude the people of the world;
For the sake of acquiring fame,
They specialize on this Sūtra."
Always in assemblies,
In order that they (*Hīna*) *may ruin us* (*Mahā*),
To kings and to their ministers,
To Brahmins and to citizens,
To the other groups of Bhikshus,
Of us they will speak slanderously,
Saying: "These are men of false views,
Who proclaim heretical doctrines."
But, from reverence for Buddha,
We will endure those evils.
Though contemptuously addressed as—
"All you Buddhas!"
Even such scorn and arrogance
We will patiently endure.
In the corrupt kalpa's evil age,
Abounding in fear and dread,
Devils will take possession of them
To curse, abuse and insult us.
But we, reverently believing Buddha,
Will wear the armour of long-suffering;
For the sake of preaching this Sūtra
Every hard thing we will endure.
We will not love body or life,
But care onby for the Supreme Way.' (129)

It is clear from this that intolerance had early characterized some of the Hīnayāna followers and their outlook on the scriptures of other Buddhist traditions. But let us return from the past to the present and consider a few other charges against the Theravāda.

One of these concerns treatment given non-Theravāda Buddhist monks. A monk wearing the yellow-orange-brown robes usual in Theravāda countries is recognized as a 'real' bhikkhu. If he wears the maroon robes of Tibet and Mongolia,

129. Sad Pun, Ch. XIII.

the iron-grey of China, or the different patterns peculiar to Japan, then he is *not* a bhikshu.* This discrimination results in respect being given to the 'real' Bhikkhus, whereas monks of Tibet, Mongolia, China, Korea and Viet-nam, whose ordination is basically similar and certainly just as valid, are accorded the status of laymen. One of the incidents which marred the last Great Recital of the Pāli Canon in Burma (Chattha Sangāyana), was that Bhikshus not of Theravāda lineage were not recognized as monks and were given low seats amongst the lay-people. This shows an unjustifiably narrow outlook and violates the canons of Buddhist good manners and tolerance.

Reform movements and new converts are famed for their zeal to the cause (whatever it is), also for their antipathy to existing systems and old faiths. In Nepal, the tradition of Buddhism has long been the Vajrayāna steadily declining since unaided by a native Bhikshu-saṅgha. Of recent years, some young Nepalis decided to become Bhikkhus in Ceylon—and so re-introduce the Saṅgha. So far, so good. Unfortunately the Nepali Bhikkhus returned to their homeland with some strong ideas as to what was and was not Dharma. Theravāda Abhidhamma, Pāli Commentaries and Ceylon tradition are Dharma; Tantras, their Commentaries and the traditions of Nepal are certainly not Buddhadharma—so they said. Thus ignoring the good to be found in Vajrayāna (essentially a meditative way) they, by their intolerance, diminished people's confidence in both themselves and their teachings. This is a tragedy, since much good might have come from a fusion of ideas from the two traditions. One hears now that there is some sort of *rapprochement*—may it prove fruitful!

It would be unfair to pretend that intolerance is all on the side of the Theravāda, and now instances of it concerning the Mahāyāna should be cited. The first goes to the root of the names given to the principal divisions of Buddhism—Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna. 'Mahā' is great, 'hīna' is small or lesser, so it is not difficult to guess that those who styled themselves 'Mahāyāna' called the others 'Hīnayāna', for it is rare for a party to debase itself! 'Hīna' was used to describe those schools which advocated the attainment of Arhatship, a lesser attainment than the Sambodhi (Full Enlightenment) of a Buddha, as the Mahāyāna pointed out. Unhappily, the term 'hīna', at first quite legitimately, even politely, used, degenerated in meaning in the course

* This may be true of some Japanese monks, for a Saṅgha in the sense in which it exists in all other Buddhist countries is almost absent in Japan.

of time. It passed through several stages of meaning, first to 'inferior' then to 'selfish', and so finally to 'despicable'.* This debasing of a doctrinally correct term to something near the level of abuse has had most serious repercussions. The only existing school to which the label Hīnayāna (in its original meaning) could be applied is the Theravāda. Due to the derogatory way in which 'hīna' can be understood, those following the doctrines of this school very naturally prefer to be known as Theravādins. Due also to the animosity which 'hīna' has aroused, they look upon the Mahāyānists not only as innovators but sometimes as not even Buddhists. Action and reaction . . .

A part of this quarrel may be traced, sad to say, to some of the references to Hīnayānists in Mahāyāna texts. Some are not very polite and are even belittling though there do not exist any references encouraging active hostility or to persecution of the lesser vehicle. On the other hand, there are passages (see below) which obviously encourage harmony between the two great vehicles.† At least one famous Mahāyāna scripture makes a serious attempt to reconcile them, that is, the Saddharma Pundarika Sūtra. In this Sūtra it is pointed out by the Lord, after he has told the beautiful parable of the Burning House, that all Yānas are really only skilful means for bringing all beings ultimately to the Supreme Enlightenment of Buddhahood:

'There is only one single vehicle. A second does not exist, and there is no third anywhere in the world. It is only through a device of the Supreme Persons (Tathāgatas) that a multiplicity of vehicles has been exhibited.' (130)

However, the old tradition of sneering at and belittling the Hīnayāna is continued in the present day by certain Japanese scholars who are evidently thoroughly soaked in this poison and unable to resist a malicious poke at the Smaller Way. As some of these Mahāyāna scholars may have taken the Bodhisattva's Vow, they should be aware that they are contradicting by this unsympathetic attitude what is said in one of their own texts:

'He (a Bodhisattva) assimilates them (the Disciples of Hīnayāna) without opposing them. He trains with the intention that he should demonstrate and reveal also the virtues of the disciples.' (131)‡

* See Additional References 24.
130. Sad Pun, Ch. II.
‡ See Additional References 22.
† See Additional References 23.
131. Asta 433.

The Bodhisattva also reflects in this way:

' "I, whose duty it is to drive away, to pacify and appease the quarrels, disputes and conflicts of all beings, yet I myself engage in disputes! It is indeed a loss to me, and not a gain, that I should answer back as I am spoken to. When I should be to all beings a bridge across the sea of birth-and-death, I nevertheless say to another (the same to you), or return a harsh or rough answer. This is not the way in which I should speak. In fights, quarrels and disputes I should behave like a senseless idiot or like a dumb sheep. When I hear someone using offensive, abusive, insulting words towards me, my heart should not cherish malice for others. It is not meet and proper for me to perceive the faults of others, or to think that what is being said about the faults of others is worth listening to. For I, since I am earnestly intent (on full enlightenment), should not do harm to others. When I should make all beings happy by giving them everything that brings happiness, when I should lead them to Nirvāna after having won full enlightenment—yet nevertheless I bear ill-will! I should not bear ill-will even against those who have offended against me, and I must avoid getting into a rage, and I must make a firm effort in that direction. Even when my life is in danger I must not get into a rage, and no frown should appear on my face" . . . This is the attitude which a Bodhisattva should adopt also towards persons who belong to the vehicle of the Disciples. Never to get angry with any being, that is the attitude of mind one should adopt towards all beings.' (132)

Respecting these different Yānas, we should come to realize that each has its strong and weak points: the Hīnayāna inclines too much towards reliance upon the letter—and so to rigidity; while the Mahāyāna is quite opposite and tends to lose itself in its readiness (upāya) to compromise with other religions; and the Vajrayāna by itself easily degenerates into 'mumbo-jumbo', or, to use the deprecating Indian term, into 'mantra-tantra'. The followers of the various Yānas, far from criticizing each other, should realize that each of the traditions has also its good points and these, added together, form a unified tradition of Buddha-dharma. Thus there is the discipline, renunciation and practice of Śīla so strongly insisted upon in the Vinaya and Sutta Pitakas of the Pāli Canon; the Mahāyāna contributes the thorough doctrine of Perfections upon which is based the noble Bodhisattva ideal together with much profound psychological philosophy; while the Vajrayāna shows the Way to the attainment of the highest perfection—Buddhahood in this very life. Thus all Yānas are complementary and the sooner this is well recognized, the better

132. Asta, 421–2.

it will be for the Dharma as a whole. Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna may well be understood not as terms to be bandied about nor as the names of sects, but truly as attitudes of mind. In this way the Ch'an school understands them and this is fully consonant with Buddhist practice. A Hīnayāna follower, according to the Ch'an tradition, is one with a closed and narrow mind, bookishly intent upon the study of Buddhist 'doctrines'—but less concerned with their practice. He approaches the rigid standpoints of followers of the dogmatic religions. A Mahāyānist, in this sense, aware of all-pervading relativity, takes his stand nowhere, not grasping doctrines and so not dogmatically forced to defend them; he has no views and his ways accord with the passages already quoted from the Sutta Nipāta—such a one is a paradigm of tolerance.

Understood in this way, these terms lose all their sting, and there is only oneself to blame if one qualifies for the term 'Hīnayānist'. Buddhists should realize that it is quite time that they, however labelling themselves, should bury all these old and stinking bones of abuse.

Another aspect of conflict among Buddhist schools may be mentioned for the sake of completeness, but is not really intolerance. Arising from historical and political considerations, sectarianism among Buddhists became strongest in Japan. This is now dissolving under the economic pressures of today combined with the rivalry of Christianity. In the past, however, some of the Buddhist temples aspired to great political power—Shingon, Tendai and Shinshu movements have all been embroiled in worldly power-seeking. History records that monasteries of these different schools had armies of ruffian warrior-monks as well as mercenaries.

Later, when the power of these castle-monasteries had been broken, the government ordered the forcible reclamation of the early Japanese Christians (converted by the Jesuits) to the Buddhist faith. A number died rather than give up their new religion and all the Catholic priests were expelled.

In both the above cases intolerance is not the main factor. Inter-sectarian fighting was for political power, not for doctrinal reasons. It was politics again which led the government to persecute the Christians, for it learnt of the havoc wrought by the Jesuits in other Asian countries where they had gained a foothold, and, suspecting that they converted merely to overthrow the government and seize power, decided to put a stop to their activities. They learnt also that Christians are very quarrelsome

and may have had the impression, easily come by, that the gentle followers of Jesus are never so happy as when fighting each other.

A Buddhist sect originating in Japan, which by the words of its founder as well as its subsequent militancy may sometimes fall into intolerance, is Nichirenism. As Dr. Conze says:

> 'Nichiren always spoke with the vehemence of a Hebrew prophet and demanded the suppression of all sects except his own. For, "the Nembutsu is hell; the Zen are devils; Shingon is national ruin; and the Risshu are traitors to the country" (Nichiren). On this occasion Buddhism had evolved its very antithesis out of itself.' (133)

Nichirenists have not been very popular with other Japanese Buddhists on this count. It is ironical that this movement, founded as a 'universal church', has now more sects and splinter-groups than many less ambitious schools.

Again, politics rather than persecution were responsible for the exiling of the Bon-po priests from central Tibet to its frontiers. These leaders of the old shamanist religion indigenous to Tibet intrigued against kings influenced by Buddhism and determined to introduce the Buddhist culture to their barbarous countrymen. Later, as in Japan, some Buddhist monasteries became very powerful and after the collapse of the monarchy wielded their power politically. Thus, there were clashes between Sakya-pa and Gelug-pa, and when the latter came to power they tried to repress the ancient school of Tibetan Buddhism—the Nying-ma-pa.

Political power is like dung—and the hand stinks that picks it up. Any religious body enamoured of it soon has the stench of worldliness.

Such *doctrinal* quarrels as have existed in the Buddhist world have been remarkably few in 2500 years of history, as Bhadanta Sangharakshita points out in his article 'Buddhism in the Modern World, Cultural and Political Implications':

> 'Hardly less striking (than the close relationship between Buddhism, culture, civilization and education), is the almost invariable association of Buddhism with peace. The exceptions were not only extremely rare but of merely local importance. King Aniruddha of Burma made war upon the neighbouring kingdom of Thaton in order to seize a copy of the Tripitaka which the king of Thaton refused to have copied. This was, of course, not the most Buddhistic way of obtaining the precious documents. . . .
>
> 133. ASHB, p. 99.

Even the most industrious research has been unable to dig out from the two thousand five hundred years of Buddhist history, during which time it spread over more than a quarter of the land surface of the globe, as many as ten incidents of this kind. Not a single page of Buddhist history has ever been lurid with the light of inquisitorial fires, or darkened with the smoke of heretic or heathen cities ablaze, or red with the blood of the guiltless victims of religious hatred. Like the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, Buddhism wields only one sword, the Sword of Wisdom, and recognizes only one enemy—Ignorance. This is the testimony of history, and is not to be gainsaid.'

Indeed, what disputes there have been have come about largely through a lack of the deep understanding of the teaching given by the Lord in the following Sūtra:

'Hear from me, son of Sāri, how this Dharma has been fully known by the best of men, and how the enlightened leaders teach it through many hundreds of skilful means. Of innumerable living beings, so varied in their inclinations, I know the dispositions and conduct, for I have a knowledge of the various deeds they have done in the past, and of the merit they then acquired. With manifold explanations and reasonings I cause these beings to reach a greater spirituality; with hundreds of arguments and illustrations I gratify all beings, some in this way, some in that.' (134)

It is the fault of some Buddhists that they do not realize that the Lord taught *methods*, not inflexible doctrines: realizing this, even the little trouble found in the history of Buddhism, as well as minor frictions in the present day between different schools, all this would cease. All the numerous schools represent different skilful means, as the Lord says:

'Have I not explained to you before, Śāriputra, that the Tathāgata demonstrates Dharma in such a way that he first notes the capacities and intentions of beings, who differ so greatly in their dispositions and inclinations. Then he employs, by way of his skill in means, various methods for demonstrating his meaning, and uses many arguments and reasons, definitions and explanations. But it is precisely the supreme enlightenment that all his demonstrations of Dharma are concerned with. . . .' (135)*

134. Sad Pun, Ch. II. 135. ibid., Ch. III.
* See also Additional References 12.

B. Use of Unsuitable Words of and by Buddhists

There are certain words to be avoided by Buddhists writing in English if they do not want misunderstandings to arise. English words with religious meanings have often a Christian flavour inappropriate to Buddhadharma. All such words as 'church, bishop, service, prayer and sin', when used by Buddhists about their Dharma, can convey quite a different meaning to the one intended. But it is not with these that we are concerned here. It is those words which smack of intolerance, 'heresy, heretics, heretical, sects, sectarian, fanatics, fanaticism', these are among the most objectionable. All are scented by the smoke of burnings at the stake, all reek of the stale blood of unbelievers who refused 'conversion'; they have in general a bloody background of religious trials, wars and torture. Such words are inapplicable to Buddhists among themselves, and although they all have a basis in dogmatic religions, the attitudes which they describe are impossible within the Teachings of the Compassionate One.

'Heresy, etc.', should never be used by Buddhists to denounce other schools of their Dharma, nor be given as a label for non-Buddhists. It has been used as a translation of Mithyā Drishti, where it gives quite the wrong sense: it is, in fact, quite the worst possible translation of this meaningful term.

As to 'sects' and 'sectarian', this applies only with some justice in Japan, but the nature of the Dharma is such that it cannot really be chopped up in a typical sectarian pattern. It is correct to talk of 'schools' or 'traditions' of Buddhist thought; 'lines' or 'lineages' of Buddhist ordinations; and 'successions' or 'transmissions' of meditation-wisdom instructions; 'sect' with its suggestion of exclusive intolerance is better avoided in translations and works on the Dharma. Regarding 'sectarians', it may be seen from the following verse both what their attitude is and how it differs from typical Buddhism:

> *'Oh how they cling and wrangle, some who claim*
> *Of brahmin and recluse the honoured name,*
> *For quarrelling, each to his view, they cling.*
> *Such folk see only one side of a thing.'* (136)

A Buddhist cannot by definition be a fanatic.* With faith and understanding of his own religion, he comes with the Dharma's

136. Udāna vi, 4.

* See Appendix I on this point, 'Buddhists as Fanatics'.

encouragement to respect and appreciate others' creeds—how then can he be a fanatic?

The word 'dogma' is sometimes used even by unwary Buddhist writers to describe different teachings of the Buddha—'the four dogmas' for the Four Noble Truths, for instance. Such a use is quite wrong as no teaching in Buddhism can be dogma, all teachings being rafts for crossing over, not statements of absolute truth to be unquestioningly believed. It follows that where there are no dogmas, a 'creed' is quite impossible. There are no long lists of dogmas preceded by 'I believe'—not even one or two, since wisdom goes hand in hand with faith and one is encouraged to *know*, not merely believe.

* * *

C. Statements in Buddhist Texts

'Ekayāna ayaṁ bhikkhave maggo'—'This is the one way, O monks'; so said the Enlightened One in two of his famous discourses (137). What does this mean? Does it mean that His teachings are the only way to liberation? If so, might this be taken as a statement of exclusiveness? But this is not so, for the Lord taught, in the text following our quotation, the *Way* in which Nirvāna could be reached. 'The one way' does not refer to a doctrine—it refers to method, in this case to the methodical cultivation of mindfulness. The Buddhas always teach a method so that their words can be effectively turned into the practice and realization of the disciple. The Buddha says of His Dharma that it is 'ehipassiko'—a come-and-see-thing. You are invited to try it out and see if it works, in the spirit of the Kālāma Sutta (see Ch. 1, I).

If the Dharma is understood as it should be in the sense of method, not dogma, then it is the *only* way. For work to be well executed, the right tool is required, as well as the skill to use it: botched work results from inadequate equipment and poor knowledge. So it was that the Enlightened One criticized without intolerance the adherents of sectarian teachers. Why? Because, not having the correct method, the Samyak Drishti, to effect liberation, they aimed amiss and so came to have many and diverse goals.

'Even so, monks, wanderers belonging to other sects are blind and unseeing, they do not know what is the goal and what is not the goal, they

137. MN Sutta 10 and DN Sutta 22.

do not know what is Dharma and what is not Dharma. So they wrangle, quarrel and dispute about what is and what is not the goal, about what is and what is not Dharma.' (138)

In short, Buddhadharma states: 'wrong method, no freedom'. And where apart from the Dharma is right method found? Where else is such a teaching, clearly based upon our experience in this life, grounded on *morality*, showing clearly step by step how to cultivate the different levels of concentrated mental existence (*meditation*), and leading on to a liberating *wisdom*? This latter is uniquely Buddhist and is not found systematically developed in any other teaching. Therefore the Lord says:

'*Of all paths the Eightfold Path is best;*
Of all truths the Four Noble Truths are best;
Of states, Passionlessness is best;
Of men, the Seeing One (the Buddha) is the best.
This is the Only Way;
There is none other for (achieving) purity of insight.
Enter ye, upon this Path;
This will be the bewilderment of Māra.
Walking upon this Path
Ye shall make an end of pain. . . .' (139)

Only a path where Prajñā is taught will lead from the tangles of Saṁsāra to the peace of Nirvāna. Though there are many teachings in the world, they lead either in directions opposed to Nirvāna (materialism, Communism), or, at most, only to the lower heavens* gained by good works (and open therefore to the laymen of all religions) or to the higher states of bliss† attained through meditative tranquillity (attainable by the saints of, for instance, Christianity, Hinduism and Islam). Only in Buddhadharma is that wisdom taught which frees one completely from the round of births. It is truly as the Venerable Nāgita sings:

'*Outside our Order many others be, who teach*
A path never, like this one, to Nibbāna leading.' (140)

The Buddhist definition of a saint (Ārya) is one who has seen for himself Nirvāna. As this Highest Bliss is unlikely to be

138. Udāna 66–9. 139. Dhp 273–5.
* Kāmavacāra devas. † Rūpa- and Arūpa-vacāra devas.
140. Theragāthā LXXXVI.

attained by those incompletely guided by morality, meditation and wisdom, so Āryas are not found among other teachings. The following are the Lord's words near to the time of His Complete Passing-away:

'At nine and twenty years of age, Subhadra,
I left the world, my search for good pursuing;
Now fifty years and one year more are over,
Since I went forth and left the world, Subhadra.
Morality, concentration, have I practised,
And knowledge too with single mind attentive,
Preaching the limits of the Noble Doctrine;
Outside the range thereof is no ascetic (=Ārya).'

'In whose doctrine and discipline, Subhadra, the Noble Eightfold Way is not found, there no first ascetic (śrotāpanna)* is found, there no second (sakradāgami),* no third (anāgami),* no fourth ascetic (arahatta)* is found. But in that doctrine and discipline in which the Noble Eightfold Path is found, there all these four are also found. . . . Outside thereof are no ascetics or brahmins (in the Buddhist senses of these words). Void are other schools of ascetics or brahmins. Thus here in the congregation I roar the roar of the Noble Assembly (Ārya Saṅgha).' (141)

Good men, holy men—both surely one finds in other religions. But *wise* and holy men one finds only in Buddhism:

'There is no track in the sky. There is no sage (ārya) outside (the spiritual dispensation of the Buddha).' (142)

Wrong views will not permit the growth of Wisdom which depends on Samyak Drishti; without Wisdom there is no right Path, and without this one is embroiled in views, opinions, jungles, wildernesses and fetters of views—all this is exhaustively summed up by Bhadanta Buddhaghośa:

'In the exposition of wrong views in the sense of not viewing justly, such views are called "ditthigatā" (gone to views), from being included in the sixty-two unsound views (refuted by the Buddha in the Brahmajāla Suttanta). . . . Just "opinion" as something difficult to get beyond is what is meant by "views as jungle"—like a tangle of grass, of forest, of mountain. Just "opinion" as being something dangerous and fearsome

* Stages of realization.
141. Avadāna Śataka i, 227. 142. Dhp 255.

is meant by "view as wilderness"—like a wilderness infested by thieves and wild beasts, of sand, waterless, without food. . . . The changing and wavering of views . . . is meant by "opinion as scuffling". A man of opinions is not able to stand by one view. . . . Opinion as holding captive is meant by "fetter". . . . For a false view or opinion from the strength of its procedure establishes itself and seizes. By way of permanence ("a perverted view") . . . it convinces, hence the term "conviction". Passing over the intrinsic nature of things, it considers them perversely as "permanent, giving pleasure, having an essence, lovely"—this is perversion. It is a vile path, because it brings disadvantage; or, it is the way to vile places of suffering—hence the term "bypath". From being not the right path, it is the "wrong path". For just as one who has gone astray, although he holds that this is the path to such and such a village, yet does not arrive there, so a man of false opinions, although he holds that this is the path to a happy destiny, cannot get there; hence from being not on the right path, it is the wrong path.' (143)

The Buddhadharma is a path; follow this path to the utmost and it will lead to the goal—Nirvāna; for Buddhists of lower aspiration and those well-walking other paths, further lives await —in the heaven worlds, again to birth as man, or if they fail to live up to human standards, to the brutishness of animal existence, to suffer thwarted desires among the hungry ghosts, to fight with the demons of power, or, worst of all, long to inhabit the regions of utmost pain. The Dharma is a means of going beyond all this to the Excellent above all existence and non-existence. As a practical way is this teaching to be viewed, and all statements appearing dogmatic or exclusive, when studied, will only emphasize the Dharma as method, as a 'come-and-see-thing'.

143. Atth II, pp. 336–7.

3

WHAT IS TOLERANCE FOR A BUDDHIST?

I. NOT SUCCUMBING TO FALSE VIEWS

In being Tolerant a Buddhist does not allow wrong views (Mithyā Drishti) to creep into the Teaching. A very considerable portion of Buddhist literature is concerned with criticizing the wrong views of other schools. For instance, the earliest non-canonical work of this kind which we possess is the Kathāvatthu written in Pāli from the Theravāda standpoint. From this text one gains a clear idea of the art of refutation carried out in a spirit of politeness to opponents. This was generally to persist in after ages when doctrinal debates became a great attraction for many people.

So much activity, by way of debates, discussions and treatises, ensured that the Dharma's presentation did not suffer perversion. Ancient Buddhists were well aware of the value of Right Views and their successors of today have to thank the teachers of old who so well preserved the True Way. Many of these teachers were monks able to devote their whole time to the Dharma. The importance of the Saṅgha is thus emphasized, for where it has been strong and healthy, there the tradition of Samyak Drishti (Right Views) has been maintained. With no Saṅgha to give guidance on what is and what is not Dharma, there the tradition has frequently degenerated.

The importance of Samyak Drishti cannot be over-emphasized. A long Sutta is given over to describing what this is and showing

ultimately that Right Views are founded upon Transcendental experience.* A short digression in support of this foundation of Right Views is necessary here. It is not, as sometimes said, that Buddhism has no authority. There is authority, in the sense that the teaching is at once founded upon and proceeding towards Bodhi. Whatever fulfils neither of these conditions is not Buddhadharma. Many passages illustrate why Buddhists have confidence in the authority of both the Lord and what He taught. First then, how is the Buddha regarded in this connection? A composite quotation in praise of the Lord and His relation to Truth illustrates how with faith His followers regard Him:

> ' "I was born into the world as the king of truth. . . ." "The subject on which I meditate is truth. The practice to which I devote myself is truth. The topic of my conversation is truth. My thoughts are always in the truth. For lo! my self has become the truth." "Whosoever comprehends the truth sees the Blessed One's (greatness) for the truth has been preached by the Bhagavan." ' (144)

But it is not only from faith that Buddhists have praised Him, since His diamond wisdom is apparent in many a passage, illustrating His transcendent nature, the One who has thus-gone, the Tathāgata: some have translated Tathāgata as 'Truth-finder' and a Pāli Sutta gives some further ancient derivations of this epithet of the Buddhas:

> 'Thus, Cunda, in matters concerning past, future or present, the Tathāgata speaks at the right time, speaks truthfully, speaks profitably, he speaks of the Doctrine and Discipline, therefore he is called Tathāgata. . . .
>
> Whatever between the night when the Tathāgata comprehends supreme perfect enlightenment and the night when he attains Nirvāna with the element of Nirvāna which is without a remainder of rebirth, whatever in that interval he speaks or converses about or expounds, all that is thus and not otherwise. Therefore he is called Tathāgata.
>
> As the Tathāgata speaks, thus he does. As he does, thus he speaks. Hence, as speaking thus doing, as doing thus speaking, therefore he is called Tathāgata.' (145)

* MN, Sutta No. 9.

144. (i) *Gya Tchee Roll Pa, Histoire du Bouddha Shakyamuni*, Foucaux, Paris, 1868.
(ii) S42S (but not found in the most recent translation of Chu Ch'an).
(iii) Milinda Pañha, III, 5, 3.

145. DN iii, 134.

Respect for the Lord is founded on His profound attainments and their expression in His teaching of Dharma:

'And again, Udāyin, disciples of mine admire the surpassing knowledge-and-vision, and think: "When the recluse Gotama says: I know, I see—it is because he does know, does see. The recluse Gotama teaches Dhamma from super-knowledge, not without super-knowledge; the recluse Gotama teaches Dhamma that has a causal basis, not without a causal basis; the recluse Gotama teaches Dhamma that is convincing, not unconvincing." . . . This is the second thing, Udāyin, for which disciples of mine revere, respect, esteem and honour me and, revering and respecting, live in dependence.' (146)

Faith and wisdom aid each other in the progress of a disciple:

'He has confidence in the Teacher, that: "The Lord is a Fully Awakened One, well-taught is the Dhamma by the Lord, the Order fares along well." Monks, if others should ask that monk: "But what are the venerable one's facts, what the evidence by reason of which he speaks thus: 'The Lord . . . well taught . . . the Order . . .?' "—that monk, monks, answering rightly would answer thus: "I, your reverences, drew near the Lord so as to hear Dhamma. The Lord taught me Dhamma from further to further, from excellence to excellence, what is dark and what is bright and their counterparts. As the Lord gradually taught me Dhamma from further to further, from excellence to excellence, what is dark and what is bright and their counterparts, so did I gradually by my super-knowledge of point after point in Dhamma come to fulfilment in Dhamma. (Therefore) I have confidence in the Teacher, that: 'The Lord is a Fully Awakened One, well-taught is Dhamma by the Lord. . . .' " ' (147)

'Well-taught is the Dharma of the Exalted One'—what does this mean? Buddhaghośa answers:

'. . . it is well proclaimed since it is properly proclaimed with no perversion of meaning. For the meaning of other sectarians' law suffers perversion since there is actually no obstruction in the things described there as obstructive and actually no outlet in the things described there as outlets, which is why their law is ill-proclaimed; but not so the Blessed One's law, whose meaning suffers no perversion since the things described there as obstructions and the things described there as outlets are so in actual fact."

So in the first place, the Dhamma of the scriptures is well-proclaimed. The Supramundane Dhamma is well proclaimed since both the way

146. MN ii, 9. 147. MN i 320.

that accords with Nibbāna and the Nibbāna that accords with the way have been proclaimed, according as it is said: "The way leading to Nibbāna has been properly declared to the disciples by the Blessed One, and Nibbāna and the way meet. Just as the water of the Ganges meets and joins with the water of the Yamunā, so too the way leading to Nibbāna has been properly declared to the disciples by the Blessed One, and Nibbāna and the way meet." ' (148)

In a newly translated work of equal age or even older than the preceding, we find a similar description:

' "The Law is well-taught by the Blessed One": It is free from extremes, therefore it is called "well-taught". There are no inconsistencies in it, therefore it is called "well-taught". There are no contradictions in it, and it is endowed with the three kinds of goodness (at its beginning, middle and end), therefore it is called "well-taught". It is completely spotless, therefore it is called "well-taught".' (149)

The Buddha himself has encouraged one to question and examine critically what He taught. He taught Dharma in the spirit of 'ehipassiko', a Dharma to come and see for oneself, to experiment with and be unhindered by dogmas, to come to unobstructed realization of Nirvāna.

'Inviting (ehipassiko): It says: "Come and see my worth!" In the same way, those who have the ability to teach are called men who say "Come and see!" ' (150)

For all these reasons, others are adduced in more technical treatises, Buddhists have confidence in the authority of Buddhadharma as Perfect View.

While a Buddhist maintains Right Views, he speaks plainly and to the point, but gently. There is no humbug in his talk, no attitude (so popular in India and elsewhere) that Truth is that which 'makes one feel comfortable'. As the Sūtra says:

'Furthermore, an irreversible Bodhisattva does not pander to the shramanas and brahmanas of other schools, telling them that they know what is worth knowing, that they see what is worth seeing.' (151)

This has been the standpoint of many good Buddhists less

148. Vis Mag VII, para. 73–4, quoting DN ii, 223.
149. Vim Mag VIII, pp. 149–50. 150. ibid., VIII.
151. Asta 323.

exalted than irreversible Bodhisattvas and has ensured freedom from wrong ways of thought and belief in the Dharma. True criticism among Buddhists has generally been constructive. In Saraha's work, for instance, we find that after the witty opening remarks aimed at the weaknesses of various Buddhists and non-Buddhists, he sets down many more positive verses describing a way to liberation*. All criticism made by Buddhists of their brethren has but one purpose, to keep pure the Dharma of Enlightenment, and one justification, out of compassion for suffering worldlings.

Buddhists have seldom been afraid of criticism (only fools fear such things, as the Lord points out) and many have dearly loved discussions. In time the latter came to be organized into a debates system when representatives of different schools would try to refute each other. This was part of the ancient Indian training common to many sects and which led Buddhists, in conjunction with their spiritual philosophy, to develop a devastatingly systematic logic to deal not only with internal disputes but also with the upholders of Hindu and Jaina principles. Debates between famous pundits drew thousands of people and if all could not appreciate the finer points of the arguments, they did enjoy the dramatic gestures and triumphant victories. The art of formal debate together with its symbolic gestures is still taught and practised among Tibetan monks. It has always seemed to Buddhists more important to train the mind in clarity of insight and universal kindliness rather than submit blindly to what pope, priest, preacher or holy book declares to be 'truth'.

III NOT INTOLERANTLY CONDEMNING OTHER TEACHINGS

'I must needs answer you freely that I esteem toleration to be the chief characteristic mark of the true church.' (152)

A Buddhist finds much to agree with here, for not only is his tradition to tolerate other teachings but, as proved by his past

* Dohākośa of Sarahapāda.

152. *A Letter Concerning Toleration.* By contrast the position of dogmatic religion is summed up in the words of Joseph Pohle of Breslau (a Roman Catholic): 'The true Church can tolerate no strange churches besides herself.... She regards dogmatic intolerance not alone as her incontestable right, but also as a sacred duty.' See article, 'Persecution', p. 762 of *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*.

record, to be actively friendly with them. This friendliness has been in part due to the eagerness with which Buddhists have tried to understand others' views. As Gam.po.pa advises:

'Study the teachings of the great sages of all sects impartially.' (153)

But to those of other religions who were 'clever, subtle, experienced in controversy', and therefore liable to cause acrimonious dissension, to such recluses and brahmins as were called by the Buddha 'hair-splitters' (or in these days the theologians of any dogmatic creed), to these one should say:

'Friends, concerning those points on which we do not agree, let us leave them alone. For those on which we do agree, let the wise put questions, ask for reasons—discuss the matters with either teachers or their fellow-brethren.' (154)

Such an attitude naturally makes for harmony even between opposing points of view, thereby anger is not aroused nor even expressed in harsh words.

Buddhists, while confident that their Way is Saddharma, look with loving kindness and compassion upon those following other teachings, thus bearing in mind the reported words of their Teacher:

'Revere your own, revile no brother's faith.
The light you see is from Nirvāna's sun,
Whose rising splendours promise perfect day.
The feeble rays that light your brother's path
Are from the self-same sun, by falsehoods hid
The lingering shadows of the passing night.' (155)

In countries to which Buddhadharma has gone it has respected the native religions whether poly-, mono- or atheistic and has usually incorporated whatever elements are compatible. It has recognized, in fact, that all religions have admirable teachings and that in all one may find elements of truth. So the Buddha did not teach that all the good lay in 'Buddhism', rather He taught His disciples to regard not only His own teachings but to listen to and deeply consider whatever they found led towards their own and others' welfare (see also the advice to Mahāpajāpatī, Ch. 1, I):

153. PG III, 5. 154. Dn Sutta No. 8, para. 5.
155. Quoted by Narasu as 'Buddhavacana' but not traced.

'Wherefore, Kassapa, you should train yourself thus: Whatever doctrine I shall hear connected with what is skilful (kusala), to this I shall listen attentively, investigate objectively, reflect upon deeply and upon this concentrate wholeheartedly.' (156)

This is the Buddha's way of distilling Truth from falsehood, not condemning teachings from an emotional rejection nor from an intellectual sophistry but testing with the depth of Samādhi and weighing upon the balance of Prajñā. After this, if the tenets of other faiths have been judged as 'false views', corrective medicines have been prepared in the form of treatises, lectures, etc. Many are the books systematically refuting the wrong views of Hinduism, Bon, Tao, Confucius and Shinto. Works even existed in Mongolia, written recently by Buddhist monks there, criticizing the Dialectical Materialism of Marx. Now it would seem that with the Dharma steadily expanding into predominantly Christian and Muslim countries, and with many Western missionaries in the Far East, some Buddhist works are needed to deal gently but firmly with the dogmas of these two aggressive monotheistic faiths.

After refutation, however, a Buddhist considers that gentle teaching should follow (not the sword or stake). Teaching being best done by personal example, the Buddhist pattern is first to *learn*, this being a basis for *practice*, leading on to the third stage, when from the results of his practice he *teaches*. There is no room for dogmatism and intolerance here.

This step-by-step procedure is traditional for lay and monk alike, and while the latter should have the time and energy to accomplish much, the former, even though his sphere may be more restricted, still can apply this principle in at least one important case. This is in the instruction of children so that they conduct themselves respectfully towards those of other religions. Not mocking and not rude, to this ideal Buddhist children are educated. It is the duty of all Buddhist parents to see that their young ones are taught not only courteous behaviour but also basic knowledge and appreciation of the good points of the other world religions.

In conclusion it may fairly be said that in their attitude towards non-Buddhists the followers of the Buddha have generally tried to emulate their Teacher, who has thus been praised:

156. SN ii, 219, translated by Ven. Pāsādiko Bhikkhu.

'No matter by whom or where or how provoked,
Never do you transgress your own fair path of conduct.

Other men do not as much study the welfare of those who mean them well,
As you study that of those who seek you harm.

To an enemy intent on ill you are a good friend intent on good.
To one who constantly seeks for faults you respond by seeking for virtues.

Revilers you conquered by patience, plotters by blessing,
Slanderers by the truth, the malicious by friendliness.' (157)

III. NOT CONDEMNING OTHER FORMULATIONS OF BUDDHADHARMA AS FALSE OR WORTHLESS

After considering Buddhist tolerance from the standpoints of Right Views and their importance, and in relation to other religions, how then should a Buddhist treat schools other than his own? The state of affairs which caused Locke to remark: 'For every church is orthodox to itself, to others, erroneous or heretical' (158), has seldom existed among Buddhists. We are able to construct a continuous history of the tolerant spirit from the material available in Buddhist works.

In the days of the Exalted One this same spirit was evident amongst the many teachers of the Dharma, a fact which astonished the wanderer Sandaka when he heard of it in conversation with the Venerable Ānanda:

' "How many great leaders, good Ānanda, are there in this Dhamma and Discipline?"

"Not merely a hundred, or two, three, four or five hundred, but far more are those who are great leaders in this Dhamma and Discipline."

"Wonderful, good Ānanda, marvellous, good Ānanda; there can be no extolling of their own Dhamma nor disparaging of the Dhamma of others; but both the teaching of Dhamma in its (whole) extent as well as many teachers can be seen." ' (159)

157. Śatapañcaśatkastotra of Matriceta, 118–20, 122. On the subject of this quotation, see Appendix I, 'By Love Alone Hatred Ceases'.

158. *A Letter Concerning Toleration.* 159. MN i, 524.

Among so many teachers freedom was recognized as the right of all knowledgeable and wise men. This being so, Buddhists have seldom settled down into the rut of dogmatic thinking. Their Dharma was and is a Way leading onward to freedom, not a prison-house of imposed dogmatic 'truths'. Christian Church Councils sought to impose certain definitions of these 'truths' to be made binding upon all those who wished to be recognized as orthodox. Not so among Buddhists, for we find a splendid example of tolerance in the latter pages of the Theravāda Vinaya Pitaka. After the rules of the Saṅgha and their elaboration, there follow accounts of the first two Recitals of Dharma-Vinaya (Councils) which occurred after the passing away of the Lord. Although these accounts are certainly biassed in favour of the school which has preserved them, still the following incident has been retained, a fact which in itself indicates a tolerant spirit. This event is said to have taken place immediately after the First Recital:

'Now at that time the Venerable Purāna was walking on alms-tour in the Southern Hills together with a large order of monks, with at least five hundred monks. Then the Venerable Purāna, having stayed in the Southern Hills for as long as he found suiting, after monks who were elders had chanted the Dhamma and Discipline, approached Rājagaha, the Bamboo Grove, the Squirrels' Feeding-Place, and the monks who were elders; having approached, having exchanged friendly greetings with the monks who were elders, he sat down at a respectful distance. The monks who were elders, spoke thus to the Venerable Purāna as he was sitting down at a respectful distance.

"Reverend Purāna, Dhamma and Discipline have been chanted by monks who are elders. Uphold this tradition."

"Your reverences, well chanted by the elders are the Dhamma and Discipline, but in that way in which I heard it in the Lord's presence, that I received it in his presence, in that same way I will bear it in mind." ' (160)

Even so, soon after the Lord's Parinirvāna there were evidently differing traditions and yet we see from this passage perfect courtesy was observed between the upholders of them, a good example of how Buddhists can agree to disagree in peace.

The nature of the Dharma and its lack of centralization has ensured freedom from warring factions—as a Buddhist scholar says:

160. Vin Pit, Cullavagga, pp. 401–2. (Note: The Dharmagupta tradition here differs as it is more elaborate, but the spirit of friendly tolerance is much the same. See *Buddhist Literature in China*, p. 80, by S. Beal.)

'The absence of any centralized authority within the system, however, anything like an "established church", rendered somewhat indeterminate the question of conformity or non-conformity to the Sāsana. . . . But the tradition of the religion itself from the very beginning had been extraordinarily tolerant of "free-thinking".' (161)

In practice, as we have already pointed out, there was and is a great inter-school toleration. In ancient India where there were so many branches of the Dharma:

'In many monasteries members of different sects nevertheless lived together in perfect amity. It was generally recognized that the goal may be reached by different roads, and the sects showed great tolerance to each other, although occasional sharp religious invective was of course not entirely unknown. They all shared one common Dharma, although it is important to realize that the verbal formulations of this Dharma did not exist in a brief, handy and unambiguous form.' (162)

'Sharp religious invective' was no doubt occasionally used as in the attitude of the Hīnayānists to the Bodhisattva monk Sadāparibhuta. But he, notably patient in the circumstances, did not condemn his persecutors, far from this he said such words as: 'I dare not slight you, because you are all to become Buddhas' (163). Condemnation runs highest where sectarianism is most rigid. Usually this latter condition has not applied to Buddhism and thus the former has not occurred, but in Japan the government's policy was to control Buddhist power by forming each doctrinally differentiated group into as rigid a sectary-system as could be imposed upon the Buddhist ideals of freedom. Between scholars of the various sects there were certainly many comparisons drawn and criticisms made and these may very occasionally have descended to condemnation (see quotation of Nichiren, Ch. 2, II, A). But strict leaders of these different groups did not permit their followers to indulge in such useless and destructive activity as may be seen from the following trio of sayings:

'Rennyo (Jodo Shinshu) said: "You ought not to slander other sects and other teachings."

Susuki Shosan (Zen) ordains: "In this monastery the right and wrong of the world or the relative merits of other sects ought not to be talked about."

161. *The Buddha and Five Centuries After*, p. 136.
162. ASHB, p. 15. 163. Sad Pun, Ch. XX.

Jiun (Ritsu) admonished his disciples: "The right and wrong or the high and low of the teachings of other sects should not be discussed." ' (164)

Nor did Honen Shonin, that great and gentle saint of Japan, like the spectacle of sectarianism and he insisted upon one occasion that:

'The scholars of different sects fail to comprehend that every sect has its own peculiar standpoint, and so as soon as they discover anything contrary to their own, they at once pronounce such teaching false. This is quite unreasonable. So long as each sect has its distinctive features, they cannot be expected to be all alike, and it is a matter of course that each should have something against every other.' (165)

And he admonished his disciples upon another:

'You must not foolishly or narrow-mindedly insist on people of a different faith and practice from your own giving up their distinctive religious practices. Never jest at them.' (166)

Modern exponents of the Dharma should take note of this attitude; it may be that some of them can learn something from these quotations.

The exactingly correct and the easy broad-mindedness as two sides complementary to the Dharma are brought out in the quotation below, and surely only a Buddhist could write of his faith:

'Whatsoever is rightly spoken and free from error, that is the teaching of the Buddha.' (167)

Where such a standard applies what room is there for narrow sectarian strife?

164. *Japan and Buddhism*, published by the Association of Buddha Jayanti.
165. *Honen, The Buddhist Saint*, p. 158.
166. ibid., p. 551.
167. Sikśāsamuccaya of Śāntideva (quoting the Adhyaśayasaṁcodana Sūtra).

4

HOW IS TOLERANCE TO MEET ITS OPPOSITE?

Before concluding this subject, our account, so far mainly definitive and descriptive, would be incomplete unless some positive suggestions were offered as answers to this question. Buddhist tradition is always to teach the method to be used for the attainment of any given goal. Indeed, unless some attempt is made to answer this question, the common reaction might be to label what has already been said as 'high-flown theories' or 'impractical ideas'. How then do tolerant Buddhists deal with intolerant and aggressive supporters of proselytizing creeds? If they are sincerely practising they will feel only compassion arise for those so deluded and will surely agree with the stanza which says:

> 'It is not right for me to hate those who destroy or are rude to the rūpas (images), shrines or the Saddharma because the Buddha and those who present His teaching are unaffected thereby.' (168)

Truly the Buddha is not affected however his shrines are pillaged or destroyed, certainly the truth of the Dharma can never be lessened even though knowledge of it ceases to exist, and surely the minds of the great saints of the Mahāsaṅgha have no hatred against persecutors—on the contrary, they see in such events good opportunities for the practice of patience; but still the bases of Buddhist endeavour, the traditions associated with

168. Bodh, Ch. VI, 64.

Buddhist life and culture, the monastic training and even the Saṅgha itself, these may certainly be demolished. We have therefore to enquire further for an answer to our question.

It is no use looking back into the past for solutions to this problem. The past, in this respect, presents no solution—only a series of disasters, and sadly these continue to the present day.

Leaving aside the minor persecutions of Buddhism by Jains and Hindus in India, or its occasional proscription in China, let us briefly look at the reigns of terror imposed on the Dharma by the great dogmatic forces in the world.

The first of these to affect Buddhism was Islam.* The sword and spoil were first in the minds of roving Islamic hordes, the Qu'ran coming a decided second. Ravaging first Central Asia, then India, these invaders destroyed all religions, attempting to force their 'True Faith' on all 'unbelievers'. Hindus, Jains and Buddhists all suffered. But Buddhadharma suffered worst, for Buddhist learning was concentrated into vast university-monasteries (Nālanda, Odantapuri, Vidramaśīla, Jaggadala and Somarūpa were among the most prominent). It was in such centres that thousands of students obtained a thorough knowledge of all aspects of Buddhism. It was just these centres where thousands of monks were butchered, countless books reduced to ashes and the beauties of Buddhist art defaced and ruined. How could a religion so insistent upon knowledge and its realization survive the destruction of its great schools and the murder of its venerable teachers? Buddhism did not survive. For 700 years it was virtually extinct in India and has only recently begun to return to its homeland. So much for the effect of Islamic onslaught upon the Dharma.

A side-issue which may be mentioned here is the assertion frequently repeated that Buddhist emphasis on loving kindness and tolerance brought about the downfall of India when it was subjected to Muslim attacks. People, according to this theory, were so bemused by the principle of ahiṁsa advocated by Buddhists and Jains and were therefore too soft of heart to defend

* Muslim intolerance can be based on the following Suras from the Qu'ran: 9 : 29 reads: 'Fight against those who do not believe in Allah, the Last Day, and do not forbid what God and his apostle have forbidden, and do not follow the true religion of those to whom scriptures were given, until they pay tribute out of hand, being brought low.' And 3 : 79: 'He who chooses a religion other than Islam, it will not be accepted from him, and in the next world he will be one of the lost.' While the 'Verse of the Sword' (9 : 5) says—'Slay the polytheists wherever you find them.'

their country against the invaders, so unused to warfare were they. But upon reading Indian history it is found so full of the wars of the many petty states that lack of martial experience can hardly be the answer. This point in itself is one answer: lack of political unity and common feeling among the various kingdoms. Another is to be found in the state of Hindu society, severely weakened as it was by the divide-and-rule policy* recommended by Brahmanical tradition and also by the rigidities of the caste system. Where the different castes are mutually antagonistic, how can efficient defence be organized? Buddhism may thus be cleared of this charge of 'weakness', the fault lying not in its tolerance but rather with the social intolerance of the caste system.

Let us now turn to Christianity.† How have the apostles of Jesus treated Buddhists? A well-known example is to be found in

* 'Bheda'—see Manu Samhita.

† For Christian intolerance, the following texts are relevant:

'Ask of me, and I shall give *thee* the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth *for* thy possession.

Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.' (Psalms ii: 8–9)

'Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword.' (Matthew x: 34)

'Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?

And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?' (II Corinthians vi: 14–15)

'Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.

Whoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.' (Romans xiii: 1–2)

'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.' (Mark xvi: 16)

Besides these there are a host of the most barbarous exhortations by the Old Testament God, to kill, to pillage and to overthrow the faiths of the original inhabitants of Israel, which words have doubtless had their effect upon the Christian soldiers sent out to conquer for the Church the Eastern lands (the military language is both typical and significant). Two rather acid comments on the Christian outlook will sum this up:

'When error prevails, it is right to invoke liberty of conscience; but when, on the contrary, truth predominates, it is proper to use coercion.' (J. C. Bluntschli's summary of St. Augustine's preaching)

'I am in the right and you are in the wrong. When you are the stronger, you ought to tolerate me; for it is your duty to tolerate truth. But when I am the stronger, I shall persecute you; for it is my duty to persecute error.' (Macaulay, *Critical and Historical Essays*)

the ancient Buddhist stronghold of Ceylon. The Portuguese, the Dutch and the English followed each other in their rule of parts or all of the island. Each adopted a different attitude to Buddhism but all tried, more or less forcibly, to convert the population.

The Portuguese, backed by the authority of Holy Church, were most vile, violent and destructive. Intolerance took the form of killings, especially of bhikshus,* burning temples and intimidating lay-people. Nearly all the coastal regions were Portuguese-occupied and to this day the majority of Roman Catholic descendants of forced converts live near the coasts. During Portuguese rule bhikshus could not be found in these parts and if daring to show themselves might with good luck enjoy a quick death; but more usually, as the authorities were solicitous for the well-being of their souls, they gave time for repentance and conversion by ordering a gradual end of life.

The methods of the Dutch were less horrible but no less rigid, and their brutal behaviour did little to convince the people that the Dutch Church enshrined the teaching of the Highest Truth. Their method of conversion was to indoctrinate forcibly the children attending the Church schools. A Buddhist loyal to his ancient faith stood little chance of getting a post in government service.

The English were less rigid but in a way more cunning. Appearing at first to safeguard the liberties of Buddhists and the position of Buddhism, they gradually neglected their promises, while giving Christian missionaries more and more encouragement. During the British Raj a multitude of Christian sects streamed into Ceylon and, with the connivance of the government, flourished—while the Dharma, after centuries of persistent attack, continued to decline. The indifference, if not hostility, of both civil and religious authorities led to the neglect of Buddhist education with its rich tradition. It became a disgrace to be a Buddhist and even Buddhists took Christian names. At this low ebb the Venerable Dharmapāla and his contemporaries revived Buddhadharma, and in recent years, with Ceylon's freedom, an effort has been made to restrict the destructive forces of Christianity while actively promoting the good of the long-suffering and tolerant teachings of the Enlightened One.

This account of Christian barbarity may be brought up to date with a short account of the position of Buddhists in Catholic-

* See Additional References 10.

dominated South Viet-nam. In the past when the country was under French rule, the colonial government gave every opportunity to Roman missionaries, one of whom boasted that 'After three years there will be a Mary on every Buddhist shrine'. As a start towards the achievement of this goal, two districts in the north of the country were forcibly converted with the destruction of all Buddhist and Confucian shrines. In the present 'free' republic all Buddhist books are censored by a Catholic-controlled board and no Buddhist publication of any sort is permitted which makes comparisons between Buddhadharma and Catholicism—evidently the regime fears the consequences for the latter! There is also discrimination against Buddhists in the universities and generally they have been blamed by the Catholics that since they do not believe in God they are therefore Communists!

Undoubtedly Communism represents today the greatest menace to Buddhadharma.* It is true, of course, that both Buddhism and Communism are atheistic (in the sense of disbelieving in a Creator God), but their methods are opposite. The former's appeal is its tolerance and love of peace, whereas the latter relies on wars, inter-class strife and forced indoctrination for its spread.

Communism began to swallow Buddhist countries about 1920, when the Buriat region of Siberia came under the domination of red Moscow. Since then, and approximately in this order, Tannoutuva, Mongolia, Sinkiang, China, North Viet-nam, North Korea, and lastly Tibet, have passed into the Communist stomach. They are now in varying stages of digestion. The pattern of Communist behaviour towards Buddhism is much the same in each country. First there is the indoctrination of children: the Buddha is pictured as an ancient mythical teacher and His Dharma as a lot of superstitious nonsense having no bearing upon modern life; the members of the Saṅgha are shown as idle parasites, doing nothing for their living and contributing nothing

* Hear the orthodox voice of Communism in Lenin's words: 'All contemporary religions and churches, all and every kind of religious organization, Marxism has always viewed as instruments of bourgeois reaction, serving as a defence of exploitation and doping of the working class. . . . The struggle against religion cannot be limited to abstract preachery . . . this struggle should be brought into connection with the concrete practice of the class movement directed towards the elimination of the social roots of religion. . . . The party of the proletariat must be the intellectual leader in the struggle against all kinds of medievalism, including religion' (*Lenin on Religion, collected papers published 1935*).

towards the wellbeing of society.* Buddhist temples and monasteries are either closed or destroyed and no young men or women are allowed to take up the homeless life in the Saṅgha. A few temples are preserved here and there with some old monks to staff them—this is just to show the young something of the art of the past, impress on them the useless life of a Buddhist monk or nun, and, of course, to give tourists, especially those from Buddhist countries, a good picture of how the state is supporting Buddhism!

It appears that Dharma is all but extinct in Mongolian regions and its destruction in China to a 'safe' level controlled by the Communist State has not been so difficult due to its declined condition there. The tragedy of Tibet should teach all Buddhists just how far Communism will tolerate them. In Tibet the great universities are closed, or partly so, the Saṅgha has been suppressed at least to the extent of it being an effective vehicle for the teaching of Dharma; gelongs (bhikshus) are made to work on roads and farms and for those who fail to co-operate there is imprisonment, torture and death. The piety of Buddhists whose tradition is always to offer the most precious to their Master, making Buddhist shrines gleam with gold and glitter with gems, has proved a profitable source of income to the Communists—after all, why waste gold on the figures of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas when it will pay for so many machine-guns, rockets and even nuclear weapons? One can scarcely doubt that the same would happen in other Buddhist countries. Beware, Buddhists! A monster is gnawing at your vitals—how many more organs will he devour?

Complacence is useless in this matter. One should not think that a great religion cannot be destroyed. It can. This has happened in the past with a faith once world-wide—Manichaeism. The religion of Mani had scriptures translated into many languages and it was popular from France to China. It was a faith stressing non-violence, peace and toleration. As far as we know from fragmentary records, the followers of Mani, who were pacifists, never persecuted other religions—indeed they respected them and taught their own in a form acceptable to the peoples of differing faiths into whose countries they spread. They were everywhere persecuted out of existence. By Christians in the West and in Africa, by Zoroastrians and then Muslims in the Middle East and in Central Asia, by Confucian and Taoist

* See statements under 'Buddhism' in the official *Encyclopaedia of the U.S.S.R.* (in Russian).

followers in China—they all persecuted Mani's religion. Buddhists alone may rejoice that they had no part in the destruction of a religion of peace and goodwill. Now where is Manichaeism? In scholarly journals and damaged parchments it no longer guides men in good ways. Beware, Buddhists! What would happen if Ceylon, Burma, Thailand and Japan were also swallowed by an alien and hostile creed?

So much for history, the facts of the present and the possibilities for the future. They all present a challenge to Buddhists to find practical solutions to the question, 'What is to be done?'

The fact is that Buddhism, when attacked by intolerant forces, has a number of weaknesses which in combination have led to its destruction. By investigating the weak points, counteractive measures may be designed. The former will first be listed and then examined together with the proposed correctives.

The weaknesses are:

1. Ignorance of the Dharma and lack of religious education, especially amongst lay-people.

2. Rigidity and lack of adaptability in matters of doctrine and practice.

3. Apathy among a majority of both monks and laity regarding Dharmaduta work (Messengers of Dharma).

4. A lack of unity noticeable upon several levels.

5. A tolerance too much inclined to submission.

6. Not enough practice.

1. It has already been stressed that Buddhadharma has usually promoted education among not only the monks but also for the majority of Buddhists—the lay-people. But from time to time the emphasis has shifted so much to the monasteries that lay-followers have been neglected. Such was the case in the latter years of Buddhism in India and something similar occurred in Tibet. When the vast monasteries, treasuries of spiritual learning, had been destroyed, all that was left were lay-supporters knowing a few rituals and popular texts—not enough to sustain the Dharma! Another tendency is seen when ritualism overwhelms knowledge. The Teaching is finally lost sight of under a mass of symbology, which, however profound in meaning, is not a substitute for study of the Dharma. It does undoubtedly lead to the production of a rich artistic tradition which in turn is attractive to non-Buddhists and among those already following the Dharma favours the less well educated whether monk or laity, but ends disastrously, in

ignorance of even the significance of the symbols and accompanying rituals.

In general, though, the lay attitude to knowledge of Dharma is to be comforted by the thought that the bhikshus know all about it. Of course, this is a generalization, but seemingly justified, for although there are a number of knowledgeable lay-teachers, their number compared to the mass of laity is very small. In different countries ideas vary amongst laymen as to what constitutes Buddhism. To take a few examples: in Ceylon, Buddhism popularly conceived is 'pirit',* while to Nepalese and Tibetans, Dharma is largely a matter of ceremonial observances including pūjas;† again, to Chinese and Japanese, Buddhism may seem most important for its death ceremonies; and to all the uninstructed laity in every country Buddhism consists of the various anniversaries with their processions and festivals. None of these activities is wrong in itself provided it does not usurp the place of knowledge.

The corrective for this lamentable situation is intensive education of the laity. By education is not meant the cramming of facts for material gain—the usual Western interpretation—but rather education in the Buddhist spirit, where knowledge is not only for one's own advantage but also for the benefit of others. This spirit is found in the education-verse of the Maṅgala Sutta where the Lord has said:

> '*Much knowledge, and much skill in arts and crafts,*
> *A well-learned discipline, and pleasant speech—*
> *This is the most auspicious sign of all.*' (169)

Buddhist education should aim at a standard where the majority of laymen, at least, can give a fair account of the Buddha's teachings, and a good core of them can accurately expound the Dharma in greater detail. Efforts are being made in this direction, notably amongst the harassed Buddhists of Ceylon and commendably in the Dhamma examinations in Burma. Well-informed laymen and laywomen can instruct their children at home—a guard against enforced secular education. These

* Pāli: 'paritta'—protection. The practice of having bhikshus recite certain Buddhist texts as a protection against all misfortunes.

† Worship of various Buddhas, Bodhisattavas and deities with the appropriate offerings.

169. Maṅgala Sutta, trans. Ven. Saṅgharakshita.

children are the Buddhists of the future; if they receive no instruction how can the tradition be maintained? If the parents themselves are not educated in the real fundamentals of the Dharma how can they teach their children? Only a higher standard of knowledge among lay-Buddhists can break this circle.

• If an ignorant laity is bad an ignorant Order is worse. Nothing will bring Buddhism into worse repute, especially amongst educated non-Buddhists, than the yellow robe worn by a monk ignorant of everything except the administration of the Three Refuges and Five Precepts, or, worse still, of one accomplished only in greatness of rice-consumption and length of resultant sleep. Such monks are hardly an advantage when the Dharma faces the unrelenting criticisms of either Christian missionaries or Communist officials. If the Saṅgha is to function effectively in the complex modern world its standard of education generally must be higher than that of the laity. This means not only that more and deeper Buddhist scholarship is required but also that attention is given to the relations of such subjects as physiology, modern philosophies, and systems of psychology, to the Dharma. Also essential, if monks are truly to prove their worth to society, is a good grounding in meditational experience. In order to accomplish all this, many bhikshu-training centres have been established in different countries; upon the success of these depends the quality of the Dharma taught to the younger generations, and upon the depth of this teaching depends the whole future of Buddhadharma.

2. The world is fast changing, faster it seems by man's efforts than before. That which cannot adapt itself to this change will surely die, as in remote ages, and for the same reason, the dinosaurs. The Buddha preached: 'Sabbe sankhārā aniccā'—'Impermanent are all compounded things' (170). This includes all mundane manifestations of the Dharma: the Rules of the Saṅgha pertaining to observances, dress and food, etc.; the thousands of pages of written and printed Buddha-word and the philosophies founded thereon; the festivals and ceremonies; the art and architecture, in fact all which constitutes Buddhist culture is recognized as impermanent.

Or, rather, it should be. Failing to do so means failure of understanding that all Dharma is a skilful means to Enlighten-

170. Dhp 277.

ment, and this in turn results in an attitude of doctrinal rigidity and formalistic observance. This is dinosaur-Dharma; a Buddhism like this is, as those strange beasts, doomed to die. The Dharma has now either to make such changes in its organization and presentation as are compatible both with modern conditions, and with the attainment of Enlightenment, or it will pass away from this world and with it all hope of true wisdom and compassion.

To take a few examples of some points requiring the attention of Buddhists. The Saṅgha as one of the Triple Gems is often thought of as persons wearing certain coloured robes. In a Buddhist society this has some advantages; the laymen and laywomen readily recognize the monks, are generally helpful and behave towards them in a manner which enables them to continue living the homeless life. The West too has a tradition (at least in Orthodox and Catholic circles) of ordained monks and priests who wear a garb apart from the lay dress. Thus a Buddhist monk in the West is not too conspicuous provided that his robes are sufficiently sober in hue. But what of a bhikshu teaching in a Communist land? Sleepy old monks to keep a temple swept are not objected to, but what about a young and active preacher? Bhikshus venturing into countries in the Catholic stranglehold or those taking the Dharmain to Muslim lands—any such would find that robes are going to make him very conspicuous to intolerant authorities. What is it best for him to do—spread the Dharma quietly and unobtrusively or be expelled, or even to lose his life? A robe, while it does *distinguish* a bhikshu, does not *make* one, this the Lord says in the Dhammapada (verse 266). It is obvious that to work under difficult conditions as may be necessary some adaptations must be made.

Again, the Dharma would to this day have been confined to India and the tropics of South East Asia if monks had worn only the three robes prescribed in the Vinaya. A good proportion of bhikshus considered that compassion for suffering beings was more important than adhering to such a minor rule. Thus, the Dharma spread in Central and Eastern Asia. This adaptability, which has made such a success of the Dharma in the past, has now to be applied where necessary in the present.

Regarding the Dharma considered as written word, it will do no good to pontificate on what is and what is not Buddha-word. Such statements, politely called conservative orthodoxy, sound suspiciously similar to definitions made by the religions of dogma. Nor will a blind and uncritical acceptance of one system of

Abhidharma, as the ultimate and all-inclusive philosophy-psychology, give non-Buddhists over-much confidence in the Dharma. Positions such as these will not help the Dharma long continue. It *will* be aided by some new evaluations and commentaries on the Pāli Sutta Pitaka such as Dr. Malalasekera has recently suggested. Comparative studies between works canonical to different schools, and their relation to modern psychologies and philosophies, are also much needed.

For all these works Buddhists should have nothing but praise. If any fear such proposals they are ruled by rigidity, and with this dominating the mind will certainly not be able to appreciate or employ creative criticism. For many years scholarly criticism has been directed at the history of the churches and their dogmas, and in the course of researches many facts uncomfortable to church leaders and their flocks have come to light. That the same may happen in other dogmatic creeds is to be expected when they in turn are critically examined. The results of criticism are usually to expose the carefully hidden foundations on which legends and dogmas rest. Scholars are then accused of destroying the 'faith' of the laity.

Now Buddhists should have no such fears for whatever the critical and enquiring mind unearths it can do no harm to the basis of the Buddhadharma; no faith can here be undermined since Buddhist faith is bound up with wisdom, not dogmas. So complex, so intricate is the Dharma, that researches into it can only be fully successful by those who are themselves constantly applying Buddhadharma to their own lives and have thereby developed their own insight. Non-Buddhists investigating Buddhism are almost certain to blunder somewhere. It therefore behoves Buddhists to realize that they must provide their own scholars in this field, which can only profit the Dharma, and never lead to its destruction.

These are a few matters selected from a multitude, in which the perfection of skill-in-means is necessary if the Dharma is to be able not only to maintain itself, but to shed its beneficent light on ever-increasing circles of humanity.

3. This brings us to the third point—Dharmaduta work. In spreading the Dharma, bhikshus have a fine record: Indian monks have carried the Dharma to Egypt and Macedonia, Ceylon, Central Asia, Tibet and China; Tibetan teachers spread the message of peace in Mongolia and Siberia; Chinese bhikshus

took the Teaching to Japan and even got to Mexico, while from Ceylon the Theravāda spread far throughout South East Asian lands. None of this was done to 'convert the heathen' but rather with compassion for those floundering in their own ignorance. All this was the fruit of the Lord's exhortation to the first sixty monks (all of whom were arhats):

> 'Go ye, O bhikkhus, and wander forth for the gain of the many, for the welfare of the many, in compassion for the world, for the good, for the gain, for the welfare of gods and men. Proclaim, O bhikkhus, the Dhamma glorious, preach ye a life of holiness, perfect and pure.' (171)

There is no reason to suppose that all who in after ages were messengers of Dharma were also arhats, so there is no excuse here for the numerous learned but apparently inactive bhikshus of the present. Are bhikshus less compassionate now than formerly? Or just more lazy? Or less able to adapt Buddhadharma, applicable in every age, to the present time? Some thorough heart-searching is needed to answer these questions.

Whatever the reasons are, there seems less inclination to pioneer the Dharma in new fields than there was in the past. The fields are vast—India's millions of bhikshu-less Buddhists and those in Europe, many Buddhist centres in North America and the healthy shoots of Dharma in Australia. Africa and South America are barely touched, and hardly a bhikshu has been seen in Muslim lands, to say nothing of Soviet Russia and Eastern Europe.

To give but two small but significant instances showing lack of Dharmaduta spirit: there is now trouble in Burma because the hill-peoples have been converted to Christianity. This could easily have been avoided if a few bhikshus had been available to teach these peoples Buddhadharma—but monks, according to reports, did not like to leave the warm plains for the cool hills, nor, one suspects, the bountiful Burmese dāna for the harder life they would have to lead among the hill-tribes. Another case comes from Ceylon, where there appears to be a difficulty in attracting monks to go to the 'resettled areas' and there provide Dharma-instruction for the settlers—their old vihāras are, doubtless, more comfortable. . . . If such examples as these can occur within single countries, and those mentioned here have a majority

171. Vin Pit I, pp. 20–1. See also the Lohicca Sutta (DN XII), for the Buddha's attitude to preaching.

of Buddhists, then what hope is there for the world-wide propagation of the Dharma?

Dharmaduta is not only the concern of bhikshus, for without the support of the laity how can they do this work? Here again one sees the need of an educated laity awake to the necessity of beating the Drum of the Dharma in distant countries.

When laymen give unstinted support to such work, and when there are bhikshus of both the quantity and quality required, this will prove the most practical way of preserving the invaluable Teaching of Enlightenment. Buddhists must remember that 'attack is the best means of defence'. Buddhism is certainly under fire, to defend the Dharma, actively spread it!

This must also be done through properly translated texts. Buddhist scriptures exist in four main languages* and not a tithe of them are yet available in Western tongues let alone in Arabic, the African languages, etc. Many of the older translations are now unreliable, having been made by Western scholars, very few of whom were Buddhist, while most did their work isolated from the living Buddhist tradition; thus on two counts they failed to understand the true meaning. Some modern translations have the great advantage of being produced by Buddhists and so have gone beyond mere literalism and given authentic interpretations. The ideal translations are yet to come when the joint-translator system formerly employed in China and Tibet is established. Then Buddhists the world over will have translations produced by the fruitful collaboration of East and West. In these ways Buddhists will give ever more beings the chance to exclaim:

'And who, Lord, on hearing this doctrine of the Exalted One, would not be well-pleased, as if with a great joy. I also, who have now heard the doctrine of the Exalted One, am thus well-pleased, even as with a great joy. Most excellent, Lord, are the words of thy mouth, most excellent, just as if a man were to set up what was thrown down, or were to reveal that which was hidden away, or were to point out the right road to him who has gone astray, or were to bring a lamp into the darkness, so that those who have eyes could see external forms—just even so, Lord, has the truth been made known unto me, in many a figure by the Exalted One.' (172)

* Pāli, Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan, with a few texts also in Japanese, Mongolian and the extinct Central Asian languages.

172. DN Sutta 8, para. 23.

4. That unity is strength is a commonplace in many languages. In English 'united we stand' is followed by its opposite, 'divided we fall', a saying which applies to three levels of Buddhism.

On the lowest but nevertheless important level is the unity attained through organizations. In this respect, compared with Christians, Buddhists do not shine. There is a great need for Buddhist societies (*not* those existing merely on paper or, more tenuously still, only in the mind) but those which are active, hold lectures, discussions, meditation sessions, attend to the education of Buddhist children, or specialize on the publishing side—pamphlets, magazines, books, and encourage generally all Buddhist cultural activities. Where practicable, Buddhist newspapers and schools should be established. Buddhist publication societies devoted solely to disseminating reliable accounts of aspects of the Dharma (along the lines of the admirable institution in Ceylon) are much-needed. They should proclaim the Dharma from all Buddhist countries and in all the world languages. Organizations like these would provide a firm foundation for Buddhist unity.

On this level might also be mentioned the divisions which appear to be due to national customs and the most serious barrier of all, that of language.

Regarding the first, it is regrettable that the Dharma of the Buddha, which in truth transcends considerations of space and time, is all too often identified with particular national ways of doing things. A Ceylon monk's reaction to Nepali Buddhists' prostrations was to exclaim: 'Tell them how to worship *properly*.' 'Properly' here means 'according to the tradition of Ceylon'. At Buddha Gaya itself some Ceylon bhikkhus are quoted as having exclaimed about Tibetan Buddhists: 'Oh, we don't understand *their* religion.' As though it were not even Buddhism!

National characteristics, and even history, tend to be seriously divisive factors and this can easily be seen in the situation now obtaining at Buddha Gaya. Here, if anywhere, one might expect Buddhists to show their sense of unity at the very place of their Dharma's rediscovery. Sad to say, this is not so. However desirable an international Buddhist Council might be in this Holy Place, it just does not exist. This is not to say that there is much antagonism between the different Buddhist nations represented there. No, there is no antagonism, but there is no contact either, no interchange of ideas and not much understanding. The Thai monastery is a little bit of Thailand set down amidst Bihari

surroundings, the Burmese Rest-house keeps itself to its Burmese self, the Maha Bodhi Rest-house radiates a certain Sinhalese atmosphere, while little Tibet next door to it has even less contact with the others. Such provincialism at the very place of the Buddha's Enlightenment is distressing to say the least of it, showing how even monks can become attached to the ways of their homelands, fail to have contact with or understanding of their brother Buddhists and show a general weakness by lack of any concerted effort to teach Buddhism to the surrounding population.

Language is, admittedly, a great limiting factor, but with English fast becoming better known amongst many Buddhist nations, it will soon be a poor excuse for divisions which are really rooted in historical events (such as the Thai-Burmese wars), differences of custom (as the varying modes of worship), or in doctrine (for instance, the rather sharp contrast which is apparent between Theravāda and Mahāyāna Vajrayāna).

Much good may come from breaking down these barriers, by way of co-operation, understanding and finally perhaps from a fruitful interchange of methods of Buddhist practice.

There is need also of unity on a second level—that of the Saṅgha. Buddhist tradition, based upon and inclining towards freedom, favours spiritual development: no dogmatic authority exists to check it. The Buddha, asked by Ānanda to appoint his successor, said:

> 'It may be, Ānanda, that in some of you the thought may arise: "The word of the Master is ended, we have no teacher more." But it is not thus, Ānanda, that you should regard it. The Dhamma, and the Rules of the Order, which I have set forth and laid down for you all, let them, after I am gone, be the Teacher to you.' (173)

Clearly Buddhists stand in no danger of having a pope. Rather they err in the opposite direction and active formation of schools and sub-schools, always a characteristic of Buddhadharma, testifies to its spiritual versatility. This is very admirable in matters of spirit, but it has grave disadvantages organizationally. When in a single country one has three rival groups in the Saṅgha (not to speak of sub-groups), which are far from agreeing with each other, one realizes the difficulties in the way of Saṅgha unity. One does not recall that the Lord was ever

173. DN Sutta 16.

favourably impressed by the groups formed in His day.* If there is but little harmony between groups of the same tradition within a single country how can co-operation be established between all countries where a single tradition predominates, and if this is not possible when shall we see all the schools of all the countries actively supporting each other?

The Saṅgha with no sort of unity is weak as an organization and it is also the most vulnerable part of Buddhism. It is easily destroyed and when the continuity of training provided by it is broken much of value in the Buddhist tradition is lost. This effectively prevented the Dharma continuing in India after the Muslim invasions; Communists are also aware of this and after a few years of their domination they can eliminate completely the True Way. The disunity of the Saṅgha only makes it easier to attack and the conspicuousness of its members further contributes to its weakness under persecution. Buddhist schools which have best survived this (the Nying-ma-pa and Ch'an are examples) have sacrificed formal observance of rules, ritual practices and the possession of temples to the necessity of keeping the Dharma alive under difficult conditions. An 'underground' Saṅgha is something worth the thought of all Buddhists.

The vast numbers of monks common in all Buddhist countries also makes the Saṅgha an easy target for persecutors. This is more so when numbers of bhikshus are in the Saṅgha not so much for the Holy Life and the Goal at which it aims but because they have been put there by their parents, remain to enjoy an easy life and fill their time with idling, or activities unbecoming to monks, such as money-making and politics.

To effect an internal Saṅgha unity are needed more highly trained bhikshus leading a life of morality, well practised in meditation and possessing the faculty of insight. If the quality of bhikshus was raised to this standard there would be a far greater chance of understanding in the Buddhist world and a firm defence against hostile forces, for it is teachers who 'know for themselves' the Buddha's Truths who are the best aid for the Sāsana and though coming from divers schools they will understand each other.

The third unity is at the level of realization. It needs to be recognized by Buddhists that unity lies in the Way and its Fruits. The external differences are too much seen. But looking deeper one finds a unity of aim—the destruction of suffering for oneself

* See MN Sutta 48, 128, and Vin Pit., i, 341, 349 ff.

and others, and a unity of way since all schools agree that only within the Buddha's teachings is this found.* It is essential that many more Buddhists in every country realize this, which will hardly come about unless they are practising actively and opening the eye of inner understanding.

Here are some advantages of unity. With recognition of their importance must come a well-educated laity actively supporting Buddhist enterprises; another result would be a Saṅgha free from internal dissensions and co-ordinated in some way so that its valuable energies were utilized most economically; and lastly, Buddhists knowing of each other's traditions could for the enrichment of the Dharma exchange their thoughts and methods. When consolidated in these three ways, the Dharma would be well guarded against the onslaught of all dogmatic forces which stand ranged against it.

5. Buddhist tolerance is both gentle and tough. The gentleness results from the emphasis on loving kindness and compassion while the toughness or rather resilience is a product of the wisdom tradition. It seems that Buddhists tend too much towards gentleness and are therefore easily crushed, more resilience being needed to withstand domineering faiths and all kinds of persecutions. It is in the bamboo, having for Buddhists so much significance, that both aspects are seen. In storms of wind, rain and snow the bamboo bends—it seldom breaks. It bends low to the earth, but when the storm is over and the snow melted there, gracefully as ever, the bamboo sways aloft. Buddhadharma being flexible can adapt itself to most worldly storms. It can survive by the power of patience and the light of understanding which among its followers should keep alive the Teaching, even under crushing burdens. When peace and tolerance once again rule, there is the Dharma, gently but justly proclaiming the Only Way.

6. There is clearly a lack of true practice of their Dharma by Buddhists. Some indications of this have already been given and it is surely a valid conclusion that where ignorance is strong the standard of practice cannot go deep. But what is needed is not less practice but more of it, much more. The more the Dharma is practised, the clearer becomes the insight into its truths. With deepening insight all skilful methods—the books, recitations,

* See Additional References 15.

Sūtras, pūjas, formal meditations and finally even the Dharma itself—can be abandoned (must be abandoned in the sense of non-attachment, though they are quite generally continued after Enlightenment). This means that one's Dharma is securely in the heart and no longer linked to impermanent worldly things, such as beings, temples, societies and so forth. At this point, which is part of the message of the Dharma compared to a Raft, we recognize the similarity to Ch'an and Zen. It was certainly this ability to abandon all trappings that enabled the enlightened Ch'an Masters of the ninth century C.E. to weather the storms of persecution in China. Who could tell that the ragged countryman tramping along with a staff in his hand was, after all, an Enlightened Master? No one knows who composed the following verse, originally in Chinese:

> '*A special transmission outside the scriptures,*
> *Not depending upon the letter*
> *But pointing directly to the (enlightened) mind,*
> *And leading us to see into the (Dharma) Nature itself,*
> *Thereby making us attain Buddhahood.*' (174)

This is typical of the enlightened Ch'an attitude, it is only the Raft described in greater detail, it is the securest way of preserving the teaching for the future, since its foundations are constant practice and diamond insight.

Buddhists should not lament that this is an age of decay for Saddharma when nothing can be done: the Dharma's life is the sincerity of its practice and the depth of its realization. On *these* its endurance depends and its life is lengthened accordingly. Let us resolve that our Dharma shall be independent of worldly conditions, transformed to the immutable and secure Heart-Dharma!

174. Quoted in *A Manual of Zen Buddhism*.'

CONCLUDING REMARKS

It is said, perhaps by the optimists, that there is more tolerance in the world today than in former times. Is this true? In answer to this question both a negative and a positive reply can be given.

Hatred, pride and narrow-mindedness—all fed by ignorance—continue to drive men along the ways of intolerance. This will continue to exist just as long as ignorance rules the minds of men. For this reason the negative reply may be given. It is, of course, true that intolerance is not always of the same variety. Just now power is in the hands of politicians whose parties announce the 'true ways' to gloriously prosperous material states. Fascism and Communism have their holy books and their dogmas, a host of independent dictators at the heads of their parties declare this and that thing for the welfare of the people. But in such cases it is only for the welfare of those who agree: the others must suffer the usual penalties for the opposition of dogma.

Happily, it is also possible to affirm the truth in our assertion and this may be attributed to three factors. The first of these is education, which is responsible for a wider knowledge of other people, their countries, customs and religions. To give an example. At one time a Buddhist monk walking in the streets of any European city would have been a comic sight to the ignorant and an abominable heathen to educated 'religious' folk. Now it is different, for teaching by way of schools, radios, papers and foreign travel has acquainted people with some knowledge of Buddhism, and it then ceases to be 'queer', 'Eastern', 'idol-worship' or any of the other strange notions to which it is related by the ignorant mind. With more education, tolerance of others' ways becomes appreciation, even sympathy. This leads on to the second point. Increased tolerance has resulted from the decay in the power of priests over people. Secular education has been largely responsible for relaxing the iron grip of priestly power exercised by keeping the laity in ignorance. Dogmatic creeds have ever been unwilling to educate their followers, who must

blindly tag along asking no questions. Now this is changing, and one looks forward to a time when education and culture will make still more people question the authority of creeds, loosen their bondage and so increase peace and tolerance in the world.

For many years European thought has contained a humanistic tendency which becomes increasingly pronounced with the abandonment of old superstitious beliefs. Humanism says that man is important, that his life should be led happily, at peace with his fellow-men; life is not, it says, for the propitiation of some inscrutably erratic God. It is certain that men are less inclined to implore Divine Creators for uncertain mercies, rather they try to stand squarely upon their own feet. This is a step in the right direction, but, having cast off the burden of God, one has to have some powerful guiding principles. It is not enough merely to talk of loving one's fellow-men, one has to practise it as well, and this is where a method is necessary. The greatest weakness of humanism is that it fails to provide one, whereas Buddhadharma offers a whole range of equipment to subdue the enmity of hatred and convert it to wisdom. Hatred is a powerful emotion not so easily uprooted from the mind and a powerful remedy is necessary—hence the importance given to Maitrī (loving kindness) and its development. With a mind of loving kindness, all beings including men are dear. Has not humanism, which places man not God in the centre, similar aims? God-centred religions have proved, in history, inseparably connected to persecution. Only a religion placing man at the centre can be humane. This is found in Buddhadharma, the tolerance of which is based upon a balanced growth of wisdom and compassion. Hence the Dharma has made a great contribution to the history of toleration. A Western writer has enumerated several motives for the practice of our subject:

> 'The motives which induce a policy of toleration are various, such as mere weakness and inability to enforce prohibitory measures, lazy indifference, the desire to secure conciliation by concessions, the wisdom to perceive that "force is no remedy", the intellectual breadth and humility that shrinks from a claim to infallibility, the charity that endures the objectionable, respect for the right of private judgement.' (175)

This passage has neatly summed up a number of points made

175. 'Toleration', by W. F. Adeney, in Vol. 12 of the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*.

in the previous chapters. The first two motives given have nothing to do with Buddhist tolerance which has never relied upon force and never been the result of apathy or the *laissez-faire* attitude. The third mentioned might cover some of the rulers of states within and outside India where several religions, including Buddhism, have been practised. The reasons which follow might all be given by Buddhists who stress, particularly, wisdom, non-violence, humility, patience and a tolerant respect for the beliefs of others.

Buddhist tolerance is a unique kind, it is the true tolerance which regards the good of all in the light of understanding. It is a quality inextricably bound to the practice and realization of the Dharma, so much so that one finds no distinct word for it in Buddhist languages and therefore no insistence upon it as a separate factor.

In examining this facet called tolerance of the Jewel of the Dharma, one sees reflected many different doctrines—what treasures these are, what wealth of skilful means! It is the glory of Buddhism that it has spread love and wisdom wherever it went. It is the richness of Dharma that has brought to so many differing peoples a peaceful way of life. It is the incomparable splendour of the Buddha's message that it has with tolerance treated outsiders, tolerantly settled its internal disputes, and encouraged amongst all a spirit of harmony conducive to progress along the Path, until Nirvāna's highest bliss is won.

DEDICATION OF MERITS

If any have found benefit for themselves or help for others upon reading this book, then the writer's aims are fulfilled. He apologizes deeply to readers for his faulty presentation of this subject and can only hope that a little merit may have accrued through compiling these riches of the illumined Ones. If this is so, may that merit, however small, be entirely devoted to the welfare of all beings; may devas' hearts be unsnared from enjoyments and long guard the True Teachings; may men be turned from sensual attachments towards the practice of this SublimeWay; may Asuras and other beings of power refrain from fighting and be born amidst peace and harmony; may pretas cease hungering for the fulfilment of innumerable desires and enjoy contentment; may animals be released from the heavy load of delusion, developing intelligence and understanding; and may all hell-beings by terrors tormented and by strong hatred tortured, may all these cultivate the boundless heart of love and compassion.

'*May sentient beings gain happiness with its causes,*
Be parted from all grief with its causes,
Not become parted from the Happiness wherein no grief is,
And dwell in the condition of Equanimity.' (176)

176. Tibetan formula for Brahma-vihārās.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

I. GENERAL

1. 'It cannot be argued that inasmuch as there are other ways to Enlightenment than that taught by the Buddha, the disappearance of His Teaching from the earth is not equivalent to a temporary obscuration of the Path to Peace. For the Dharma is not a way among ways, but The Way. This fact we assert not out of sectarian bigotry, or dogmatic prejudice in favour of the Teaching which claims our own allegiance, but because the Dharma states with a precision and clarity which, in Christian lands, are considered the prerogatives of science rather than of religion, those universal laws in accordance with which the attainment of Enlightenment by a human being takes place, and, therefore, the conditions upon which it depends and the means by which it must be achieved. It is thus not just one more path to Nirvāna but the underlying principle, the rationale, of all paths. The disappearance of the Dharma means essentially the disappearance of the principal knowledge of the means to Enlightenment and not merely of any particular application of that means. Outside the Dharma it is impossible to go, for it presents in their most universal, and hence in their most individual aspect, those teachings which in other religions are more often found in fragmentary and distorted forms.'

A Survey of Buddhism, by Ven. Sangharakshita Sthavīra, (I.I.W.C., Bangalore).

2. 'Another important event which occurred (in the reign of Rama III of Thailand) was that the future King Mongkut entered the Order and remained a monk all the time his half-brother was on the throne. . . . The Prince chose to practise only according to the Buddha's Discourses and Discipline. This practice led to the formation of the Dhammayuttika sect, which still exists today. . . . .

When Mongkut ascended the throne as Rama IV, people expected that he would issue a royal decree ordering all monks to practise according to the new Dhammayuttika sect started by him. But the King was of the opinion that any religion depended on personal faith. Although as a monk he firmly believed that his brethren should practise only according to the Discourses and Discipline of the Buddha, as King he supported all sects and religions. . . . Monks of the two sects were treated equally all through the reign.'

Buddhist Monuments in Siam, by H.R.H. Prince Damrong Rajanubhab, Siam Society.

3. 'In whatsoever quarter the monks dwell in strife and uproar, given to disputes and wounding each other with the weapons of the tongue, it is unpleasant for me (the Buddha is speaking) even to think of such a quarter, much more unpleasant for me to go to it. I came to this conclusion in the matter: Surely these worthies have abandoned these three conditions and have made a habit of these other three conditions? What three conditions have they abandoned?

Dispassionate, benevolent and non-harming thinking. These are the three.

And of which three have they made a habit?

Sensual, malevolent and harmful thinking. . . .

But in whatsoever quarter the monks dwell in harmony and mutual courtesy, without wrangling but just as milk and water mix, regarding each other with the eye of affection, to such a quarter I am glad to go—not to speak of thinking about it.'

AN i, 274 (PTS)

4. ' "I have heard it said, Master Gotama, that Gotama the Recluse speaks thus: 'Alms should be given to me, not to others; to my followers, not to another's followers. . . .' "

"Those who say so, Vaccha, are not of my way of thinking. Moreover such misrepresent me by stating what is not true but falsehood." '

AN i, 160 (PTS)

5. 'Monks, when in a dispute, words are bandied back and

forth, with views held tenaciously, malicious minds, sulkiness and discontent . . . it may be expected that this will conduce to protracted, bitter, contentious strife and that monks will be unable to live at ease.'

AN i, 79 (PTS)

6. 'Householder, when thought is warped, bodily action, speech and mental action are also warped. . . .

Just as, housefather, when a peaked house is ill-thatched, the peak, the roof-beams are warped even so . . . is it in this case.'

AN i, 262 (PTS)

7. ' "But pray, Master Kaccana, what is the reason, what is the cause why recluses quarrel with recluses?"

"They do so because of their bondage and servitude to the lust of opinion, their greed for the lust of opinion, because they are devoured by (attached to) the lust of opinion." '

AN i, 66 (PTS)

8. 'Those monks who bar out both the letter and the spirit, by taking the discourses wrongly and interpreting them according to the letter (grammatical rules)—such are responsible for the loss of the many folk, for their discomfort, for the loss, discomfort and sorrow of devas and mankind.'

AN i, 69 (PTS)

9. 'Monks, both he who urges adherence to a doctrine and discipline that are wrongly expounded, and he who is thus exhorted, and he who thus urged walks according to that doctrine —all alike beget much demerit. What is the cause of that? It is the wrong exposition of doctrine (and the reverse with sound doctrine).'

AN i, 33 (PTS)

10. 'Who with ill-fashioned wit revileth them,
Sages of other sects, lust-freed, composed—
That man shall great demerit thus beget. . . .'

AN iii, 372 (PTS)

11. 'Put by the rod for all that lives,
Nor harm thou anyone thereof. . . .'
Sn 6.i.3 (PTS)

12. 'The noble Tathāgata, the Perfectly Awakened One, knows the sense, the dhamma, the proportion, the time and the assembly. Endowed with these five qualities the Tathāgata turns the transcendental Wheel of the Law according to Dhamma.'
AN V, 131 (trans. Ryukan Kimura) in *A Historical Study in the Meaning of the Terms Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna* (University of Calcutta).

13. 'Those who are lax in their thinking are saying that the essence of Taoism, Confucianism and Buddhism is identical, that the difference is only that of the entrance into the Way, and also that the three are comparable to the three legs of a tripod. Many Buddhist monks of the great Sung (dynasty) have quite often said this. If people say such things, Buddhism has already gone from them.'
'Shobogenzo' of Dogen, the Book of Buddhist Sūtras (*The Young East*).

14. '. . . that the Dhamma is not considered a unique revelation which alone contains the sole truth. The Buddhist definition of "the right philosophy of life" was comprehensive enough to contain, recognize and respect whatever truth other religions may have. According to the Buddhist conception of conversion, each person has to realize the truth for himself and rather than be hostile towards the ignorant, one has to be compassionate and helpful towards them. The use of threats or force or the utilization of economic and social incentives for conversion was evidently considered futile for such a purpose.'
Buddhism and the Race Question, by G. P. Malalasekera and K. N. Jayatilleke, UNESCO Publication.

15. 'This unity (characterized by "non-aggressiveness and tolerance" and transcending "the boundaries of Buddhist lands"), is certainly not the unity of orthodox beliefs, for Buddhism never

sought to inculcate such orthodoxies and curb the free spirit of enquiry in man. The verdict of one pilgrim traveller in Buddhist lands, Hiouen Tsang, was: "In agreement with the mysterious character of this doctrine the world has progressed to its higher destiny; but distant peoples coming to interpret the doctrine are not in agreement. The time of the Holy One (Lord Buddha) is remote from us, and so the sense of His doctrine is differently expounded. But as the taste of the fruit of different trees of the same kind is the same, so the principles of the schools as they now exist are not different." ' (*The Life of Hiouen Tsang*, translated by S. Beal.)

Buddhism and the Race Question, by G. P. Malalasekera and K. N. Jayatilleke, UNESCO Publication.

II. TOLERANCE IN THAILAND

That the Emperor Aśoka's exhortations were not peculiarities due to his time and country, but rather are the spirit of Buddhism prevailing at all times, may be seen from the following quotations dealing with the relationship of Buddhadharma and other religions in Thailand from a time 300 years ago to the present.

It is interesting to compare and contrast the tolerant Thailand of King Narai's reign with the bloodshed common in Europe at this time between different Christian factions. Can anyone imagine a Christian prince of the seventeenth century cordially inviting Buddhist Messengers of Dharma to his realm and then granting them complete freedom to propagate their religion, as did King Narai to the Christians? We have yet to see a Christian prince (or government) granting land and monies to a Buddhist who desires that others may know of his religion: the reverse, however, has often happened and Buddhist authorities, although now more wary due to the militant and even aggressive attitude of many Christian missionaries, continue to hold out the hand of friendship.

16. The Message of King Narai (1657–88) to Pope Innocent XI.

'By sending this mission We hope to give yet another testimonial of Our desire to cultivate Your friendship and to acquaint Your Holiness of Our constant purpose to support the Christian missionaries who have come to spread their Religion in this

country as well as the people who have embraced it. We would take this opportunity to assure Your Holiness that it shall be Our duty to look after them in such a manner that You shall not need to be anxious for their welfare.'

17. Privileges granted to the first missionaries in Siam (Apostolic Mission, 1685).

'The King of Siam (King Narai) will have a proclamation posted in every city of his realm authorizing both the Apostolic Missionaries to preach the Christian religion therein, also the people to use their own discretion in giving ear to them, with complete freedom from any possible interference from Governors or other officials. . . .'

16, 17 from the *Journal of the Siam Society*.

18. During the reign of King Rama IV (Mongkut)—see also Additional References 2—many missionaries came to Thailand. The King, who was well versed not only in Buddhadharma but also in the principal world religions, had many conversations with them though they always failed to convince him of the superiority of Christian belief. Still, he granted them land and permission to preach and propagate their religion. One such missionary desired to preach in Bangkok in a place where it would be easy to attract large audiences. Upon being asked whether he had a preference for any particular place, he replied that he wished to preach outside Wat Bovoranives. The King (who for many years had been a monk at this famous temple) invited him to preach as often as he liked in a pavilion *inside the temple compound*. It seems that the King was sure of two things: that his people would profit by knowing about another religion, and that they would have the wisdom to distinguish Saddharma from dogmatic beliefs.

19. Somdet Chao Phya Boromaha Sri Suriyawongs, speaking for the Throne (King Chulalongkorn), said in 1870:

'It is our will that our subjects of whatever race, nation or creed live freely and happily in the Kingdom, no man despising or molesting another on account of religious difference, or any other difference of opinion, custom, or manners.'

20. Edict of Religious Toleration, October 8th, 1878.

'That religious and civil duties do not come in conflict. That whoever wishes to embrace any religion after seeing that it is true and proper to be embraced, is allowed to do so without any restriction. That the responsibility for a right or wrong choice rests on the individual making the choice. That there is nothing in the laws and customs of Siam, nor in its foreign treaties, to throw any restriction on religious worship and service of anyone.'

21. 'Moreover, O Maitreya, by four causes the word of the Buddhas may be recognized. What four? O Maitreya, it refers to truth, not to untruth; to Dharma, not to adharma (not the Law); it lessens defilement, not increases it; it shows the advantages of Nirvāna, not indicating those of continued rebirth. These are the four.'

Sikshāsamuccaya of Śāntideva 15, quoting Adhyāśaya-saṁcodana Sūtra, trans. Bendall and Rouse (John Murray).

22. 'We also, venerable Lord, have reviled, have injured, have been wrathful against men who were in the Way of the Disciples (Śrāvakas) of the Blessed Buddhas, whether they were vessels meet or unmeet for the preaching of many Tathāgatas of old time, and have uttered calumny and defamation against them. Through that obstacle to merit, we have meted out to ourselves in the three hells, sufferings varied, keen, fierce and grievous. . . . All that remains of this obstacle to merit we desire to confess now in the presence of the Blessed One.'

Sikshāsamuccaya 68, quoting Kshitigarbha Sūtra.

23. 'I have never preached the Law (Dharma) in separate portions, one for the Disciples' Way, one for the Pratyeka Buddhas' Way, one for the Great Way. Therefore they are children of confusion who make divisions in this my Law: saying, "This belongs to the Disciples, that to the Pratyeka Buddhas, and that to the Bodhisattvas." Whoever says this rejects the Good Law (Saddharma) by describing it as being divided.'

Sikshāsamuccaya 95, quoting the Sarvadharmavaipulyasaṁgraha Sūtra.

24. 'We who are here present, O Lord, from this day forth, in the presence of the Tathāgata do make this solemn undertaking: We shall have broken faith with the Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Fully Enlightened One . . . if we show contempt to one who walks in the Way of the Disciples or the Pratyeka Buddhas, saying, We are more distinguished than they; if we fail to live with a humble mind, with a mind like that of the lowest outcast; if we exalt ourselves, or oppress our neighbour. . . .'

Sikshāsamuccaya 98, quoting the Adhyāśayasaṁcodana Sūtra.

25. 'Now in the holy Dharmasaṅgīti Sūtra, the point is clearly illustrated how no other activity is fitting for Bodhisattvas, except that which works for another's interest: "Every case of the Bodhisattva's bodily action, O Blessed One, or verbal action, or mental, as it goes on, is regarded from the point of view of his fellow-creatures, is under the constraining power of mighty compassion, has as its object to establish the weal of all creatures, as the result of taking thought for the weal and happiness of all beings. Then it is called: 'Thoughts for others' weal.' This is the attainment that I must attain, bringing as it does weal and happiness to all beings. . . ." '

Sikshāsamuccaya 117.

GLOSSARY OF NON-ENGLISH TERMS

Terms are usually given in their Sanskrit form (except the few Chinese etc. words), followed by the Pāli where this differs. Pāli is only listed first where the form of the word in this language has been used here, as in the section dealing with the Abhidhamma factors.

ABHIDHAMMA (Skt. abhidharma), Buddhist psychological philosophy intended as a basis for meditation practice.

ĀCARYA (acariya), teacher, preceptor.

AHIṀSA, non-hurting, non-violence; paraṁadharma, the ḣighest teaching (according to Jainism).

ANĀTMAN (anattā), the doctrine of ultimate selflessness. Spiritual growth depends on becoming progressively less self-centred. When no distinction is made between self and others since one knows the Self to be a delusion, then the highest spiritual goal is attained (Buddhahood).

ANITYA (aniccā), impermanence of all phenomena arising due to conditioning factors, or due to all phenomena being compounded of other states, conditions, etc.

ĀSAVA (āśrava), the four outflows—of sensual pleasure, of becoming, of ignorance and of false views.

ĀTMAN (atta), 'Soul' or 'Self' considered as an abiding and unchanging entity dwelling in or connected with each person or being.

AVATĀRA, incarnations of God descending periodically into this world according to the Hindu belief.

AVIDYĀ (avijjā), ignorance of the true nature of saṁsāra which brings upon us all our ḍuḥkḥa.

BHADANTA, used indirectly when speaking of a bhikshu. *Bhante*, the respectful term of direct address used when speaking to the Buddha or to a bhikshu.

BHAKTA, devotee of some teacher or god; one in whom faith is much developed even at the expense of wisdom.

BHIKSHU (bhikkhu), a celibate monastic follower of the Buddha. The best English translation, though inadequate, is 'monk'.

BHIKSHUNĪ (bhikkhunī), a Buddhist 'nun'.

BODHISATTVA (bodhisatta), a wisdom-being; one who is dedicated to become a Buddha; Gautama before His experience of Sambodhi at Buddha Gaya.

BRAHMAN, the Godhead of Hindu speculation.

CETASIKĀ (Skt—caitta-dharma), factors of mind, mental concomitants which in combination produce various types of mind.

CH'AN (Chinese), *Zen* (Japanese), a Buddhist school whose name is derived from the Sanskrit 'Dhyāna' (meaning concentrated absorption of mind); those who truly follow its teachings lead lives given over wholly to the practice of meditation.

CH'ING-TU (Chinese), see Shin.

DHARMA (Dhamma). When used in this book with a capital D it always refers to the Teaching or Law of the Buddha.

DHARMADŪTA (dhamma-), messenger of Dharma, either bhikshu or layman who teaches but does not *expect* to convert, nor of course does he force the Buddha's Teachings upon people; one who gives Dharma out of his compassion to any coming *voluntarily* to listen. To be clearly distinguished from other religions' missionaries.

DOŚA (dvesha), hatred, arises when greed is not satisfied; not wishing to come into contact with painful experiences.

DUḤKHA (dukkha), unsatisfactoriness experienced due to anitya, due to physical and psychological ills, and because of the inherently painful nature of the component parts of our being.

EHIPASSIKO, come-and-see. The Buddha's Teaching invites everyone to investigate for themselves whether they are true or not.

HĪNAYĀNA, the Lesser Vehicle or Way teaching the attainment of arahanthood; it has been suggested as a term to connote a state of mind in which rigidity, adherence to the letter of the scriptures, and scholarship without practice, are dominant. Of course, when used as a synonym for Theravāda it does not necessarily imply 'ridigity', etc., etc.

HIRI-OTTAPPA, the Guardians of the World—conscience and fear of blame (by others).

ISHVARA, various gods in Hinduism mentioned under the aspect of an Eternal Creator of the World.

KARMA (kamma), volitional or consciously intended action which by its force may come to fruit in future.

KARUNĀ, compassion with all beings; sympathy and sympathetic action to aid all beings in their sorrows. Opposed to harming.

KSHĀNTI (khanti), patience, endurance, forbearance, forgiveness.

LAMA (Tibetan), respected teacher, either monk or layman. Not synonymous with bhikshu.

LOBHA, greed, desire to experience or to possess.

MAHĀYĀNA, the Great Vehicle teaching the attainment of Buddahood; it has been suggested this term includes a mental attitude involving flexibility, skilful means and application of Dharma stemming from the cultivation of Wisdom and Compassion, but used as a synonym for Northern Buddhist schools it does not necessarily mean such an attitude.

MAITRĪ (mettā), loving kindness, altruistic and non-discriminative love for all beings. Opposed to hatred.

MĀNA, conceit, pride, haughtiness etc.

MĀRA, the personification of the unwholesome or evil in Buddhism.

MICCHĀDITTHIKA, one holding false views, an outsider to Buddhism.

MITHYĀ DRISHTI (micchā ditthi), false or wrong views; those not leading in the direction of Nirvāna; or incomplete spiritual instructions; those leading to the experience of increased duḥkha. *Micchāditthika*—one holding such views.

MOHA, dullness, delusion, inability to understand.

MUDITĀ, joy at others' happiness, opposed to envy.

MUDUTĀ, humility, flexibility, malleability.

NAMO BUDDHĀYA, etc., Praise or Homage to the Enlightened One, His Teaching (Dharma), and His Community of Noble Followers (Saṅgha), the Triratna or Triple Jewel of Buddha-dharma.

NEMBUTSU (Japanese), contraction of Namu Amida Butsu (Skt. Namo Amitabhāya Buddhāya—Praise to the Buddha of Infinite Light); here, the name of the school advocating the repetition of this formula, otherwise the name of the practice where Namu Amida Butsu is recited rhythmically as a type of meditation or thanksgiving.

NIRVĀNA (nibbāna), the ultimate goal of Buddhist striving, a suprapersonal and non-dual experience of voidness which is the end of all duḥkha and the highest happiness.

NYINGMAPA (Tibetan), the Old-style Ones. Followers of the most ancient Tantric lineage in Tibet founded by the Guru Rimpoche, Padma Sambhāva.

PĀLI, the language in which one collection of Buddhist scriptures are preserved among the Theravādins of Ceylon, Burma, etc,

PĀRAMITĀ, perfection. 6 or 10 of these in Sanskrit as follows: Dāna. śīla, kśānti, vīrya, samādhi, prajñā+pranidhāna, upāya-kauśalya, bala, jñāna; 10 in late Pāli works, these are: Dāna, sīla, nekkhama, paññā, viriya, khanti, sacca, adhitthāna, mettā, upekkhā. These are declared to be the qualities to be made perfect by a Bodhisattva before he can attain Buddhahood. (Dāna = giving; vīrya, viriya = energy; pranidhāna = vow; bala = strength; jñāna = practical application of transcendental knowledge; nekkhama = renunciation; sacca = truth; adhitthāna = resolution; upekkhā = equanimity).

PRAJÑĀ (paññā), wisdom, either worldly, derived from instruction, books and thinking, or transcendental, gained after the practice of meditation.

PRATITYA-SAMUTPĀDA (paticca-samuppāda), The Law of Conditioned Co-production fundamental to Buddhist philosophy.

PRATYĀYA (paccaya), condition, conditioning factor.

RISHI (isi), sage. In Hinduism, ascetics of great power but by Buddhist standards lacking in both wisdom and compassion.

RITSU or risshu (Japanese), the school emphasizing the maintenance of the code of discipline of bhikshus (vinaya) for spiritual attainment.

SADDHĀ (śraddhā), faith, devotion; in Buddhism this is never a blind quality but always balanced with wisdom.

SADDHARMA (saddhamma), the True Teaching of the Buddha founded upon His Complete Enlightenment.

SĀDHANA, spiritual practice.

SAMĀDHI, as a stage of the Path. This is training the mind in certain meditations to produce peaceful concentration; in others works, synonymous with final attainment (Buddhahood).

SAMATHA, training the mind in quietness and concentrated peace. Balanced by Vipassanā.

SAMBODHI, Perfect Enlightenment in which all ignorance, the root of our sufferings, is eradicated from the mind.

SAṀSĀRA, the world of birth-and-death, extending even to the gods and to those inhabiting states of woe.

SAMYAK DRISHTI (sammā ditthi), see definition Ch. 1, I (footnote).

SAṄGHA. Bhikshu(nī)-saṅgha means the Order of monks (or of nuns) considered collectively. Āryasaṅgha signifies all those disciples, monastic or lay, who have attained undeluded insight into the Truths taught by the Buddha.

SASSATAVĀDA (Skt. saśyata-), eternalism, the extreme view that there is an unchanging and eternal soul either passing from this life to heaven or hell (Christianity, Islam), or passing from life to life in different realms (Jainism, Hinduism). Its danger lies in the subtle pride retained by thinking of *my* Soul, Self, etc.

SATI (smriti), mindfulness, awareness, carefulness, awakeness, practised with regard to the body, feelings, states of mind and factors of mind.

SHĀSTRA, philosophic treatises of different schools in which the Way to Sambodhi is explained thoroughly.

SHIN, Jodo Shinshu (Japanese), Buddhist schools of China and Japan teaching reliance upon the Vows of Amitābha or Amida Buddha for salvation. Particular stress is laid upon faith.

SHINGON (Japanese), the Tantric school of Japan.

ŚĪLA (sīla), the Buddhist morality based upon the desire that all should enjoy happiness (since this is universally desired amongst beings) and therefore neither causing hurt to oneself nor to others.

SKANDHA (khandha), five groups, heaps or aggregates which compose what we think of as our 'self'—rūpa (form), vedanā (feeling), saṁjñā (perception), saṁskāra (habit-tendencies), and vijñāna (consciousness).

STHAVĪRA (thera), elder, senior bhikshu of more than ten years in the Saṅgha; a bhikshu following the teachings of the Theravāda (Sthavīravāda) school.

ŚUNYATĀ (suññatā), voidness of an essence or entity in all phenomena; in Hīnayāna the voidness of the conceptual Self is recognized, and in the Mahāyāna of this 'Self' and of all constituent phenomena (dharma).

SŪTRA (sutta), literally 'thread' and so a discourse of the Buddha to others, or an account of a discussion by the Buddha's disciples.

TANHĀ (Skt. trishnā), craving; longing for sensual pleasures, continued life, or for annihilation.

TANTRA, these are Buddhist scriptures giving instructions in the sādhanas of the Vajrayāna; *tantrika*, one who practises tantric meditations.

TATHĀGATA, 'one who has thus-come' (into the world out of compassion for beings), or 'thus-gone' (beyond the world of birth-and-death).

THERAVĀDA, the only Hīnayāna school now existing independently strong in Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, etc.

TILAKKHANA (Skt. trilakśana), the three characteristics or marks

of all phenomenal existence: anitya (q.v.), duḥkha (q.v.) and anātman (q.v.).

TRIYĀNA, the working whole formed from the renunciation and discipline of the Hīnayāna; the aspiration to become a Buddha and save all beings and practising the pāramitā for this end—the Mahāyāna; and the strenuous effort made in this life to realize that aim—the Vajrayāna.

UCCHEDAVĀDA (Skt. utcheda-), annihilationism, the extreme view of one life after which all is finished (Materialism, Communism). The danger lies in the attitude fostered of having a 'good time' now, it being of no importance what is done since there is no result in any following state of existence.

UPĀYA, skill-in-means; using the right method or preaching at the right time for the right person—in order to enlighten oneself or others.

VAJRAYĀNA, the Diamond Vehicle or Way, leading by the constant practice of tantric meditations to the attainment of Buddhahood in this life.

VIHĀRA, monastery dedicated to the Saṅgha, either that of bhikshus or of bhikshunīs.

VIPĀKA, the fruits or result of karma.

VIPAŚYANĀ (vipassanā), insight; clearly seeing into the nature of the world; experience of supermundane wisdom. Complementary to samatha and neither can be truly developed without the other.

YĀNA, Vehicle or Way. Three complementary yānas are taught in Buddhism, Hīna-, Mahā- and Vajrayāna.

ZEN, see Ch'an.

SOURCES OF QUOTATIONS

The writer is extremely grateful to all the following authors, translators and their works, without the aid of which the writing of this book would not have been possible. Each book mentioned below is preceded by the number found in brackets in the text following each quotation.

1, 2, 3 — *Mahayana Buddhism*, B. L. Suzuki, Allen & Unwin, London.

4, 12, 55, 86, 111, 155, 167 — *Essence of Buddhism*, P. L. Narasu, Thacker, Spink & Co., Bombay.

5, 45, 47, 48, 49, 91, 139, 142, 170 — *Dhammapada*, trans. Ven. Buddharakkhita Thera, Maha Bodhi Society, Bangalore.

6, 133, 162 — *A Short History of Buddhism*, Dr. E. Conze, Chetana Ltd., Bombay.

7, 120 — *The Religion of Burma*, Ven. Ānanda Metteyya, Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar.

8 — *Lankavatara Sūtra*, trans. D. T. Suzuki, Routledge, Kegan Paul Co., London.

9, 83 — *The Lamp of the Law*, trans. Ven. Theras Soma and Piyadassi, Buddhist Publication Society, Kandy, Ceylon (BPS).

10, 22, 25, 42 — *Anguttara Nikaya*, trans. various hands, Pāli Text Society, London (PTS).

11, 54 — *Psychological Attitude of Early Buddhist Philosophy*, Lama Govinda, Rider & Co., London.

13	*The Light of Asia*, Sir Edwin Arnold, many editions.
14, 138	*Living Thoughts of Gotama the Buddha*, trans. I. B. Horner, Cassell & Co., London.
15, 17, 29, 51, 53, 64, 67, 75, 76, 77, 81, 84, 93, 94, 95, 105, 118, 123, 146, 147, 159	*Majjhima Nikaya*, trans. I. B. Horner, PTS.
16, 41, 62	*Udanavarga*, trans. Rockhill, Luzac & Co., London.
18	*The Age of Adventure*, G. de Santillana, Mentor Books Ltd., New York.
19	*The Young East* (magazine).
20	*Discriminations between Buddhist and Hindu Tantra*, Chien Ming Chen, in MSS, by permission of the author.
21, 160, 171	*Vinaya Pitaka*, trans. I. B. Horner, PTS.
23, 70, 73, 74, 82, 148	*Visuddhi Magga* (*The Path of Purification*), trans. Ven. Ñānamoli Bhikkhu, R. Semage, Colombo.
24, 30, 32, 97	*Sutta Nipata*, trans. E. M. Hare, PTS.
26, 143	*Atthasalini*, trans. Maung Tin and Rhys Davids, PTS.
27, 28, 39	*Buddhist Dictionary*, Ven. Nyānatiloka Mahāthera, Island Hermitage Publications, Dodanduwa, Ceylon.
31, 32, 33	*The Buddha's Philosophy*, G. F. Allen, Allen & Unwin.
34, 35, 36, 37	*Indian Philosophy*, S. Radhakrishnan, Allen & Unwin.
38, 92, 122, 128, 169	*Maha Bodhi Journal* (magazine).
40	*Sūtra of 42 Sections*, trans. J. Blofeld (Chu Ch'an), Buddhist Society, London.

43, 52, 60, 61, 72	*Samyutta Nikaya*, trans. various hands, PTS.
44, 46	*Sūtra of Wei Lang (Hui Neng)*, trans. Wong Mou Lam, Luzac & Co.
50, 78, 88, 96, 99, 153	*Tibetan Yoga and Secret Doctrines*, Kazi Dawa Samdup and Evans-Wentz, Oxford University Press.
56	*Manual of Insight*, Ven. Ledi Sayadaw, BPS.
57, 58	*Essays in Zen Buddhism III*, D. T. Suzuki, Rider & Co.
59, 79, 107, 115	*Ch'an and Zen Teaching Series III*, Lu K'uan Yu, Rider & Co.
63, 131, 132, 151	*Astasahasrika Prajnaparamita Sūtra*, trans. Dr. E. Conze, Asiatic Society, Calcutta.
65, 174	*A Manual of Zen Buddhism*, D. T. Suzuki, Rider & Co.
66, 87, 145, 157	*Buddhist Texts*, ed. Dr. E. Conze, Bruno Cassirer, Oxford.
68, 90, 130, 134, 135	*Buddhist Scriptures*, trans. Dr. E. Conze, Penguin Books.
69, 137	*The Way of Mindfulness*, trans. Ven. Soma Mahāthera, Vajirārāma Publications, Colombo.
71	*Sūtra of Teachings left by the Buddha*, trans. K. Eidmann, distributed free from Japan.
80, 104, 117, 119	*Jewel Ornament of Liberation*, trans. Dr. H. V. Guenther, Rider & Co.
85, 152, 158	*A Letter Concerning Toleration*, John Locke, numerous editions.
89	*Systems of Buddhistic Thought*, Y. Sogen, Calcutta University Press.
98	*Jataka Stories*, ed. E. B. Cowell, PTS.

100, 149, 150	*Vimutti Magga* (*The Path of Liberation*), trans. Ven. Ehara, Soma and Khemin-da, Dr. D. R. D. Weerasuria, Colombo.
101, 121	*Selected Sayings from the Perfection of Wis-dom*, trans. Dr. E. Conze, BS, London.
102, 168	*Bodhicaryavatara*, trans. A. A. G. Bennet, in MSS. to be published in the Buddhist Library, by Chetana Ltd., Bombay.
103	*Saddharma Pundarika Sūtra*, trans. H. Kern, *Sacred Books of the East*, OUP.
106, 154, 172	*Digha Nikaya*, trans. T. W. Rhys Davids, PTS.
108, 109, 110, 113	*The Bodhisattva Doctrine*, Har Dayal, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., New York.
112	*The Quest of Enlightenment*, trans. E. J. Thomas, *Wisdom of the East*, John Murray, London.
114	*Buddhist Wisdom Books*, trans. Dr. E. Conze, Allen & Unwin.
116	*Long Discourses of the Buddha I–XVI*, trans. A. A. G. Bennet, Buddhist Library, Chetana Ltd.
124	*Edicts of Asoka*, trans. G. S. Murti and A. N. K. Aiyangar, this and other trans. used.
125, 161	*Buddhism and Five Centuries After*, S. Dutt, Luzac & Co.
126, 140	*The Buddha and the Gospel of Buddhism*, A. Coomaraswamy, Asia Publishing House, New Delhi.
127	*The Wisdom of Confucius*, Lin Yutang, Modern Library, New York.
129, 163	*The Lotus of the Wonderful Law*, trans. W. F. Soothill, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

136 *Some Sayings of the Buddha*, trans. F. L. Woodward, OUP.

141 *Early Buddhist Scriptures*, trans. E. J. Thomas, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.

144 *The Gospel of Buddhism*, ed. P. Carus, Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago.

164 *Japan and Buddhism*, Association of Buddha Jayanti, Tokyo.

165, 166 *Honen, The Buddhist Saint*, trans. Coates and Ishizuka, Nishi Hongwanji, Kyoto, Japan.

173 *The Life of the Buddha*, ed. E. H. Brewster, Routledge, Kegan Paul Co.

175 *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. Hastings.

Other books consulted include:

The Wisdom of Buddhism, ed. Christmas Humphreys, Michael Joseph Ltd., London.

Jatakamala of Aryasura, trans. H. Kern, *Sacred Books of the Buddhists*, OUP.

Ethics of Buddhism, S. Tachibana, Bauddha Sahityā Sābha, Colombo.

Buddhism answers the Marxist Challenge, F. S. Story, World Buddhist Mission, Burma.

The Lure of the Cross, S. Haldar, Maha Bodhi Society, Calcutta.

Islam, A. Guillaume, Penguin Books.

Life of St. Theresa, trans. J. M. Cohen, Penguin Books.

Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms, Soothill and Hodous, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.

Buddhist Thought in India, Dr. E. Conze, Allen & Unwin.

See also the books mentioned in the section of Additional References.

APPENDIX I

BUDDHIST STORIES RELATING TO TOLERANCE

A. GENERAL

THE KORANDIYA JĀTAKA

This interesting birth-story (brought to my notice by Ven. Aśvaghośa of Kathmandu, to whom thanks), is the only example found where a Buddhist is shown proselytizing in a mildly zealous manner and it is evident from the whole tone of the story that, even so, the Lord disapproved of this as did the other right-minded bhikshus. But He not only disapproved, He thought it downright stupid trying to force everyone to believe the same things—a message which Christian and Muslim missionaries might well take to heart. . . .

I. THE STORY OF THE PRESENT

The Master told this story when he was living in the monastery given by Anāthapindada in the Jeta Grove, about the Captain of the Dharma, Venerable Śāriputra. Not long after his ordination, the Elder had been in the habit of sitting at the cross-roads, and to everyone who approached he would say, 'Accept the Precepts!' (pañca śīla).

(These are always preceded by going for Refuge to the Triple Gem, thus the Venerable One was forcing not only the Buddhist code of moral observance but also the Refuges, on others. This he did from his own great conviction that his Teacher was right, and so tried to make everyone followers of the Buddha.)

Many passed that way who would not voluntarily have taken

either the Śarana or Śīla but who, out of respect to the bhikshu, repeated these after him. Some were fishermen and deer-hunters who could not from the nature of their occupations possibly keep these precepts but they dared not interrupt the Venerable Śāriputra while he was discoursing to them. They therefore accepted the precepts but had neither the intention nor possibility of practising them and each carried on with his usual occupation, disregarding, of course, the advice and obligations thrust upon them. . . .

At this, Śāriputra decided to complain to other bhikshus truly established in faith, saying, 'Friends, these men have received the precepts in my presence, and yet they are not observing them.' Those monks then said to him: 'Bhante, you gave them the precepts against their will and they, not daring to interrupt your sermon, had to accept them. Therefore, in future please do not give these precepts under such conditions.'

But the Ven. Śāriputra was displeased with this advice for had he not tried zealously to spread Saddharma?

When his displeasure became known by the monks, they organized a Dharma-meeting to discuss this matter of the Venerable One's conduct. It was said during this conference, 'Friends, we hear that the Elder Śāriputra administers the precepts to every person he catches sight of. . . .'

As frequently happened, the Lord came at this juncture to the place where the bhikshus were discussing and asked what was the subject of their conversation. Having told Him the reason for their Dharma-meeting, He said to them, 'Not only nowadays but also in former times he used to administer the precepts freely and to those who did not ask for them.' Then He related the story of olden times:

2. THE STORY OF THE PAST

There was once a religious teacher who was very anxious that all should follow *his* way and *his* precepts. He tried to proselytize among all the people with whom he came in contact, becoming, as a result, widely known for this fanatical tendency. He had a disciple called Korandiya whom he used to send to all the religious and philosophical meetings as a sort of spy. Korandiya had then to listen well to what was said and then to report all this to his teacher. After one such errand, feeling tired of continually spying, the pupil climbed to the top of a hill and started to roll boulders and throw stones and earth down to the bottom. This

strange behaviour was quickly reported to his teacher, who, fearing that his disciple's mind might be deranged, came quickly and in person. He enquired of Korandiya what he was doing and the reason for his rock-throwing activities. In reply the pupil held out his hand, saying that he was levelling all the earth to the smoothness of his palm. 'But,' said his master, 'you can never do that in the way you are carrying on! A single man cannot flatten the whole earth!'

'Neither can you convert everyone to your opinion and force them to follow your precepts, nor level all those thinking differently to believe the same thing.' In this way Korandiya taught his teacher.

Then the Lord showed the connection with the present by saying, 'At that time, I was Korandiya and Śāriputra was the teacher.'

3. FROM THE LIFE OF BHADANTA ĀRYADEVA

In the days of Āryadeva, many kings of South India were followers of the non-Buddhist sects. He, therefore, intended to convert them. Some time after, he saw that a king was collecting sentinels to guard his palace. As soon as he became aware of the fact, he offered himself as one of the candidates for the post and was thereafter employed by the king. He did his duty to the best of his ability and after a while he became the leader of the king's favourite and faithful troops. Then he asked the king for permission to discuss with outsiders the following subjects in his presence:

1. The Buddha is the greatest of all sages.
2. Buddhadharma is the best of all religions.
3. The Buddhist Saṅgha is the best of all religious communities.

The king allowed him to collect all the sectarian teachers. Those with false views came in crowds from all quarters to discuss or to witness the discussion. But no one could refute his arguments, and as a consequence all of them became his disciples, according to the conditions governing such contests, shaving off their hair and becoming bhikshus. Unfortunately, this victory was the cause of his death. A young micchāditthika disciple, enraged at his teacher's defeat, said to himself, 'Though you have conquered with your mouth, I shall be victor with my sword.' And he waited for a fit opportunity to carry out his murderous intention.

One day, Deva was teaching as usual the doctrine of Śunyatā

(the voidness of all 'things'), and was refuting various False Views before his disciples in a lonely part of the forest. When he was taking a walk at the resting time, having arisen from his meditation seat, his disciples meanwhile wandering about or meditating under the trees here and there, suddenly the malcontent sprang from his hiding place. With his sword he ripped open the Venerable Deva's belly, and cried, 'You have conquered my teacher with your knowledge and now I conquer you with my sword.'

The Venerable One, in spite of the bowels bursting from his belly, and his nearness to life's end, quietly warned the foolish assassin. 'O murderer, here are my three robes and my bowl on this seat. Take them, making your escape by the mountain road as quickly as you can. Do not go by the usual road, because those of my disciples not yet enlightened, if they see you, will pursue and capture you after which you will be gaoled and sentenced to death by the judge. You have not got the right idea of human life; therefore, you will be sorry about your body when you are sent to be executed. But mind and body (nāma-rūpa) are the root of the greatest trouble. I feel great pity seeing so many people attached to their bodies for which it is unwise to have attachment. Through their erroneous views they do not even feel sorrow when they should. And so I feel deep regret at seeing you sow the seed of a painful karma, having been deluded and burned by the poisonous fire of the mind of hatred.'

Then the murderer, hearing the Venerable Deva's words, wept aloud and asked him for instruction in the doctrine. In reply, the great teacher said:

'Reflect well, everything is unrestrictedness. There is no Dharma which is to be taught, nor any man who teaches—this is according to ultimate truth. There is no subject or object; everything is void. He who does not understand this Dharma is deluded by his mad mind. Then you should cultivate such recollections as these: Here am I, there is another, neither like pain, both enjoy pleasure. All pain and pleasure depend upon attachment. No pain arises without this dependence. There is also no pleasure without pain.'

After a little while, a disciple came and wailed aloud upon seeing his teacher's sad condition: whereupon other disciples came running from various quarters. They who had not attained Enlightenment cried out: 'Where is the brutal man? Who is the murderer of our teacher?' Some fell down on the

ground, some fainted, some appeared insane with grief, while others ran in search of the killer. Seeing all this, the Venerable One was able to teach them thus before he died: 'Everything is unrestrictedness. Mark well the true meaning of all Dharmas. Where is oppression and cruelty? Who is to be stabbed or cut down? If you understand rightly the essence of all the Dharmas, there is no object which is to be killed, nor subject which kills. Then who is a friend and who an enemy? Who is the murderer? Who is the victim? You are crying on account of the delusion springing from erroneous views. You ought to reflect upon this teaching carefully.'

(From Book VI of Fu-fa-tsang-yin-yuen-kuan, translated into Chinese by Ki-kia-ya and adapted from the English of Y. Sogen.

* * *

B. BUDDHISTS AS FANATICS

According to Western definitions of the term 'fanatic', it should be impossible to apply this to Buddhists. One thinks of fanatics, whether blind or low-browed, easily swayed en masse by priest and preacher; or the intellectual fanatic clutching at some straw to save his unbalanced reason. Neither types of persons are typical results of Buddhist culture, so how will Buddhists be fanatics? Some light is thrown on this matter by an experience of the writer which may be of some interest.

A young ex-Rāmakrishna brahmacāri had the noble aspiration to become a bhikshu and with that purpose journeyed up from the plains to the hills. Before taking bhikshu ordination, however, it is very necessary first to be wholeheartedly a *Buddhist*. He had undoubtedly a deep regard for the Buddha but this in the rather vague and bhaktic way which is common among Hindus. The Buddha in India is generally respected without any knowledge of His Teachings; that is, the Dharma is divorced from its source and the Enlightened One worshipped (at best) as an incarnation of Vishnu. This particular young man knew more than most for he had read the Dhammapada, which, he said, is the book equivalent in Buddhism to the Bhagavad Gīta of the Hindus, a commonly accepted valuation by Hindus which unbiassed study would hardly corroborate. It seems that the Dhammapada's

words had not sunk into his mind so deeply, as may be seen from what follows.

He was anxious to learn—a good thing. So the pūja, which twice a day is held in the little shrine here, was explained to him. He did not object to the explanation of, 'Natthi me saranaṁ aññaṁ' (see Ch. 1, II, A5), perhaps because he had not realized fully the implications of going for *sole* Refuge to the Triratna. With the few words given on the meaning of, 'Bahu ve saranaṁ yanti . . .' (Dhp 188), he seemed quite in agreement: an agreement on both these verses which shows perhaps how widely the head may be separated from the heart.

A greater disturbance to his settled ideas was given when, after reading a previous book of the writer (*The Buddha's Middle Way*), he discovered that contrary to the usual Hindu notions, the Buddha was not one who had said nothing about God, he was not an agnostic! (A Buddha can hardly be one who does not know!) The Buddha is truly the greatest 'One-who-knows' (gnostic), for He experienced Anuttara Samyak Sambodhi after which no trace is left of dark ignorance. When he chose to keep silent, this was not because He did not know, as some scholars have tried to make out, but because answers to the questions asked Him on these occasions could not be of any spiritual benefit to those enquiring. On the subject of Creator Gods, the Buddha made some very forthright pronouncements and besides calling the belief in such a Supreme Being a False View, there are several discourses where the poor 'Creator' is shown, with mild ironical humour, to be the subject of his own delusions (see Kevaddha Suttanta—DN, and Bakabrahmasutta—MN).

Our young friend had considerable difficulty in understanding such an atheistic notion which hardly fits very well with the current Hindu ideas ,that all religions teach the same thing and are equally true. The Buddha demands a precision of thought, vague woolliness being regarded as a hindrance to understanding, and the Exalted One was not just another of those old Hindu rishis, an old man benevolently sitting rapt in meditation and surrounded by adoring disciples: some such ideas as these may have begun to dawn on him.

It follows from the general Indian view of the sameness of religions that all should be equally respected. One day, returning to our vihāra, the brahmacāri and the writer were walking along a road leading past a Durga temple. The former asked what sort of temple it was, and on being told, proposed to go in and pay his

respects to the goddess and to the swāmi in charge. No doubt a very pious impulse. However, the latter pointed out that on no account would he enter such a place as animals were frequently sacrificed to the deity, let alone worship there as he had taken Refuge in the Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, and regarded these as the highest possible Refuges and all-embracing in their scope. The brahmacāri had some difficulty again, first in seeing that a place where hiṁsa (violence) is used in worship could only be abhorrent to Buddhists, who respect a code of morality based on the opposite principle—ahiṁsa. Secondly, with regard to the Refuges which are 'secure' and 'highest' simply because by practice of the Buddha's Teachings one may prove them so. Refuge-taking in Durga is simply to be avoided since based upon violence, superstition and an inability to prove in any way that such a refuge could possibly be effective and spiritually helpful.

As the writer was obviously not to be swayed by contrary arguments, his companion lagged behind rather as he passed this 'holy' place, and though not actually observed to do so, probably paid his respects with folded hands from the road.

When he had caught up again, he expostulated, 'Four hundred million Hindus worship this goddess,' for he undoubtedly thought that walking past without any salutation was irreverent. In reply, he got a hard truth: 'Most people are fools.' So that he would not regard this as an attack on the Hindu religion—which certainly was not intended—a second statement followed to amplify the first: 'And so too are most Buddhists.' It is legitimate from the Buddhist standpoint to call anyone a fool who allows his actions to be swayed by greed, hate and delusion, who, in other words, is a worldling. It was further explained that this condition obtained among men of every religion. The only truly wise are the Āryans (Noble Ones) who act from motives entirely of non-greed, non-hatred and non-delusion (or wisdom).

Nearer to our vihāra, another discussion started when he accused Buddhists of being 'fanatical'. The writer was surprised for he had never thought of tolerant Buddhists in this way. Interested, he asked: 'In what way are Buddhists given to fanaticism? We have not killed others of our religion as heretics, we have never forcibly converted any peoples, there are no "Holy Wars" in our history, no burnings at the stake, no tortures. . . .' What the brahmacāri objected to turned out to be just this: that Buddhists firmly defend their own standpoint (Samyak Drishti). They say that it constitutes the one reliable way to go beyond

saṁsāra. They refuse to admit that all religions are the same or of equal spiritual worth. They reject such undiscriminating ideas as one might a pulpy and flavourless mush of pumpkin curry. Such was the substance (though not the words) of his objection.

Buddhists, in other words, are fanatics because they believe unshakably that they are right (they differ from other religions in that they have not forced this conviction on others, since they also understand the truths contained in those other faiths).

By now, the brahmacāri's Hindu saṁskāras were thoroughly jangled and it needed but one more instance of Buddhist firmness to decide his future course. He came up against this in a passage from among the Buddha's last words (quoted No. 141). The Buddha proclaims there quite unmistakably that among outsiders there are no Āryans—a term which must be fully understood in its Buddhist connotation. The Lord did not say that there were no 'saints' in other religions, for this is a much vaguer term without the precision attaching to the Buddhist definition of Ārya.

This settled matters. Not finding us particularly in agreement with the all-is-oneist sentiments of his former master, Rāmakrishna, and the rigour of our insistence upon Samyak Drishti, the brahmacāri quietly disappeared one day. . . .

So near but so far from Saddharma—how sad!

* * *

C. 'BY LOVE ALONE, HATRED CEASES'

(For this incident the author is indebted to a Vietnamese who wishes to remain anonymous.)

In 1956, when the revival of Buddhism in Viet-nam was flourishing, the Buddhist Association of one of the villages of the Hānha District, Quang Nam Province, was established. All the Buddhists of this area came together and built one pagoda to house their own shrine and for their ceremonies.

One day, they staged a procession carrying the Buddha image from the old pagoda to the new one. On the way, the procession was stopped by a group of Catholics. They maintained that the Buddha image did not belong exclusively to the Buddhists but to them as well, because before their recent conversion they had offered money for its casting. For the sake of 'justice', they wanted

the image to be cut in half and one part given to them as their share: The Buddhists requested them not to disturb the procession but they did not heed them.

When the procession moved on, the Catholics fell upon the carrying-chair to try to get the image. At such shamefully violent action, the Buddhists had to defend the figure of their Teacher. Many of them were injured before the police intervened. As a result, the Catholic ringleader was imprisoned for three years and some of the Christian participants were even sentenced to life-imprisonment by the Court of Quang Nam Province.

But after learning of the Court's severity, the Buddhist Association of Hānha District pleaded for their release.

* * *

D. STORIES TOLD BY BHADANTA BUDDHARAKKHITA THERA OF BANGALORE

A few years ago, when I was in Burma, I visited the Shan States of that country where the whole population are very staunch Buddhists. I met the king of one of these states and he related to me the history of a church-like building which could be seen in his chief town:

When he had been a young man, he had travelled in Western lands and returned to his little country full of new ideas. He was not at all prejudiced about Christianity though he, like his people, firmly followed the teachings of the Buddha. Therefore, when a Protestant missionary approached him asking for land to build a church and permission to preach, the king not only gladly consented but gave the missionary all the materials for the church construction and paid for the labour himself.

So the little church, built by the Buddhists, rose among a land of pagodas. The missionary, feeling sure of converting many persons after such friendly co-operation (he mistook Buddhist open-mindedness for a desire to be converted), started his mission work as soon as the church was finished and he had learned some of the people's language.

At the opening service, the church was packed, for all were curious to know what the new doctrine taught. No doubt the missionary's hopes were very high indeed. However, it soon became apparent that while people were interested to know about

Christian doctrine, nobody wanted to be converted: for, said one person to another, he does not believe in Kamma, Paticca-samuppada or Rebirth—so what sort of religion can that be?

In the end, those who came to church to hear the good missionary were fewer and fewer, though even then he did not despair and lingered on in that land, frequently entertained and well supported by the king.

The latter said that after many years, having converted no one at all, the missionary, tired of his fruitless labours, had to return to England. The building, explained the king, now serves a really useful purpose—it is now a school.

In Burma in the 1930's, there were some riots between Muslims and Buddhists, one reason for which was that the former were marrying Buddhist girls and then forcing them to become Muslim.

During this violence, many Muslims sought for safety until the riots died down. Many of them fled into Buddhist monasteries and were protected by the monks there. They were fed from the surplus food collected by the monks on their alms-rounds and given shelter and anything else which the monastery could provide.

Although the monks could easily have brought some pressure to bear on these poor Muslims to make them Buddhists, they did not do so, respecting the religion of the Muslims even if they did not agree with it.

APPENDIX II

THE COMPASSIONATE CHARACTER OF BUDDHAS, BODHISATTVAS AND DISCIPLES

The aim of this appendix is to stress particularly how important compassion has been to all schools of the Dharma and how all, whether Disciples, Bodhisattvas or the Buddhas themselves, have actively practised it. The character of this Dharma with its pronounced emphasis on non-hurting and tolerance is largely bound up with the numerous occasions on which compassion was enjoined. . . .

A. COMPASSION OF DISCIPLES

'But if ill-will or the desire to hurt others should stir in your mind, purify it again with its opposite, which will act on it like a wishing jewel on muddied water. Friendliness and compassionateness are, you should know, their antidotes; for they are for ever opposed to hatred as light is to darkness. A man who, although he has learnt to abstain from overt immoral acts, still persists in nursing ill-will, harms himself by throwing dirt over himself, like an elephant after his bath. For a holy man forms a tender estimate of the true condition of mortal beings, and how should he want to inflict further suffering on them when they are already suffering enough from disease, death, old age and so on? With his malevolent mind a man may cause damage to others, or he may not; in any case his own malevolent mind will be forthwith burned up. Therefore you should strive to think of all that lives with friendliness and compassion, and not with ill-will and a desire to hurt. For whatever a man thinks about

continually, to that his mind becomes inclined by force of habit. Abandoning what is unwholesome, you therefore ought to ponder what is wholesome; for that will bring you advantages in this world and help you win the highest goal. For unwholesome thoughts will grow when nursed in the heart, and breed misfortunes for yourself and others alike. They not only bring calamities to oneself by obstructing the way to supreme beatitude, but they also ruin the affection of others, because one ceases to be worthy of it.'

(Saundarananda Kāvya of Aśvaghośa, trans. Dr. E. Conze.)

* * *

B. COMPASSION OF BODHISATTVAS

1. 'Those who are afraid of Saṁsāra and seek their own advantage and happiness in salvation are inferior to those aspirants to Buddhahood, who rejoice at their rebirth, for it gives them an opportunity to do good to others. Those who feel only for themselves may enter Nirvāna, but the aspirant to Buddhahood who feels for the sufferings of his fellow-creatures as though they were his own, how can *he* bear the thought of leaving his fellow-creatures behind, while he himself is making for salvation and reposing in the calm of Nirvāna? Nirvāna, in truth, consists in rejoicing in others being made happy, and Saṁsāra means them not feeling happy. Whosoever feels a universal love for his fellow-creatures will rejoice in conferring bliss on them and doing so (is called) attaining Nirvāna.'

(Mahāpuruśa Śāstra of Āryadeva; Nanjio Cat. No. 113, trans. Y. Sogen.)

2. 'Sons of the Buddha neither kill any beings themselves, cause others to kill, nor rejoice at killing, not in thought, word, nor deed! A Bodhisattva is to have mercy.

Sons of the Buddha are not to use false words, nor cause others to do so, because the Bodhisattva uses right words and he, by good example, helps others to use right words and right thoughts.

Sons of the Buddha do not speak of others' sins, nor let others do so, whether they be the misdeeds of bhikshus, bhikshunīs or laymen. A Bodhisattva should profess mercy for those without the Way, for those of the Two Vehicles (of the Disciples and the Solitary Buddhas), however much they may speak ill of the Great

Vehicle, he should be filled with mercy that they may come to understanding and attain faith.

Sons of the Buddha neither get angry nor cause others to get angry; always merciful to everyone, they do not quarrel, nor hesitate to accept apologies.

Ye sons of the Buddha: arouse always a mind of great mercy. Entering castles, houses, and such, urge all sentient beings to accept the three refuges and the ten rules of training. On seeing animals, think and say to them: ye animals, arouse the Bodhicitta. Moreover, wherever a Bodhisattva enters, he urges all beings to arouse this Bodhicitta. To fail to develop this mind of great mercy is not to be a true Bodhisattva.

Ye sons of the Buddha: by teaching you should arouse the mind of great mercy. . . .'

(Synopsis of the Sūtra of Brahma's Net of the Bodhisattva Precepts, paragraphs 5, 8, 10, 13, 65, 66, trans. P. K. Eidmann.)

3. 'The Bodhisattva's great compassion is awakened in ten ways; when he sees beings without a refuge, when he sees them led into a wicked way, when he observes them poor and without a stock or merit, when he sees them sleeping in the midst of Saṁsāra, when he sees them practising evil, when he sees them bound by desire, when he sees them drowning in the ocean of Saṁsāra, when he sees them suffering incurable diseases, when he sees them showing no ambition to do good, and when he sees them altogether going astray from the Dharma of all Buddhas.'

(Avataṁsaka Sūtra, trans. B. L. Suzuki.)

4. 'Purnamaitrayāniputra asks Śāriputra: "Should the Bodhisattva pay respect only to other Bodhisattvas and not to all beings generally?"

Śāriputra answers: "The Bodhisattva should respect all beings just as much as he does the Tathāgata. He should respect all the Bodhisattvas and all sentient beings without making any distinction between them. For it is for the Bodhisattva to cultivate towards all beings the feeling of humility and reverence and not to look upon them with arrogance. He should in fact revere them with the same feeling of self-abnegation as he does the Tathāgatas.

The Bodhisattva is to think in this wise: When I attain enlightenment I will instruct all sentient beings in the essence of the Dharma in order to make them cut off their evil passions and

realize Nirvāna, or attain enlightenment and rest in peace and happiness, or become fully emancipated from the pain of the evil paths.

The Bodhisattva should thus awaken a great compassionate feeling towards all beings and keep his mind completely free from arrogance and self-conceit, and let him feel in this wise: I will practise all the skilful means (upāya) in order to make all sentient beings realize that which is the foremost in themselves, i.e. their Buddha-nature (buddhatā). By realizing this they all become Buddhas, and I will by virtue of the skilful means lead them to this final realization which entitles them to the rank of King of Dharma. The Dharmarāja is the highest and most honourable position, for here one becomes master of all things (dharma).

Therefore let the Bodhisattva respect all sentient beings, let his compassionate feeling pervade all around, irrespective of its objects; for the Dharmakāya of the Tathāgata pervades all things.'' '

(Mahāprajñāpāramitā Sūtra, Ch. 12, Fasc. 387, trans. Dr. D. T. Suzuki.)

5. 'Subhuti: "Doers of what is hard are the Bodhisattvas who have set out to win full enlightenment. Thanks to the effect which the practice of the six perfections has on them they do not wish to attain release in a private Nirvāna of their own. They survey the highly painful world of beings, they want to win full enlightenment, and yet they do not tremble at birth-and-death."

The Lord: "So it is, Subhuti. Doers of what is hard are the Bodhisattvas who have set out for the benefit and happiness of the world, out of pity for it. 'We will become a shelter for the world, a refuge, the place of rest, the final relief, islands, lights and leaders of the world. We will win full enlightenment, and become the resort of the world'—with these words they make a vigorous effort to win full enlightenment.

How then do Bodhisattvas, awoken to full enlightenment, become the world's shelter? They protect from all the sufferings which belong to birth-and-death, they struggle and make efforts to rid the world of them.

How do they become the world's refuge? They set free from birth, decay, illness, death, sorrow, lamentation, pain, sadness and despair those beings who are doomed to undergo these conditions.'' '

(Aśtasahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra XV, 293 f, trans. Dr. E. Conze.)

6. 'The Lord: "Subhuti, that son or daughter of good family who, as a Bodhisattva, even for a single day remains attentive to the perfection of wisdom, begets a great heap of merit. For, as he goes on dwelling day and night in those mental activities, he becomes more and more worthy of the gifts bestowed on him by all beings. Because no other being has a mind so full of friendliness as he has, except for the Buddhas, the Lords. And the Tathāgatas, of course, are matchless, unequalled, endowed with inconceivable dharmas.

How then does that son or daughter of good family at first aspire to that merit? He becomes endowed with that kind of wise insight which allows him to see all beings as on the way to their slaughter. Great compassion thereby takes hold of him. With his heavenly eye he surveys countless beings, and what he sees fills him with great agitation: so many carry the burden of a karma which will soon be punished in the hells, others have acquired unfortunate rebirths, which keep them away from the Buddha and His teachings, others are doomed soon to be killed, or they are enveloped in the net of false views, or fail to find the path, while others who had gained a rebirth favourable to their emancipation have lost it again.

And he radiates great friendliness and compassion over all those beings, and gives his attention to them, thinking: 'I shall become a saviour to all those beings, I shall release them from all their sufferings.' " '

(Aśtasahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra XXII, 402 f, trans. Dr. E. Conze.)

7. "The Bodhisattva thinks: "May I be the means of healing the sick, their physician and nurse, till the time when sickness no longer exists.

May I destroy the torments of hunger and thirst with rains of food and water, and in the aeons of famine intervening, may I become the water and food!

To the wandering mendicants and to all living beings may I be the place where is set down food; in all places and on all occasions may I be the accepted resting-place!

My personality throughout my existences, my possessions

and my merit in all three ways (past, present and future), I give up without regard to myself for the benefit of all beings.

To give up everything is Nirvāna, and my mind's aim is Nirvāna. If I must give up everything, it is best given to all living beings.

I wish to be a protector for those who are unprotected, the leader of a caravan of travellers, a boat, a bridge to carry those across to the opposite bank,

A lamp for those who need a lamp, a bed for those who need a bed, a slave for all beings who need a slave.

To living beings may I be the Thought-Gem fulfilling every wish, the Wonder-Pitcher, the Magical Knowledge, the Healing Herb, the Kalpa Wonder-Tree, the Cow of Abundant Supply!

Just as the earth and (other) elements are serviceable in many ways to the infinite number of beings inhabiting limitless space,

So may I become that which maintains all beings situated throughout space, as long as all have not attained to quiescence." '

(Bodhicāryāvatāra of Śāntideva, Ch. III, verses 7–11 and 17–21, trans. Mrs. A. A. G. Bennet.)

8. 'A Bodhisattva resolves: "I take upon myself the burden of all suffering, I am resolved to do so, I will endure it. I do not turn or run away, do not tremble, am not terrified, nor afraid, do not turn back or despond.

And why? At all costs I must bear the burdens of all beings. In that I do not follow my own inclinations. I have made the vow to save all beings. All beings I must set free. The whole world of living beings I must rescue, from the terrors of birth, of old age, of sickness, of death and rebirth, of all kinds of moral offence, of all states of woe, of the whole cycle of birth-and-death, of the jungle of false views, of the loss of wholesome dharmas, of the concomitants of ignorance—from all these terrors I must rescue all beings. . . . I walk so that the kingdom of unsurpassed cognition is built up for all beings. My endeavours do not merely aim at my own deliverance. For with the help of the boat of the thought of all-knowledge, I must rescue all these beings from the stream of Saṁsāra, which is so difficult to cross, I must pull them back from the great precipice, I must free them from all calamities, I must ferry them across the stream of Saṁsāra. I must grapple with the whole mass of suffering of all beings. To the limit of my endurance I will experience in all the states of woe, found in any world system of all the abodes of suffering. And I must not cheat

all beings out of my store of merit. I am resolved to abide in each single state of woe for numberless aeons; and so I will help all beings to freedom, in all the states of woe that may be found in any world system whatsoever.

And why? Because it is surely better that I alone should be in pain than that all these beings should fall into the states of woe. There I must give myself away as a pawn through which the whole world is redeemed from the terrors of the hells, of animal birth, of the world of Yama, and with this my own body I must experience, for the sake of all beings, the whole mass of all painful feelings. And on behalf of all beings I give surety for all beings, and in doing so I speak truthfully, am trustworthy, and do not go back on my word, I must not abandon all beings.

And why? There has arisen in me the will to win all-knowledge, with all beings for its object, that is to say, for the purpose of setting free the entire world of beings. And I have not set out for supreme enlightenment from a desire for delights, nor because I hope to experience the delights of the five sense-qualities, or because I wish to indulge in the pleasures of the senses. And I do not pursue the course of a Bodhisattva in order to achieve the array of delights that can be found in the various worlds of sense-desire.'"

(Śikshāsamuccaya of Śāntideva, 280–1 (Vajradhvaja Sūtra), trans. by Dr. E. Conze.)

9. 'The Lord: "A Bodhisattva, a great being, after he has produced an adamantine thought, will cause a great mass of beings, a great collection of beings, to achieve the highest."

Subhuti: "What is the production of an adamantine thought?"

The Lord: "Here the Bodhisattva produces a thought thus: 'After I have put on the armour in the immeasurable stream of birth-and-death, I should become one who never abandons all beings. Towards all beings I should adopt the same attitude of mind. All beings I should lead to Nirvāna by means of the three vehicles. But even when I have led all beings into Nirvāna, no being at all has been led to Nirvāna. For one should look through to the fact that all dharmas are neither produced nor stopped. With my thought exclusively on the knowledge of all modes should I course in the six perfections. Everywhere I should train myself to accomplish a penetration into all dharmas. I should penetrate to the consummation of the one principle of all dharmas. For the sake of the penetration to the consummation of the

perfections should I train myself in all dharmas, for the sake of penetrating to the consummation of the Unlimited, of the trances, the formless attainments, the super-knowledges, of the ten powers, the grounds of self-confidence, the special Buddha-dharmas.' This is the production of an adamantine thought by the Bodhisattva, the great being. Supported thereon the Bodhisattva will cause a great mass of beings, a great collection of beings, to achieve the highest; and that without depending on anything. Moreover, a Bodhisattva produces a thought thus: 'For the sake of as many beings as have painful feelings in the hells, among the animals, or in the world of Yama, for their sake I will have the same painful feelings.' With regard to this a Bodhisattva should produce a thought thus: 'For the sake of each single being will I experience for hundreds of thousands of Niyutas of Kotis of aeons the pains of the hells, of the animal world, of the world of Yama, until those beings will have become released in the realm of Nirvāna which leaves nothing behind. That will be my skill in means. Afterwards I will, for the sake of my own self, having planted wholesome roots for hundreds of thousands of Niyutas of Kotis of aeons, and having become equipped for enlightenment, fully awake to the utmost right and perfect enlightenment.' This is the production of an adamantine thought by the Bodhisattva, the great being." '

(Pañcaviṁśatisahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra, 169–70, trans. Dr. E. Conze.)

* * *

C. COMPASSION OF BUDDHAS

1. 'The Lord, compassionate, seeking welfare, teaches Dhamma out of compassion.'

(Majjhima Nikaya ii, 238, trans. I. B. Horner.)

2. 'All knowledge in thy ken, thou hast revealed
Dharma in thy compassion for mankind:
Veil-lifter art thou with eye that seest all
And stainless dost the world illuminate.'

(Sutta Nipāta 378, trans. E. M. Hare.)

3. 'That the Tathāgatas appear in the world is to benefit all beings; out of a great compassionate heart they revolve the Wheel of the Dharma.

The Buddhas have gone through many heart-rending experiences for ages and for the sake of sentient beings; so how can all the world requite them for what it owes to them?'

(Gandavyuha Sūtra, trans. Dr. D. T. Suzuki.)

4. 'For the Buddhas there is only one thing to do; to benefit all the world, to purify the world, and to cause the cessation of all unrighteousness. This is the reason for their appearance.'

(Pratyutpa-Buddha-sammukhavasthita-samādhi Sūtra, trans. B. L. Suzuki.)

5. 'The Tathāgatas with endless compassion sympathize with the triple world. They appear in this world in order to propagate the doctrine and to save and benefit beings.'

(Sukhāvati-vyuha Sūtra, trans. B. L. Suzuki.)

6. 'Great compassion and a great pitying heart is called Buddha-nature. Compassion is Tathāgata; Tathāgata is compassion.'

(Nirvāna Sūtra, trans. B. L. Suzuki.)

7. 'I had heard this, revered sir: Sublime is abiding in friendliness. The Lord is seen as my witness for this, revered sir, for the Lord is abiding in friendliness.'

(Majjhima Nikaya i, 369, trans. I. B. Horner.)

8. '. . . Thou hast,
Ill-ender, helped me cross,
Grasped my perplexity
And borne me o'er my doubt.
To thee be worship giv'n,
Kin of the Sun, goal-won,
Sage of the silent ways,
Vital, compassionate!
. . . Thou, the sage
O'er Māra triumphing,
Hast cut all leanings off,
And, crossed thyself, dost help
Mortality to cross.'

(Sutta Nipāta, verses 539–40 and 545, trans. E. M. Hare.)

9. 'The King of Dharma I am, who arose in the world to crush becoming;

Dharma I teach to beings, after I have discerned their
dispositions.
It is like a great cloud which rises above the earth,
Which covers up everything and overshadows the firma-
ment,

And this great cloud, filled with water, wreathed with
lightning,
Resounds with thunder, and refreshes all the creatures.

Just so, O Kāśyapa, the Buddha also
Arises in this world just like a rain-cloud.
And when he has arisen, then the World's Saviour speaks
And shows the true course to all living beings.

And the great Seer announces,
Honoured by the whole world with its gods:
"The Tathāgata am I, the best of men, a Jīna,
Arisen in the world just like a rain-cloud.

I shall refresh all living beings,
Whose bodies are withering away, who cling to the
triple world,
Who wither away in pain,—at ease I will place them,
And pleasures I will give them and the final Rest.

With one and the same voice I preach to all the Dharma,
I always make enlightenment its foundation.
For this is the same for all, about it there is no partiality.
I know no hatred and no love.

I refresh this entire world
Like a cloud which releases its rain evenly for all;
Equal is enlightenment for noble and mean alike,
For those who are immoral and for moral ones,

For those who lead a depraved life,
As well as those whose conduct is good,
For those who hold false views and unsound views,
And for those who hold right views and pure views.

I preach the Dharma to beings whether their intellect
Be inferior or superior, and their faculties weak or strong.
Setting aside all tiredness,
I rain down the rain of the Dharma.

When I rain down the rain of the Dharma,
Then all this world is well refreshed.
Each one according to their power take to heart
This well-preached Dharma, one in taste!

As when it rains the shrubs and grasses,
The bushes and the smaller plants,
The trees and also the great woods
Are all made splendid in the ten regions;

So the nature of the Dharma always exists for the weal of the world,
And it refreshes by this Dharma the entire world.
And then, refreshed, just like the plants,
The world will burst forth into blossoms.'' '
(Saddharma Pundarika Sūtra V, verses 1, 5, 16–18, 21, 24–6, 36–8, trans. Dr. E. Conze.)

10. 'Out of the cloud of Compassion
The rain of the Doctrine of the Victorious One
Falls without premeditation
As a continuous harvest for all.'
(Jewel Ornament of Liberation, quoting Uttaratantra, trans. Dr. H. Guenther.)

11. 'With Great Compassion the Knower of the World
Looks at the whole universe.'
(ibid., trans. Dr. H. Guenther.)

Saraṇāgata bhayanāsana vajirālaya paṇibhaṁ
Bhavasāgara pattāmita janatārana niratam,
Sirasāvaham amalañjali putapaṅkaja makulaṁ
Paṇamām'aham akhilālaya vigatam muniṁ atulaṁ.

Him, with the lotus-bud formed by my hands reverently clasped and raised to my brow, do I worship, the entirely Bond-free, Peerless Sage who, impregnable as a 'Diamond Castle', banishes all fear from those who take refuge in Him, and who delights in guiding the countless fallen multitudes across the ocean of becoming.

(Kamalañjali of Ven. W. Piyatissa Mahā Nayaka Thera, verse 14, trans. Ven. Buddharakhita Thera.)

About the author

Phra Khantipalo, the author of TOLERANCE was born near London thirty years ago and first took an interest in Buddhism when he was taught Indian history at school. Later, he spent two years in the Army in Egypt, a circumstance which caused him to reflect on life and religion. Upon reading once a popular book on Buddhism, he was completely convinced of the truth of the Buddha's teachings. Subsequently, he joined the Buddhist Society and Sangha Association in London and then, leaving the household life, became a Sramanera (novice) in 1959 at the headquarters of the latter organization. He remained in England for one year and then spent three years in India during which he received his Bhikkhu (monk) ordination. He has now gone to Thailand to practise there the Teachings of the Buddha.

Printed in Great Britain

Piyadassi Thera

THE BUDDHA'S ANCIENT PATH

This is a book on basic Buddhism with a difference for it is written by a monk who is a native of Ceylon, a scholar and a well known preacher and broadcaster in Ceylon. He has the Pali Canon and the Commentaries at his fingertips, so that his book is full of apposite stories and quotations of what the Buddha said — many of them appearing in English for the first time.

In recent years a number of expositions of the Buddha's teachings have been published in English, but most of them lack authenticity and do not represent what the Buddha taught correctly. Hence the need for this authentic book based on the Four Noble Truths about suffering which are the central conception of Buddhism and on the Noble Eightfold Path which is Buddhism in practice.

This should prove the standard text book from which basic Buddhism of the Theravada is taught for many years to come. It cannot be stressed too strongly that the Mahayana Buddhism of Tibet, China and Japan is based on and developed out of this basic Buddhism of the Theravadins in Ceylon.