

# THE HISTORIC ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE HSING YUN MODEL

Deng Zimei

*Institute of the Sociology of Religion*

## Abstract

At the core of religion is faith. Rebuilding faith is key to reversing the decline of traditional religion and to successfully realize modernization. True faith comes from the heart. In recent times, there have been two paths by which Chinese Buddhism has been rebuilding faith. The first method focuses on reconstructing Buddhist faith based on sūtras, i.e., on the authority of scripture. This has been adopted by the Faxiang school, among others.

The second method focuses on inner religious experience supplemented with the inspection and verification of sūtras and treatises, which is the primary path that Master Taixu strongly insisted upon. Humanistic Buddhism in the Hsing Yun Model is a perfect example of the latter method of reconstructing faith, and is an epoch-making historic achievement in itself. Although traditional Buddhism adapted to a patriarchal Chinese society, it did not properly deal with the relationship between religion and society. In most cases, traditional Buddhism was tightly bound to the social elite, and thus spurned by and withdrawn from society. The second historic achievement of Humanistic Buddhism in the Hsing Yun Model is to prove that both approaches were wanting, and by building effective modes and methods for relationships between laity and monastics, Buddhism and intellectuals, and, Buddhists and society.

**Keywords:** Hsing Yun model, Humanistic Buddhism, religion and society, modernization of Chinese Buddhism

## Introduction

What is Humanistic Buddhism in the Hsing Yun Model? This term was first proposed by Venerable Jing Hui and fully explored in Venerable Man Yi's book *Humanistic Buddhism in the Hsing Yun Model*,<sup>1</sup> and I will not repeat it here. In the

history of Han Chinese Buddhism, the Fo Guang Shan model of Humanistic Buddhism established by Venerable Master Hsing Yun has had many achievements. I primarily apply the methodologies of history and sociology to analyze these two epoch-making achievements, to help unravel the related doubts that academics have cast on the topic.

## **1. Reversing the Marginalization and Decline of Buddhism Since the Ming and Qing Dynasties**

Buddhism's societal status differs from Christianity's in the West. Although it assimilated into traditional Chinese culture, it never became the core of mainstream Chinese culture. Compared to its peak during the Tang and Song dynasties, Buddhism had become increasingly marginalized since the Ming and Qing dynasties. The impact of western culture and the various campaigns against religions and superstition in recent times has placed Buddhism's existence at peril. Despite lay Buddhist Yang Wenhui's earliest proposition in "A Proposal for Chinese Buddhist Revival,"<sup>2</sup> Buddhism remains relatively passive by only seeking to emulate Christianity's establishment of schools and missionary work. Others like Master Taixu inherited the approach of Yang, his teacher, and having expanded his horizons travelling to Europe and America, actively pursued modernization. However, given the circumstances at this time, he could only pave the way in theory, while Yin Shun expanded upon and strengthened those theoretical foundations. In practice, the generation who commenced the reversal of Buddhism's marginalization and decline is that of Venerable Master Hsing Yun.

Before Venerable Master Hsing Yun propagated the Dharma in Yilan in 1953, the relationship between laity and monastics, Buddhism and intellectuals, and Buddhists and society, had irresolvable differences. These differences were important intrinsic factors hastening Buddhism's marginalization. At that time, people were largely illiterate, in addition to general illiteracy, the Classical Chinese that Buddhist sūtras were translated into obscured their true meaning, making them difficult to understand. Therefore, the public's understanding of Buddhism was mostly from hearsay. Statues of buddhas and bodhisattvas were taken as deities and ghosts that added to the ambience in temples. Even if one wished to seek teachings from monastics, it was mostly a case of "the blind leading the blind," because most monastics and their teachers were born into impoverished households who could not afford an education. As a result it can hardly be expected of the monastics to be able to discuss the sūtras and treatises in detail and clarity.

Their understanding of Buddhism relied upon oral transmissions from their teachers and from their experiences of living in traditional monasteries. The author once heard the following earnest discussion. Someone asked a novice monk: “Which bodhisattva does your temple make offerings to?” To which the monk replied: “Amita[bha Buddha]!” The person then asked: “Where does Amita[bha Buddha] come from?” The monk answered: “In the olden days, our patriarch Ah-Mi carried [“ta”] the Buddha on his back.” This answer really leaves one speechless.

Contemporary individual perceptions of Buddhism can be employed to categorize devotees into three groups. The first and major group consider buddhas and bodhisattvas to have spiritual powers stronger than other idols. Therefore, members of this group will seek help from the buddhas and bodhisattvas in times of need or pray for blessings for the new year. They will burn incense and worship the Buddha as one-off event, occasionally donating large sums of money to the monastery or, at most, place their names on the wall of benefactors, but rarely do they require spiritual support from monastics. It is precisely this situation that Dharma propagators should pay attention to, but it is a situation that has long been neglected in Chinese society. Monastics who are supposed to maintain the Dharma instead degrade themselves and become mere guardians to the statues of buddhas and bodhisattvas.

The second group believes that Buddhism encourages people to act virtuously, is beneficial to social norms, and engaging in Buddhist worship throughout the year can accumulate merit and prevent misfortune for their family and generations to follow. They therefore form a large segment of Buddhist practitioners who are in a constant and stable “bartering” relationship with the monasteries—members of this group will make offerings or donations, while the monastics conduct Dharma services for their benefit or their family’s benefit. Members of both this group and the former group will continue to neglect spiritual advancement.

The third group believes that faith in Buddhism can help them break away from their current worries, be reborn in the Western Pure Land after death, or be liberated from *samsāra*. Their numbers are small, but they take a special interest in the simple methods of Buddhist cultivation. Most of them have taken refuge in the Triple Gem and observe the Five Precepts. They typically fulfill their duties of making offerings to the monasteries and monastics. However, in the past, there were once few monastics

who could provide proper guidance to alleviate their sufferings and develop the spiritual cultivation that this group sought.

In the early part of the twentieth century, even monastics—who were supposed to be Buddhism’s primary inheritors—did not properly understand the Dharma. Furthermore, because monasteries were disconnected from society, Buddhism operated in isolation.

Hence, notables such as Yang Wenhui, Master Taixu, and Venerable Cihang regarded it as their fundamental mission to nurture a new generation of monastics who could both inherit the essence of Buddhist traditions and absorb modern knowledge in order to integrate into contemporary society. However, most practitioners were unable to endure this course, it was only Venerable Master Hsing Yun who inherited and implemented these ideas, and devoted his life to this course of action. From the very beginning, the new monastic community nurtured by Venerable Master Hsing Yun was markedly different from that of other major Taiwanese Buddhist temple organizations in terms of their average age and erudition. However, Venerable Master Hsing Yun’s greatest contribution was not just not following his predecessors, but was also in cultivating an independent monastic community who developed its core function of maintaining the Dharma, giving back to devotees, and purifying society.

Firstly, apart from practicing what he preaches, Venerable Master Hsing Yun asks that his monastic disciples, “not let Amitābha Buddha repay the merits for devotees on my behalf.”<sup>3,4</sup> He also made improvements to and created new ways of giving back to devotees. For example, with regard to the first group of devotees, Fo Guang Shan temples give them souvenirs and items that bear messages of right faith upon accepting acts of merit-making. This is done in the hope that upon reading or carrying these items, some of the spirit of the Dharma will transfer to the devotee.

For the second group of devotees, even though Venerable Master Hsing Yun does not encourage over-engaging in Buddhist rituals, Fo Guang Shan temples often hold rituals in some form or another as a foundation for other methods such as home visits, various activities and training classes to elaborate upon how devotees can be liberated from their defilements, learn skills to improve their quality of life, and practice the Dharma in a correct way.

For the third group of devotees, Fo Guang Shan is even more welcoming, providing these practitioners with many expedient means, such as regular participation in Buddhist meditation, Pure Land practices guided by monastics, and organized assistive chanting for those dying. These concepts and methods are common in Taiwan today, and while Fo Guang Shan has an acceptance towards folk religious beliefs, it was Venerable Master Hsing Yun who established this new attitude of acceptance—reversing a vicious cycle that started since the Ming and Qing dynasties where folk religion practitioners were considered inferior to Buddhist monastics (in Master Taixu’s words). This cycle influenced one another in a way that led to the decline of right Dharma—and this reversal in attitudes took the first steps towards continual propagation by creating a type of positive interaction between the right Dharma and the monastics, devotees and society.

This historic achievement is highlighted in the following:

1. As education and religious freedom become increasingly common, the laity is beginning to understand the true meaning of Buddhism. At the same time, the complexity of modern society has brought about an increasing number of problems caused by secular worries and troubles. People are no longer satisfied simply with mere ritualistic worship, and as a result are asking monastics to guide them and deepen their spiritual practice. Laity entering the “mountains” [i.e., temples] for spiritual cultivation and monastics entering society to propagate Buddhism are results of the demands of the times.

However, since the Ming and Qing dynasties, monastics have generally been of poor quality and low social status, leading to some acting arrogantly towards devotees. This bad habit became an obstacle in the communication between monastics and devotees, and accordingly the distinction between monastic and laity in many temples was strongly maintained. Some older devotees may be accustomed to this standard, but many practitioners today are more familiar with modern egalitarianism. People who held a bias against Buddhism may have put it aside had they participated in the Dharma’s truth, and become filled with the inspiration to contribute to Buddhism. Young people may have come into Buddhism looking up to monastics, but later became disillusioned as they discovered the monastics were putting on airs. They therefore adopted an attitude of, “if not for the sake of the monk, at least for the sake of the Buddha”<sup>5</sup> and kept a distance from the monastics. Even if young people were to stay in the monasteries and contribute to the monastic community, they often feel like “beggars can’t be choosers.”<sup>6</sup>

The isolation experienced by these new young Buddhists is also a communication barrier between them and the monastics. However, only if these young Buddhists continue to affiliate with the Sangha community, can the former exchanges of the Buddhist teachings and traditions that were solely limiting to specific small groups of people be broken.

Under the leadership of Venerable Master Hsing Yun, the unique atmosphere of equality shared between the monastics and laity at Fo Guang Shan is a great breakthrough. On one aspect, the laity no longer feel inferior at Fo Guang Shan temples. Moreover, Venerable Master Hsing Yun established the Home of Devotees at Fo Guang Shan, so that devotees, and in particular Buddha's Light International Association (BLIA) members, may feel as though they have returned home upon visiting any Fo Guang Shan temple. They would be willing to discuss their worries and feelings with monastics and accept their advice. As a result, they naturally develop respect from within towards monastics. On the other, Venerable Master Hsing Yun has trained his disciples with regards to their interactions with people and how they conduct themselves, and such training are one of the best in Taiwan. Venerable Master Hsing Yun was also the first to propose equality between monastics and laity, a principle which Fo Guang Shan monastics are expected to internalize. Only by bringing together these two aspects will true harmony between monastics and laity be achieved. Imagine the case that devotees are able to learn the principles of the Dharma and also receive monastics' advice on everyday issues in modern life, and the monastics in turn are able to gather real-life information from devotees about current issues and then investigate how Buddhist principles can resolve such problems. In this way, the originally lively teachings of the Buddha could continue to be applied in everyday life and propagated.

2. In the past, some conservative and narrow-minded monastics adopted two different attitudes towards scholars and intellectuals. They flattered scholars of high social status and with well-established careers while treating those poorer scholars and independent literati quite differently. On the surface they may have appeared polite, but that only masked conceit. In reality, scholar-officials saw through this flattery and the poorer scholars simply understood the reasons for this treatment and kept a distance. These circumstances were detrimental to the spread of Buddhist culture as a function and to the improvement of the Sangha community as an establishment. This was due to the independent intellectuals, especially the Buddhist scholars playing an increasingly important role in the modern and multicultural society. As Professor Wang Lei-quan

said, “to establish the autonomy of Buddhism in modern society, it will be unimaginable and unachievable if it is secluded from the independent characters of Buddhist intellectuals.”<sup>7,8</sup> In fact, none of these statements can deviate away from the importance of Buddhist intellectuals, whether directing the focus of Buddhist research; adapting to current major trends; criticizing, adjusting, and adopting of the modern concepts, or suggesting corrective measures for the inevitable malpractice within the monastic community.

Venerable Master Hsing Yun has always valued intellectuals and their talents. He opined that, “Society in the past generally thought little of the literati who wrote for a living, and Buddhism that had degenerated into a mere superstition was unacceptable to the intellectuals.”<sup>9,10</sup> Therefore, “the hope of reviving Buddhism lies in valuing talented people.”<sup>11,12</sup> Not only does he value and emphasize the nurturing of talent within Buddhism, Venerable Master Hsing Yun also particularly values communication with academia, and respects the independent positions scholars take. Venerable Master Hsing Yun established departments of religious studies and of life-and-death studies at Nanhua and Fo Guang universities, he keeps in contact with the religious scholars of many universities, appointing Gong Peng-cheng (no longer in appointment), Chen Miao-sheng, Lan Jifu and many others to positions of seniority. In Mainland China, Venerable Master Hsing Yun has also cultivated close relations with, and sent outstanding monastic disciples to study within the departments and institutes of religious studies at Peking, Renmin, Nanjing, Sichuan, and Wuhan universities, among others. In terms of valuing intellectuals and talent, Master Taixu could be said to have done the same. However, he only maintained close personal relationships with scholars such as Huang Chanhua. Only Venerable Master Hsing Yun and Venerable Sheng Yen went beyond valuing intellectuals and began to nurture and educate a large group of monastic disciples who highly respected scholars and were able to communicate well with the academia. They both also published many types of academic works and papers, and further provided human resources and material support towards scholars’ independent research. This paints a bright future for positive interactions between academic and religious institutions.

3. It is not possible to separate Buddhism and society. Everything in society influences Buddhism, and thus, corrupt practices within society will inevitably deteriorate Buddhism too. Steeped in the Dharma, the Buddhist fourfold assembly is the most kind-hearted group in society. Even if they were to be selfish, they would never harm others.

Nevertheless, people's understanding of Buddhism always begins with their personal experiences, and even though the fundamental fact that Buddhism is inseparable from society is obvious, it may not be easy to grasp the idea due to limited personal experience. Leaving aside the still influential perspective that religion is superstition, even those who have a good impression of Buddhism either perceive Buddhism as utopian or view eminent monks as celestial beings or sages who are above the general populace. However, when these subjective beliefs concerning Buddhism do not fit reality, doubts about Buddhism begin to arise and even tend toward the other extreme—that it is no different from the secular. In fact, even Fo Guang Shan is criticized, and Venerable Master Hsing Yun has his shortcomings and weaknesses.

Therefore, recognizing Buddhism's present situation and understanding eminent monk such as Venerable Master Hsing Yun cannot be done without an historical comparison and comprehensive observation. As expressed by the Fo Guang Shan Board of Directors in the introduction of *Fo Guang Shan 30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Special Edition*:<sup>13</sup> "To understand Fo Guang Shan, one must look at all of its members, not a sole person; likewise at all of its history, not just one time."<sup>14</sup> Indeed, one can only truly understand Fo Guang Shan and Venerable Master Hsing Yun by doing a historical comparison between the organization's growing influence and the decline of other similar organizations. In addition, it is necessary to look at and understand the individuals that makeup the membership of Fo Guang Shan in its entirety.

It goes without saying that many people turn towards Buddhism because they reject unwholesome practices in society. However, when people begin to gradually understand the reality of Buddhist organizations, they become disappointed—those who entered with deeper respect for monastics may actually become more disappointed. As a result, many people come into contact with Buddhism but after some years, most of them choose to stay away from it. This can be said to be one of the main reasons why Buddhism has remained peripheral despite being considerably influential in China.

Many people these days chase after the secret to success. There is no secret to success for Venerable Master Hsing Yun and the Fo Guang Shan monastic community. In essence, success was obtained through step-by-step effort in understanding and responding to the trends of society and the times. The hardships and difficulties will probably never be known to those who did not experience it. This also explains why

Venerable Master Hsing Yun's monastic disciples are loyal and devoted, and why they are willing to share with anyone the history of Fo Guang Shan's development and their personal path to monasticism. Certainly, the monastics are very sensitive towards certain criticisms, and would unite in defence against any irreverence. These two different attitudes in fact come from a commonality—putting their heart and sweat into a shared mission. Solidarity such as this is capable of withstanding challenges, and has won the hearts of those who have visited Fo Guang Shan, showing them the kind-heartedness of the Buddhist fourfold<sup>15</sup> assembly and brings forth their wish to make Buddhism as a spiritual home. In Taiwan, the same strength can be said to be found in other Buddhist organizations such as the Buddhist Compassion Relief Tzu Chi Foundation, but it was Venerable Master Hsing Yun who began these practices first. In fact, when Tzu Chi began building the Hualien Tzu Chi Hospital, Venerable Master Hsing Yun lent strong support. It was these Humanistic Buddhist organizations that won the hearts of those who were discontented with corruption in society and curious about Buddhism. At the same time, it also opened up untapped resources for Buddhism. Furthermore, under Venerable Master Hsing Yun's leadership, Fo Guang Shan monastics have gone outside of the monasteries in their efforts to establish a nationwide propagation of the Dharma, free medical consultations, inter-organizational fellowships, various undertakings of social, cultural, and educational. In this way, a positive synergy is formed in that Buddhism is able to purify society, monastics are engaged with society, and people understand and respect Buddhism.

The claim can be made that it was precisely the joint efforts of Humanistic Buddhist organizations. Fo Guang Shan being the first to lead Taiwan in overturning the marginalization of Buddhism in Chinese society for the past two millennia. Besides winning the great respect of Taiwanese society, Chinese Buddhism also began to internationalize. In short, in having to break the deep predicament that Chinese Buddhism was in and reversing its marginalization and decline, the efforts of Hsing Yun model shall not be undermined.

## **2. Rebuilding Buddhist Faith**

Although it was practiced among Chinese immigrants prior to Dutch rule, Buddhism really took root in Taiwan after the successful landing of Zheng Chenggong. The mainland Buddhist model that was introduced then centered around Tainan, when

the Zhuxi, Mituo, and Longhu temples were built. After Shi Lang's arrival in Taiwan in 1683, the Mainland Chinese model of Buddhism was further consolidated and spread. On the one hand, the Minnan Chan school model became mainstream among monastics, while on the other hand the influence of folk Mainland Buddhism, "led to Buddhism being mixed with quasi-Buddhism (such as Zhaijiao, or a blend of Taoism and Confucianism) which grew to become an everyday religious faith for Taiwanese society."<sup>16,17</sup> After 1895, the Japanese model of Buddhism spread into Taiwan. Buddhism which existed after 1895 in Taiwan, "regardless of the temples' facilities, the monastic community's way of life, and even the apparel and ceremonies were mostly influenced by Japanese Buddhism. Examples include monastics eating meat, marrying and having children, and operating temples as a family enterprise. There was a decline in Chinese Buddhism, and Minnan influence thus waned."<sup>18,19</sup> Just as Shi Dongchu informs us, post-1945 Buddhism in Taiwan consisted of three strongholds: Japanese Buddhism continued to be of underlying influence, the lineage from Gushan, Fujian of the Mainland was revived, and the Zhaijiao was in a significant position.<sup>20</sup> It is on these foundations that Taiwanese Buddhism started a new historical transformation.

Circa 1949, the senior disciples of distinguished Mainland monastics—such as Taixu, Yuan Ying, Xuyun, and Yinguang—arrived in Taiwan, and injected fresh vitality into Taiwanese Buddhism. These notable monks then joined forces with senior Taiwanese monastics and led the transformation of Taiwanese Buddhism. However, Zhang Mantao is of the opinion that this transformation, which included: "A total change in the lifestyle of Taiwanese monastics, [which included] not marrying, [being] vegetarian, giving up meat and alcohol, shaving, putting on monastic attire, taking full ordination, etc. became necessary conditions for Taiwanese monastics,"<sup>21,22</sup> was solely expressed as the transmission of the traditional Chinese monastic precepts and emphasized Buddhist philosophy and learning. From today's perspective, this generalization is incomplete, even though the changes were extensive, the impact of these changes was at the superficial level. Even emphasizing Buddhist philosophy and learning—an area to which the Mainland scholar-monks who came to Taiwan contributed extensively—was still limited to the level of knowledge with some understanding concerning the involvement of the mind.

In regard to Buddhism, the transformation of faith is at its core. Professor Lan Jifu drew upon the historian of science Thomas Khun's concept of paradigms, finding that

from the perspective of cultural history, the paradigm of Buddhist faith has undergone three paradigm shifts, i.e., from Early Buddhism to the era of sectarian Buddhism, then to Mahāyāna Buddhism, and finally to Esoteric Buddhism.<sup>23</sup> This coincides with my views published in 1996.<sup>24</sup> What differs is that I believe that at least since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Buddhism has been undergoing the fourth paradigm shift—the creation and development of the model of Humanistic Buddhism. This new form of Buddhism, like the others, did not grow out of thin air, but is rather a transformation of the preceding Buddhist paradigms.

The initial cause was that the basis of faith in the Chan school—which was the second transformation of Mahāyāna Buddhism and the mainstream of Chinese Buddhism—was starting to flounder. As a devout Buddhist who keenly felt society was undergoing massive change, the leading academic Gong Zizhen says Chan began, “lowering [it standards] towards indiscrimination and developing towards [becoming too] easy,” and “if limitless people were to ask, they would receive the answer of limitless practice... [They] might adhere to the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra*, *Lotus Sūtra*, *Nirvana Sūtra*...[but] is there not [none which proposes a] transmission apart from teachings?”<sup>25,26</sup> Here, he does not deny the basis of the Chan faith—religious experience—but merely expressed his doubts about rejecting the basis of scriptures. Later, the unquestionably faithful Yang Wenhui also said something similar, that if most Chan practitioners did not base their practice upon the scriptures, “[they would be] practicing emptiness in isolation, signs and practice, totally unconstrained, and hard to fathom,” and therefore “a mix of true and false [practitioners].”<sup>27,28</sup> These examples suffice as evidence that even Buddhists themselves are suspicious of those who proclaim to be “enlightened” and that society’s widespread poor opinion of Buddhism is related to the veracity of religious faith. During this period, the monastics at that time were so numb to these facts either due to their isolation from society or the immense respect they were given by the laity.

From the time Yang Wenhui proposed the concept that Buddhism in the age of crisis (or declining Dharma) should be practiced according to the sūtras, with established guidelines, and with no tolerance for deviation,<sup>29</sup> the basis of faith for Chinese Buddhism started to turn from its tendency of personal religious experience in the post-Tang period towards an emphasis on scripture. However, what is the real basis that people can have faith in? With innumerable sūtras and śāstras within the Buddhist canon, and vast differences or even contradictory viewpoints discussed within—what then should we

have faith in?

This has inspired a new generation to commence on a modern-day journey to discover the source of authentic faith in the Dharma. Represented by Ouyang Jingwu, a distinguished disciple of Yang Wenhui, lay scholars at organizations such as the China Inner Studies Academy and the Three Times Study Group found authentic faith in the *Vimśatikāvṛtti*.<sup>30</sup> Basing themselves on the scriptures of the Mahāyāna Faxiang school, they rejected the other Mahāyāna schools. Lu Cheng even authored *One Hundred Reasons Why Shurangama Sūtra is Apocryphal*,<sup>31</sup> listing over a hundred pieces of evidence that asserted the Śūraṅgama Sūtra could not have been translated from Sanskrit. He claimed:

The *Scripture for Humane Kings* is a sham, [and so are] the *Brahma Net Sūtra*, *Treatise on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna*, *Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment*, and *Sūtra on the Divination of the Effect of Good and Evil Actions*. Śiksānanda's translation of the *Treatise on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* and Amoghavajra's translation of the *Scripture for Humane Kings* are the sham of shams...As for the Śūraṅgama Sūtra, it is a great compilation of lies.<sup>33</sup> It's fine prose and an ambiguous explanation of Buddhist doctrine that is suited to the Chinese people's character of liking the new and hating the old and taking this to extravagance and impracticality, and this is widely popular. [The various schools use it in different ways:] The Huayan explains dependent origination, the Tiantai cessation and contemplation, the Chan sudden transcendence, the Esoteric to connect to the extoric teachings...[when] a single practice has been taken too far, all practices become entirely defunct.<sup>34</sup>

Despite its brevity, this paper essentially negated the basis of faith for all schools of Mahāyāna Buddhism aside from the Faxiang and the core concepts contained within the above mentioned scriptures: the theories of “true permanence mere mind,” and *tathāgatarbha*. The paper also promoted the faith and religious experience of the Indian Mahāyāna Yogācāra school's theory of ālaya dependent origination, texts which were translated by Xuanzang. Venerable Yin Shun too has his own views on the

*Vimśatikāvṛtti*.<sup>35</sup> On one hand, he categorized both the “true permanence mere mind” theory and the *Vimśatikāvṛtti* as “a separate sect in the bodhisattva [path] that is inclined towards *tathāgata[garbha]*,” while the esoteric sūtras and śāstras as “the integration of Brahmanism and Buddhism rooted in the *tathāgata[garbha]*.”<sup>36</sup> Yin Shun’s contribution therefore having clarified the developmental path that the theory of *tathāgatagarbha* took from the evolution of Buddhist philosophy. On the other hand, he was greatly inspired by his reading of the Buddhist Canon and Japanese academic publications, proposing that we “root [ourselves] in the simplicity of [Early] Buddhism, promote and explain the practices, [learn to] understand the middle period of Buddhism (taking Nāgārjuna as an exemplar being careful to avoid components which have been influenced by Brahmanism), and absorb the accurate parts of the late period of Buddhism.” In reality, Venerable Yin Shun started with his discontentment towards the “true permanence mere mind” theory and the *Vimśatikāvṛtti*. He then turned towards the Indian Mahāyāna theory of *Madhyamaka*, the *Prajñā Sūtra*, and śāstras, and then the relatively early sūtras as the basis of faith. By doing so, Yin Shun inspired the growing research into the Āgamas,<sup>37</sup> which was previously not valued in Chinese Buddhism.

With the Āgama’s Twelve Links of Dependent Origination as a basis, representatives of Critical Buddhism<sup>38</sup> in Japan, Matsumoto Shirō and Hakamaya Noriaki, further opined that “true permanence mere mind” theory’s philosophy of original enlightenment and the philosophy of *tathāgatagarbha*<sup>39</sup> present in India are not true Buddhism, and even went so far as to condemn parts of Han Chinese Buddhist faith that contain traits of the above theory as “false Buddhism.”<sup>40,41</sup> What they claimed to be true Buddhism is extremely narrow in scope, with a strong tendency towards Buddhist fundamentalism. Of course, there is value in the emphasis on rationality as the foundation of knowledge and ethics, the rejection of all types of local cultural hegemony, and the opposition of Japanese cultural uniqueness and superiority. However, if we take this approach, we would have to completely reject the religious experiences which unavoidably are associated with cultural traditions and personal experiences that are temporally and spatially bounded. We would end up with a position of extreme rationalism.<sup>42</sup> The schools of Sectarian and Mahāyāna Buddhism are both the products of the union between the Buddha’s philosophy and local cultural traditions. The practitioners’ religious experiences serve as the medium, and Japanese Buddhism is no exception in this respect. Even the extant sūtras that were compiled in the Āgamas during early period in Buddhism’s history would also have been subjected to the influence of India’s religious culture and traditions,

including Brahminism, from which the compilers came from, even if they did go against, criticize, or did away with tradition. In Ui Hakuju's words: "[India's] earliest Buddhist texts were also directly subjected to the influence of these ideologies. Concepts such as the four meditations in the nine graduated concentrations, or the theory of the three realms of desire, form and formlessness are [evidence]."<sup>43,44</sup> According to rationalism, none of the scriptures and discourses can escape being questioned. Therefore, in the last two millennia (and even as early as Buddhism during the Ming and Qing dynasties), the path that started with questioning the religious experience of the Chan school and with the questioning of the theoretical basis of Han Chinese Buddhist schools' scriptures has inevitably traced to its frontier, "go back to Indian Buddhism." Thus is the limitation of an absolutist approach which leans towards critique.<sup>45</sup>

In reality, Buddhist philosophy is not conjured from thin air. A pure Buddhism that is divorced from a spatial location and from the criticism and continuity of cultural traditions has never existed. Where then can we find the "original" example of this fundamentalist pursuit of such teachings? Where is the singular, unadulterated Dharma that we are pursuing? This problem may never be solved by humankind's rationality. Even if these scholars hold well-justified opinions, can they ever receive universal acceptance? In other words, they are bound to fail in their pursuit. But the contributions of Lu Cheng, Yin Shun, and these Japanese scholars are:

1. To use the methods of philology and textual research to dispel the mythicism that enveloped the history of Buddhism and its scriptures, so that the interactions between and evolution of Buddhism and society is made obvious, that profile of the ethical and transcendent characteristics of Buddhism is raised, in order to highlight the especially strong trend of rationality in modern Buddhism vis-à-vis historical Buddhism.
2. They comprehensively clarified the various scriptures which each school of each time period adhered to, and explained them in ways that can be understood by the modern person. In reality, they have also provided more reliable and pluralistic bases of faith that meet the religious needs of different groups of people.

In contrast, even though the earlier denounced "true permanence mere mind"

theory is strongly subjective, with many different accounts of it, and could be easily impersonated or abused, a person who had a previous real and non-illusory experience of it would undeniably have a resolute faith in it. Moreover, differing religious experiences can be analyzed for common characteristics, which in turn can be used as a litmus test to differentiate between real and imaginary religious experiences. Western religious scholar Walter Stace divides religious experience into two categories—extrovertive and introvertive mysticism.<sup>46</sup> Robert Zaehner instead splits mysticism into three categories of nature, monistic, and theistic.<sup>47</sup>

More recently the philosopher Richard Swinburne summarized religious experience into the following five categories based on their objects and medium. Religious experience are obtained through:

1. Perceiving a perfectly normal phenomenon or event.
2. Perceiving a very unusual public object, witnessing a very unusual event with others.
3. Private experience which may be explained using normal language.
4. Private experience which may not be explained using normal language.
5. No specific experience.

Swinburne goes so far as to claim that these five categories encompass all religious experiences.

Each of these classifications have their own merits. According to Professor Zhang Zhigang's summary, most religious experiences share the following characteristics:

1. The feeling of unity, i.e., the individual strongly feels the union of all things or all phenomena, to the extent that the individual merges with it.
2. The feeling of transcending time, i.e., the everyday concept of time dissolves when the feeling of unity is felt.
3. The feeling of joy or serenity.
4. An indescribable feeling.<sup>48</sup>

In accordance with Zhang Zhigang's summary, it would be possible with substantial research to differentiate between real and illusory religious experiences. If we were to combine the narratives and limitations of “enlightenment”—be they found

in the scriptures of the Chan, Faxiang, Prajñā schools or in the Āgamas—and utilize and improve upon traditional ways of ascertaining enlightenment, e.g., *vyakarana*. In brief, solely relying on a sense of experience is undesirable, but religious experiences are undoubtedly a basis of faith.

Another group of Buddhists represented by Master Taixu and Venerable Master Hsing Yun clearly inherited the Chan school's tradition—adapting to modern times, emphasizing scriptures as the basis of faith, and relying upon their personal religious experience. Early in 1907, Master Taixu experienced spiritual awakening as he was reading the *Sūtra on the Perfection of Great Wisdom*<sup>49</sup> when, “Suddenly [I] lost the sense of my body and mind unto emptiness, and the world suddenly disappeared...[then] there was a clear mysterious light, and innumerable Buddha-fields appeared illuminated like images in the sky with boundless luminescence. Several hours of seated meditation went by like a snap of the fingers. For many days, my body and mind were light and calm”.<sup>50,51</sup> Due to his having multiple similar experiences, his attitude towards using philological methods to decide the authenticity of scriptures significantly differs from that of Ouyang Jingwu and Lu Cheng. Master Taixu's descriptions of his own religious experience also matches the above entirely. In Venerable Master Hsing Yun's own words, he too had several religious experiences, some of which were realizations during Chan meditation, but the deepest came from Pure Land practice:

In 1954, I was presiding over the Amitabha Chanting Retreat at Lei Yin Temple in Yilan when I had a special experience. Now that I recall it, I wonder how I spent those seven days. I only felt that the Buddha's name was continuously lingering in my ears. When I was eating, [the sound of] eating sounded like “Amitabha, Amitabha”...The sound of brushing my teeth also sounded like “Amitabha, Amitabha”...When I was sleeping, though I was physically sleeping, my mind was clear, “Amitabha, Amitabha” still kept repeating in my heart. When I was walking, my pace was light, as if I was in the air. I did not feel like it was me walking, with a force seemingly pushing me forward from behind, but every step was still [accompanied by] “Amitabha, Amitabha” At all points in time, all I felt was “Amitabha, Amitabha”...The seven days

passed in the blink of an eye, filled with a continuous stream of the name of Amitabha Buddha. I forgot that I existed, and forgot what time was. It felt as if those seven days were but a snap of a finger. This Amitabha chanting retreat gave me confidence and religious experience. It was more profound than my that of me worshipping of Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva in the past. It was a state where I experienced that neither “I,” other “objects,” time nor space existed!<sup>52,53</sup>

Precisely because he had experiences which correspond to scenarios of traditional culture, the continuation of the traditions of the Chinese monastery can be clearly observed in Venerable Master Hsing Yun and Fo Guang Shan. Of course, both Master Taixu and Venerable Master Hsing Yun have deep experiences of the Buddhist problems that existed since the Ming and Qing dynasties. They were also critical, their critique so deep that it challenged the very foundations monastics depended on—the existing monastic system. Thus, there was a higher degree of enmity toward them, compared to those who merely criticize the issues at ideological level. However, in comparison to the latter, the practitioners of Humanistic Buddhism represented by Master Taixu and Venerable Master Hsing Yun were more concerned about the reconstruction of faith.

Of course, the two major factions of modern Buddhist reform share a commonality—both emphasize the rational basis on which to strengthen faith. Needless to say, philological and historical investigation relies upon rational judgement. Master Taixu further believed that the current era was the “age of declining Dharma when one has to practice the Mahāyāna and aimed at the results of the human vehicle” and he said: “In modern society, to practice aiming at the results of the Śrāvaka [vehicle] will be criticized as negative and escapist, and to practice aiming at the results of the heavenly vehicle will be slandered as superstition and theocratic—not only are they not expedient, they are now obstacles.”<sup>54,55</sup> According to Venerable Master Hsing Yun, “Modern Buddhism should move away from nature and totem worship, and the heroic worship of theocracy, towards purifying the body and mind, and elevating one’s stage of life. Modern Buddhism cannot walk Buddhism’s old path of superstition and the ridiculous when levels of knowledge were low, or use the miraculous to bewitch people, but should guide humans to the sphere of right faith.”<sup>56,57</sup> However, on the basis of this common foundation of rationality, Master Taixu and Venerable Master Hsing Yun’s attitudes towards Buddhist scriptures can be

said to be relativistic, which differs from Ouyang Jingwu and Lu Cheng's attitude of absolute adherence to certain ones and rejecting all others. We should not be cling to the differences between the various positions of Master Taixu and Venerable Master Hsing Yun, such as both speaking on the equality and propagation of all eight schools of Buddhism in their earlier years. In later years, Master Taixu spoke of "absorbing the Hīnayāna into the Mahāyāna"<sup>58</sup> and Venerable Master Hsing Yun on harmonization of Northern Buddhism, Southern Buddhism, and Tibetan Buddhism. In fact, both masters share the same spirit, i.e. affirming that the scriptures venerated by all schools contain real knowledge and true faith to some degree, which only differed in extent. Affirming religious experience as a basis of faith will naturally lead to the conclusion that schools have different ways of entry but share the same end goal.

Among the many contemporary propagators of Humanistic Buddhism, Venerable Master Hsing Yun has truly inherited the spirit of Master Taixu and has successfully put his ideas into practice towards the reconstruction of modern Buddhist faith. He believes that:

Suffering! Emptiness! Impermanence! Yes, all these are fundamental concepts of Buddhism, and are the three Dharma seals that the Buddha spoke of. However, when we propagate the Dharma today, we should use them expediently. Why does Buddhism discuss suffering? It is to pursue happiness. Suffering is the human realm's reality, but that is not our purpose. The purpose of Buddhism is to transcend suffering and seek happiness. When it comes to emptiness, [we say] the sky is empty, the ground is empty, and the four great elements are empty, causing people to be fearful and feel that everything is non-existent. In fact, emptiness is built upon existence, but most do not understand this. They can still find existence within emptiness—it is within emptiness that we find everything in the universe. Without emptiness, we would not have anything. Wondrous "existence" arises from true "emptiness"—we have to start with having "wondrous existence" to be able to penetrate emptiness and start with the real world of "existence" to proceed from its true reality

towards experiencing the wisdom of “emptiness.”<sup>59,60</sup>

This is a classic case of the “true permanence mere mind” theory that is promoted in East Asia. While still based on Buddhist foundations, it has transformed it into a form that meets the needs of the modern people, i.e., wondrous existence and lasting joy,<sup>61</sup> hence making Fo Guang members proud of their faith. This is a rare phenomenon for a Buddhism that has been suppressed by mainstream Chinese culture in the past few millennia. Even if it did exist, it was only limited to small groups of Buddhists that were isolated from the society. Today, Buddhists in Taiwan can hold their heads up high at least in part to the influence of Fo Guang Shan. Undoubtedly, Fo Guang Shan did not isolate itself from society. Fo Guang Shan monastics and many other Buddhist temples in Taiwan, have welcome and accepted the impact of society’s trend of thoughts. However under Venerable Master Hsing Yun’s guidance, most of his monastic disciples are immovable in their faith.

For those amongst them with stronger capabilities, just as Venerable Man Geng,<sup>62</sup> disciple of Venerable Master Hsing Yun and a PhD candidate of Peking University, responded to Mainland Chinese scholars’ questions on the daily spiritual practice of Fo Guang Shan monastics in Shanghai on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2003 :

In addition to consistent attendance of morning and evening chanting as required by Fo Guang Shan, and trying their best to keep to the ideal of “ordinary mind is the way.”<sup>63</sup> As students they practice through their studies and research, when encountered with frustrations during research, regard it as a test on their spiritual practice. They lead busy but fulfilling lives. They are full of gratitude towards Buddhism and Fo Guang Shan which have nurtured them, and have absolutely no intention to leave Fo Guang Shan. Some may think that these disciples have been chosen by Venerable Master Hsing Yun and so may not be representative. However, there was a Fo Guang Shan monastic who was not sent for further studies who privately told a scholar that the above does not constitute a problem at all.<sup>64</sup>

For most people with average capabilities, it might be difficult to incorporate spiritual practice in their daily lives. However, Dharma talks are regularly held at Fo Guang Shan temples, and there are excellent conditions for personal practice of meditation, chant the name of the Buddha and of other types. The communal practices held at Fo Guang Shan definitely helps provide individuals to gain some religious experience. Needless to say, strong faith is built upon a combination of sūtra validation and personal experiences. This is not novel, but when put together with the colorful lives led by Fo Guang members, it becomes a unique modern phenomenon. Based on their personal disposition, Fo Guang members can choose to participate in community education, Buddhist education, cultural undertakings, charitable work, temple management, devotee reception, or international liaison...In the process of pursuing ultimate liberation, they also lead lives with social values.

This stands in sharp contrast to monastic life since the Ming and Qing dynasties. As recent as the 1950s in Taiwan, the question of “What else do monastics do apart from morning and evening chanting, sūtra chanting, gardening, weeding and chanting the precepts?” was asked. In addition, “year after year, with [the Dharma services of] the first and fifteenth days of the lunar calendar, and further those for devotees—being blessed to escape calamities, prayers for blessings, memorials for the dead, birth, marriage, promotion, and death, the occasional placing of funerary urns into columbariums and installing memorial tablets.”<sup>65</sup>,<sup>66</sup> Finally, they simply “eat, sleep, die, and are memorialized.”<sup>67</sup>,<sup>68</sup> This scenario only refers to life of the monastics who stay in those considerably well-established monasteries.

In this manner, despite there being strong faith and a peaceful mind, it fails to fully apply the guidance and inspiration a religion can provide. Although having faith is better than having none, how meaningful is this pessimistic faith to Buddhism and the society at large? It is not uncommon to have monastics who have lost faith but secretly receive personal gains by continuing to appear as a Buddhists due to the extreme pressure from the society when they return to secular life. All the above are the exact reasons why it is necessary to reconstruct faith.

Although it was not easy for Lu Cheng and Venerable Yin Shun to criticize the faith in “true permanence mere mind” theory, it is far more difficult to reconstruct faith. While Master Taixu provided a general direction, it was Venerable Master Hsing Yun who took

a great leap to actualize it—a historic achievement of the greatest magnitude in the reconstruction of modern Buddhist faith. Through Venerable Master Hsing Yun’s efforts and the image established and advocated by Fo Guang Shan, Humanistic Buddhism has become “a religion filled with joy and happiness, in replacing of its conservative image, that allows Taiwanese Buddhists to take pride in their faith and no longer have to cower in the face of the criticisms of western religions.”<sup>69, 70</sup>

### **3. Clearing the haze of doubts with the brightness of pragmatism**

In truth, the modern transformation of Buddhism started with Yang Wenhui’s new type of Buddhist classes. However, it has been a rocky road clouded by a haze of doubts. These are unavoidable problems of modern Buddhism to which Venerable Master Hsing Yun has provided skilfull answers to some and solved others by taking direct actions without unnecessary arguments. This is the unique characteristic of his style—clearing the haze of doubts with the brightness of pragmatism.

More than a decade ago, Professor Lan Jifu pointed out in his “Various problems in the current teaching and practice of Chinese Buddhism”<sup>71</sup> summarized the issues he observed in the contradiction between the trend of rationalization in modern religion and the values of a Buddhist belief which was based on patriarchal clan tradition:

1. The spirit of letting go in Buddhism is in conflict with the capitalistic value whereby “the pursuit of wealth is a virtue, pursuing profit is a worthwhile investment of human wisdom and such desire should not be condemned”.
2. The Buddhist position that the lives of all sentient beings are fundamentally equal is in conflict with most other religions’ “anthropocentrism”<sup>72</sup> which proposes to only save human lives.
3. The precepts established by the Buddha in “response to violations,” suited the Indian society two thousand years ago, but some of which are in conflict with modernity.
4. Doctrinal conflicts between those of different sutras or different schools cause confusion for modern people.
5. Attitudes and results gleaned from the use of objective academia methodology to study Buddhism is in conflict with the subjective faith of Buddhists.
6. The lack of a systematized organization—it will be difficult to accomplish

large-scale Buddhist undertaking if Dharma propagation is within a couple of temples, and there is a possibility of duplication, wastefulness, and a risk of failure.

In response to the first issue, Venerable Master Hsing Yun affirmed, based on the sūtras that, “Wealth, is what everyone desires, what everyone likes,” and that “however, wealth is not necessarily the best for every individual.”<sup>73</sup> He further gave examples proving that wealth is only valuable if put to good use. He expediently provided six types of wealth that Buddhism approves of and people desire: good health, a smooth-sailing life, a bright future, a safe and sound family, lawful wealth, and enriched within. He also listed the ten types of wealth that contravenes the Dharma, such as those obtained through theft and other unlawful means. Furthermore, Venerable Master Hsing Yun proposed the six-point “ways to wealth” that Buddhism encourages: diligence, frugality, magnanimous, confidence, building positive affinity, and generosity. He emphasised that “the highest and ultimate form of wealth in Buddhism is *prajñā*-wisdom.”<sup>74,75</sup>

Given the content mentioned above, though quoted from Venerable Master Hsing Yun’s speech in 1981, it was not meant to respond to Professor Lan’s questioning. It has positively clarified the Buddhist perspective on wealth, which is compatible with modern society, and even corrected the wrong attitudes towards wealth upheld by many modern people. At the same time, the doubts raised by Professor Lan is quite representative. From the author’s perspective, the strong emphasis on “letting go” in Early Buddhism is similar to the traditional misanthropic views of Catholicism—there is some degree of commonality shared between ancient religions on this matter. There are also many similarities between Protestantism which was transformed from Catholicism, and the Humanistic Buddhism that is advocated by Venerable Master Hsing Yun.

With regard to the second issue, as early as in 1981, Venerable Master Hsing Yun expressed that:

The earliest form of human politics is theocracy in which everything was controlled by providence or divine command. It gradually evolved into monarchy in which rulers had absolute power over his/her subjects. After an extended period of time, civic consciousness gradually grew and

resulted in demands for political participation, and thus monarchy evolved into today's democracy. What then would democracy develop into? It would turn into a "biocracy,"<sup>76</sup> in which all beings will have the right of political participation. Many contemporary laws and threads of public opinion have extended protection beyond that of humans to animals. Examples include the injunctions against animal abuse, bondage and hanging upside-down of fowls before they are killed, overworking of cattle and horses, indiscriminate killing of endangered animals and causing them to become extinct, etc. All of these exemplify the increasing regard that the right to life of non-human species is garnering. And so the future will be the times of biocracy.<sup>77,78</sup>

Nowadays in the West, green parties and Greenpeace have gained considerable political clout and votes. Academics have been advocating against anthropocentrism, and many Christian groups have followed suit. There have been similar trends in Taiwan, with Buddhists leading the way with life care associations.<sup>79</sup> The Buddhist proposition of equality between all beings is no longer a problem, but instead became its advantage over other religions. Research in Buddhist Ethics, represented by that of Venerable Zhao-hui, has integrated the latest outcomes in Western academia, and being at the forefront of the field.

With regard to the third question, Venerable Master Hsing Yun and Fo Guang Shan silently implemented a series of reforms. For example, Venerable Master Hsing Yun was the first to express support for the 2002 Buddhist gender equality movement jointly initiated by the Buddhist Hongshi College and scholars. In fact, under Venerable Master Hsing Yun's guidance, gender equality has been achieved internally within the Fo Guang Shan monastic community. Equality between the two genders have long been realized with outstanding results, especially in their harmonious and coordinated work. In earlier publications, the author had criticized Master Taixu's strategy in the 1930s and 40s for making use of the Buddhist Association of the Republic of China to promote reforms.<sup>80</sup> During that period, there was certainly unnecessary for revolutionaries and reformists to come together—the result was only endless internal strife. It sometimes is better to clearly raise the banner of reform. This point is already successfully proven by Venerable

Master Hsing Yun's independent establishment of the Fo Guang consortium. What is noteworthy is that, given Humanistic Buddhism has become mainstream in Taiwanese Buddhism, Venerable Master Hsing Yun's approach of silently engaging in reform to not further agitate conflicts has created conditions beneficial to gaining the support of the temporarily uninformed public and the moderates.

With regard to the fourth issue, it will be discussed together with the opposing views on the theory of Humanistic Buddhism. The fifth issue is, at its core, the long-lived debate between historians of Western religions and philosophy, i.e., the relationship between rationality and faith. In his masterpiece *Theology for the Third Millennium: An Ecumenical View*,<sup>81</sup> Swiss theologian Hans Küng summed up the historical approaches to this problem into six paradigms of the:

1. Early Christian apocalyptic paradigm
2. Early Church Hellenistic paradigm
3. Medieval Roman Catholic paradigm
4. Reformation Protestant paradigm
5. Enlightenment modern paradigm
6. Contemporary ecumenical paradigm (postmodern)

The last of which then gave rise to a plurality of contemporary models of theologies: ecumenistic, dialectical, existential, hermeneutical, political, and liberation.

Of these, only two pre-middle ages paradigms viewed rationality and faith as opposites, while the remaining four viewed them as compatible in some sense—faith requires the support of rationality while rationality exploration into the unknown requires the guidance of faith. Although Catholic theologian Thomas Aquinas asserts that faith was superior to rationality, it is precisely the paradigm he represents that encompassed rationality and opened the doors for philosophical development from the Middle Ages to the contemporary period. It is therefore apparent that the attitude of emphasizing subjective faith while rejecting objective academic research and rationality is a thing of the past in the West and is of miniscule influence. The intrinsic connection between faith and rationality manifests as both being the crystallization of experience, what differs is that the former is verified through religious experience while the latter through on heuristics.

Some might be of the opinion that these two should not be confounded. On the contrary, contemporary American philosopher of religion and theologian John Hick drew inspiration from Wittgenstein's philosophy in defining the human perception of nature and environment as "experience," and cultural expressions of "experience" as "experiential." "Experiential" therefore carries with it various senses of natural, ethical, aesthetical or religious, of which religious experience is of the highest order (which is called *prajñā*-wisdom).<sup>82</sup> We can thus tell that there does not exist a purely objective system of knowledge, for any such system (which is what the Dharma terms discriminating cognition) is always guided by and encompassed within humankind's system of subjective interpretation. "Experience" and "experiential," rationality and faith, are all united in what the Dharma terms as wisdom. We can also see from this that objectivity and subjectivity are not polar opposites. The reason why some the subjective faith of some Buddhists conflict with "objective" academic research and its outcomes is really the manifestation of the contradiction between the trend of rationalization in modern religions and elements of the clan system still present in values held by the Buddhist faith. For instance, because some people's faith is deeply ingrained with that of a patriarchal clan society, they often speak of the difficulties of gaining people's support, and thus resulting in problems such as not being able to raise funds to build temples. In turn, they direct their anger towards Buddhist organizations like Fo Guang Shan, Tzu-Chi, Dharma Drum, and others, claiming them as "[money-]sucking machines" that have taken away the monetary support from society.

In fact, even if Fo Guang Shan did not exist, other modern-type religions, such as the new religious movements of Japan and Korean will also gain inroads into their devotees. It is precisely the emergence of Fo Guang Shan and other Humanistic Buddhist organizations that developed a strong foothold in the modern age for ancient Chinese Buddhism. We can say that it is not others but life in modern society that is impacting such faith. The Dharma speaks of the external environment arising from our mind, i.e., only by taking the initiative to transform (not abandon) our thoughts and adapting to the times, can we resolve the series of problems we face. If we are able to do so, every word, and incident, every blade of grass and tree, in our surroundings can strengthen our faith. Even if faced with adversity, we can positively regard them as tests of our faith.

This is clearly proven by the ever-strengthening faith of Fo Guang Shan monastic disciples, who inherited the tradition and adapted to contemporary faith, as their efforts

blossom. However, it is unavoidable that faith will be shaken if one fails to evolve. This is because life will repeatedly throw us the problems we cannot resolve. Obviously, results of academic research, which goes by the maxims of objectivity, farsightedness, and creativity, evaluated by a different system of values vis-à-vis religion, can only be a reference. The influence of academic research on Buddhism may grow but it is distinctly different from its earlier anti-religious tendency—today’s consensus in academia is to have respect for different religious beliefs.

With regard to the last issue, using the past Mainland Chinese model of a unified Buddhist organization has already been proven ineffective in the course of Taiwan Buddhist history. In the pluralistic competitive environment of modern society, Buddhist organizations too have to reintegrate and form through competition, inevitably having to face elimination process in terms of its Buddhist undertakings. The modern Japanese Buddhist model that Professor Lan Jifu referenced may have inherited from its traditions, but the fair and open religious competition in the post-Meiji era has undoubtedly promoted each school’s internal integration and made large scale Buddhist undertakings possible. The last few centuries have also seen similar processes of competitions, divisions, joint advancement of religion, and its positive impact on religious undertakings among Protestant organisations in the West.

From a historical perspective, in both the past and present, individual temples have faced the intractable problem of making little impact, duplicating effort and wasting resources in their Buddhist undertakings. This is akin to the globalized market economy where countless small and medium enterprises are finding it hard to survive, while some among them found opportunities to become giant multinational corporations. In this respect, there are some Taiwanese monasteries which are facing imminent crisis and Venerable Master Hsing Yun has expressed his willingness to support these disadvantaged organizations. Although they deserve sympathy, this may not be an ultimate solution, and holding a grudge towards the leading Buddhist organizations will not help solve the problem either. It would be better for struggling small and medium monasteries to cooperate; if an individual monastery is unable to continue its operations, then the option is to ask the leading ones to take over, even though this is done for lack of a better option. This reduces resource duplication and creates conditions for more successful large scale Buddhist undertakings.

Many years ago, Associate Professor Zhou Qing-hua of the Taitung Teacher's College<sup>83</sup> raised the following questions: How do we regard the proponents of Humanistic Buddhism using the same term for differing interpretations? Why is it that up till today it is the Pure Land and Esoteric schools that are primary while the Chan is secondary? Is there any contradiction between the Chan and Pure Land schools, and Humanistic Buddhism?<sup>84</sup> In recent years, some monastics from Mainland China have further raised: Has Humanistic Buddhism existed in ancient times? Does Buddhism have the nature of transcendence? Is Humanistic Buddhism alone sufficient to encompass all other Buddhism schools? These are related to the fourth question raised by Professor Lan, and are directed at the philosophy of Humanistic Buddhism expounded by Venerable Master Hsing Yun, and its differences from that of Master Taixu and Venerable Yin Shun.

Indeed, Venerable Master Hsing Yun inherited Master Taixu's philosophy, but also believes that, "This is the era of integration in the human realm. Regardless of Hīnayāna, Southern, Mahāyāna, Tibetan or Chinese Buddhism, the Humanistic Buddhism proposed today is meant to harmonize and unite all the Buddhisms from the Early Buddhism of the Buddha's era to contemporary Buddhism."<sup>85</sup> He said that the following are all Humanistic Buddhism: the Dharma common to the Five Vehicles, Five Precepts and Ten Virtues, Four Immeasurables, Four Means of Embracing and Six Perfections, the Law of Karma, and the Chan, Pure Land, and Middle Path.<sup>86,87</sup> Furthermore, Venerable Master Hsing Yun cited from the scriptures to prove that, from the Āgamas to the Mahāyāna, all the scriptures contain the philosophy of Humanistic Buddhism. The content he discussed indeed covers almost all of Buddhism, and is especially what Mahāyāna has traditionally advocated for. Some critics are thus expressed the opinion of: What then is the difference between Mahāyāna and Humanistic Buddhism? What is the purpose of proposing the theme of Humanistic Buddhism? Wouldn't it be better to more directly emphasize and apply the Mahāyāna spirit of engagement?

It is obvious that those who merely come from the standpoint of conceptual differences are critics who are aloof from modern social life and have not thoroughly comprehended Venerable Master Hsing Yun's statement of "regardless of how Buddhism is divided, whether Hīnayāna, Mahāyāna, Exoteric or Esoteric, they all have to be humanistic, [because] this is very much suited to modern trends. Humanistic Buddhism inherits from tradition and is the trend of the times, it will necessarily be a torch of brightness for the future."<sup>89,90</sup> No doubt, Humanistic Buddhism did not appear out of thin air. It is firmly

founded in the Āgamas and Mahāyāna scriptures, also inherits, emphasizes, and applies the engaged spirit of the Mahāyāna tradition, but its most significant difference from past forms of Buddhism is in representing a modern trend.<sup>92</sup> Similarly, because we are living in the modern age of pluralistic values, the issues of “doctrinal conflicts between those of different sūtras or different schools causing confusion for modern people” and “how we regard the proponents of Humanistic Buddhism using the same term for differing interpretations”<sup>93</sup> cannot be approached in the same way we would in a totalitarian or conservative setting, i.e. demand that there is an authority that is absolutely reliable.

Doctrinally, for a truly modern person, he/she should seek the consensus between the various scriptures, schools or interpretations of Humanistic Buddhism. Such consensus would be far more reliable than any single authority and the least confusing in terms of content. In terms of spiritual practice and path, it has always been a personal choice based on one’s capabilities, and one can choose Chan, Pure Land or Esoteric methods. Here, it is inappropriate to confuse the choice of spiritual practice with guidance that Humanistic Buddhism provides for our direction in life. This is evidenced in Venerable Master Hsing Yun’s insistence on being guided by Humanistic Buddhist principles, while continuing the traditions of the Chan Linji school; he even much earlier on founded the “Saturday’s Recitation of Buddha’s Name Dharma Service”<sup>94</sup> and other Pure Land practice groups. Certainly, doctrinal differences will affect how one practices, but Humanistic Buddhism has integrated the Chan school’s philosophy of *prajñā*-wisdom and the Pure Land school’s spirit of relieving others from suffering. Therefore, not only does it not obstruct Chan and Pure Land practice, but is even a merging of practice and liberation from modern-day worries.

Buddhism has the characteristic of transcendence just as other religions. In fact, the reason Venerable Master Hsing Yun emphasized the humanism of the Āgamas and Mahāyāna scriptures is primarily to overcome the resistance that existed at that time towards Humanistic Buddhism. If in the past the Dharma did not propose to divorce itself from the Indian caste system or Chinese clan system, then much less can it separate itself from civil society. Likewise, Humanistic Buddhism inherited Buddhism’s fundamental transcendence, including that towards the human realm. This is expressed in its tireless pursuit of the ideals of Pure Land practice, and the exploration and experiencing of the state of liberation and carefreeness. Thus it combines with social reform to guide the purification of minds. This orientation is in harmony with the modern religions around

the world, and differs from the anti-social orientation of religions in the Middle Ages.

Each of the abovementioned doubts are symbolic and reflects the concerns scholars and moanastics have towards the future of Buddhism. They are also unavoidable questions to the future development of Humanistic Buddhism, and should be positively regarded. However, if one were to interpret it word-by-word without understanding its meaning and regard the “humanistic” as “secular,” believing that emphasizing the humanism of Buddhism is speaking only of worldly laws and being humanistic is secularizing Buddhism, then I am afraid he/she is deliberately creating confusion.

Stating the fact is the best response to all well-intentioned criticism and the best way to clear the cloud of uncertainty. Venerable Master Hsing Yun is neither a scholar nor an expert at Buddhist doctrinal studies, and for many students who are used to chewing on concepts, perhaps his simple explanation is not quite persuasive nor profound. Venerable Master Hsing Yun push forward Master Taixu’s theory of Humanistic Buddhism, but primarily in the feasibility of Humanistic Buddhism, and his main purpose was for all to be able to understand and know how to practice it. On this account, he is an exemplary practitioner of Humanistic Buddhism; the Fo Guang Shan he established is one of many real-life examples of Humanistic Buddhism.

The debate over the paradoxes of rationality and faith, also sacredness and secularity has gone on for thousands of years. Potentially it could never be resolved even if we did so for another few millennia. Illuminated by the torch of pragmatism, as long as one is not biased and understands the decline of Buddhism in the past, then one’s cloud of doubts will be dispelled. Because life is unlimited in its abundance and breath, often a paradox that cannot be solved by rationality or theoretical difficulties that cannot be overcome, it may be aided by extensive practice and *prajñā*-wisdom (without attachment nor biases) in finding resolution to achieve the balance between rationality and contradiction. Indeed, theory is abstract and lifeless while life is vibrant and generative.

#### **4. Conclusion**

It has been over 60 years since Venerable Master Hsing Yun began propagating the Dharma. Over the years, even though some temples have a strong foundation and framework, it only takes entering it to realize the dire threats to survival, while others have

or are already falling apart. Yet, alone and without support, Venerable Master Hsing Yun established the Fo Guang Shan monastic community and Buddha's Light International Association by combining his practice of Humanistic Buddhism and expedient observation of minds. Amidst criticism and even slander, Fo Guang Shan did not falter but instead grew from strength to strength, and eventually to worldwide influence. The reasons for this success are many but simple: when Venerable Master Hsing Yun or anyone at Fo Guang Shan meets a problem or difficulty, they, in Venerable Master Hsing Yun's words, "never step back," and always resolve each of them pragmatically. As for temples facing crisis, they belong to either of these two scenarios: either they disregarded minor issues to the point where it's impossible to reverse these issues, or recognized them but felt they were of no consequence, eventually leading to an implosion.

We can thus tell that the proactive approach of Humanistic Buddhism and Venerable Master Hsing Yun's pragmatic spirit is especially valuable in resolving issues (common to all religions) in overcoming Buddhism's problems since the Ming and Qing dynasty, or issues specific to each temple's survival and development. However, while we deal with the first negative manifestation of the Tathāgatagarbha theory—the tendency towards self-liberation, we should also be wary of its second manifestation—the self aggrandizing under the cover of organizational interests interfering with the Buddhist concern for liberation.

Years ago, Master Yinguang described Master Taixu's ideology and ambition as "Boundless Tai Xu." We can also consider putting Venerable Master Hsing Yun together with these venerables: Hsin Ping, Hsin Ding, Tzu Hui, Tzu Chuang, Tzu Jung, Tzu Chia, and Tzu Yi may be described as the bright clouds of stars (lit. Hsing Yun) in the sky above the railway track of Buddhist history. Under their illumination, we can expect Chinese Buddhism to be refreshed as a new tradition in this environment of modern pluralistic cultural values, and become an important peak in Chinese society. At the same time, Chinese society will also absorb and borrow from the experiences and lessons of the modernization process of each ethnic group, religion, and of localization efforts, taking a further step in the direction of a more encompassing world. Just as Hsing Yun puts it: "Only by bringing Buddhism out of the temple, by humanizing, internationalizing and modernizing it, by working jointly without division, then can we better put to good use Buddhism's power in purifying minds in tomorrow's world."<sup>96,97</sup>

## Notes

- 1 《星雲模式的人間佛教》-Ed.
- 2 〈支那佛教振興策〉-Ed.
- 3 「不能讓阿彌陀佛替我償還他（指信眾）的功德」-Ed.
- 4 Hsing Yun, "How to Build Modern Buddhism," in *Master Hsing Yun's Lecture Series (Vol. 4) (Kaohsiung: Fo Guang Publishing House, 1982)*, 27.
- 5 「不看僧面看佛面」-Ed.
- 6 「身在屋簷下，不得不低頭」-Ed.
- 7 「要確立佛教在現代社會中的主體性，離開具有獨立品格的佛教知識份子，是無法想像的。」-Ed.
- 8 Lei-Quan Wang, "Entrusting the ultimate to history (將終極託付給歷史)," in *Listening and Contemplating: Commemorative Journal for the 130th Anniversary of the Jinling Scriptural Press* (聞思：金陵刻經處) 30周年紀念專輯 (Beijing: Sino-Culture Press, 1997), 57.
- 9 「當年的社會普遍輕視爬格子的文人，而佛教淪為迷信之流，更不獲得知識份子的認同。」-Ed.
- 10 Hsing Yun, *Sentiment and Righteousness: Hsing Yun's Memoirs (Taipei: The Eurasian Publishing Group, 1997)*, 221.
- 11 「復興的希望是重視人才」-Ed.
- 12 Hsing Yun, "Where is the hope for today's Buddhist revival?" in *Master Hsing Yun's Lecture Series (Vol. 1)*.
- 13 《佛光山開山30周年紀念特刊·前言》-Ed.
- 14 「認識佛光山，要看佛光山的大眾，不要只看佛光山的個人；要看佛光山的歷史，不要只看佛光山的一時。」-Ed.
- 15 At Fo Guang Shan it is referred to as the sevenfold assembly -Ed.
- 16 「使得佛教混合著一般的擬似佛教（像齋教等民間宗教，或與道教、儒教信仰交雜）而成為台灣社會一種『生活性』的宗教信仰。」-Ed.
- 17 Shun-ming Wang, "The Change of Buddhism in Contemporary Taiwan," *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 8 (1995).
- 18 「不論寺院的設備、僧團的生活方式、乃至服裝及儀式等大都受到日本佛教的影響，如僧人不茹素，可結婚育子，攜家帶眷營運寺院，而由大陸福建傳來的中國佛教則日趨式微。」-Ed.
- 19 Jianye Shi, ed., *Shi Tianyi: A Nun who Went through the Transitional Period in Taiwanese Buddhism (Taipei: Zhongtian Press, 1999)*, 20.
- 20 Please see Dongchu Shi, "Clues to Understanding Buddhism in Taiwan," in *Buddhism in Taiwan, ed. Mantao Zhang (Taipei: Mahayana Culture Press (大乘文化出版社), 1979)*, 109.
- 21 「從此台灣僧人的生活型態被徹底改造，不婚嫁、茹素、斷葷酒、剃髮、著僧衣、受具足戒等，成為台灣僧人的必要條件。」-Ed.
- 22 Jianye Shi, ed., *Shi Tianyi: A Nun who Went through the Transitional Period in Taiwanese Buddhism (Taipei: Zhongtian Press, 1999)*, 23.
- 23 Jifu Lan, "The Formation and Development of Buddhist Cultural Forms (佛教文化形態的形成及其發展)," in *Ting Yu Seng Lu Foxue Zaji (聽雨僧廬佛學雜集) (Taipei: Modern Chan Press (現代禪出版社), 2003)*, 14-6.
- 24 See Bing Chen and Zimei Deng, *Chinese Buddhism in the Twentieth Century (5) (Beijing: The Ethnic Publishing House, 2000)*. A 2003 reprint was published by Modern Chan Press (現代禪出版社) of Taipei.
- 25 「愈降愈濫，愈誕愈易。」「無量人間，當用無量法門……答之。……或宗《華嚴經》，或宗《法華經》，或宗《涅槃經》……烏有所謂教外別傳者乎？」-Ed.
- 26 Zizhen Gong, "An Introduction to the Past Writings of Earlier Distinguished Monastics of China (支那古德遺書序)," in *Gong Zizhen's Complete Works (Shanghai: People's Publishing House, 1975)*.
- 27 「絕跡空行，縱橫排蕩，莫可捉摸。」「真偽雜出」-Ed.
- 28 Wenhui Yang, "Brief Outline of the Ten Schools," in *Posthumous Publications of Yang Renshan (楊仁山居士遺著)*. Please see Vol. 4 of the 1982 reprint by the Jinling Scriptural Press.
- 29 Wenhui Yang, "Brief Outline of the Ten Schools," in *Posthumous Publications of Yang Renshan (楊仁山居士遺著)*.
- 30 唯識論-Ed.
- 31 《楞嚴百偽》-Ed.
- 32 《楞嚴經》-Ed.
- 33 《仁王》偽也，《梵網》偽也，《起信》偽也，《圓覺》偽也，《占察》偽也。實又重翻《起信》，不空再譯《仁王》，又偽中之偽也。……至於《楞嚴》一經，集偽說之大成。蓋以文辭纖巧，釋義模稜，與此土民性喜驚虛浮者適合，故其流行普遍。賢家據以解緣起，台家引以說止觀，禪者援以證頓超，密宗又取以通顯教。……一門超出，而萬行俱廢。-Ed.
- 34 The author did not provide a reference to this quotation, but it might be from 呂澂佛學論著選集 [Lü Cheng, *The Selections on Writings of Lü Cheng on Buddhism* (Jinan: Qi-Lu Press, 1986)] -Ed.
- 35 唯識論-Ed.
- 36 「傾向如來（藏）之菩薩分流」，稱密乘經論為「如來（藏）為本之梵佛一體」-Ed. The addition of "garbha" behind "Tathāgata" were the author's own.
- 37 《阿含經》-Ed.
- 38 「批判佛教」-Ed.
- 39 真常唯心論的「本覺思想」與印度就有的「如來藏思想」-Ed.
- 40 「偽佛教」-Ed.
- 41 See Shirō Matsumoto, *Critique of Tathagatagarbha Thought in Buddhist Philosophy (Tokyo: Daizo Shuppansha, 1989)*; Noriaki Hakamaya, *Critique of Innate Awakening Theory and Critical Buddhism (Daizo Shuppansha, 1989 and 1990)*; and, Chen-kuo

- Lin, "Critical Buddhist Thought," in *Emptiness and Modernity* (Taipei: New Century Publishing Co., Ltd., 1999).
- 42 Noriaki Hakamaya, *Tathatā as Location* (作為場所的真如), 289.
- 43 「佛教最古的典籍也直接受到這些學說很大的影響，例如九次第定之四禪，或欲界、色界、無色界之三界說……等諸說皆是。」-Ed.
- 44 Hakuju Ui, *The History of Buddhist Philosophy in China and India* (Hsinchu: Infinite Life Press (無量壽出版社), 1987), 122.
- 45 The problem will not be solved this way of course, it will appear with a seemingly new face. As American scholar Lusthaus pointed out, the emergence of critical Buddhism was inevitable. This time, it was a philosophical way for East Asian scholars to use "the historical-linguistic methods of Bible study developed in the West during the 19th century. In the West, these methods are critical of the "historical Jesus," the editors of the Gospels, and the rise of the early Christian church." Lusthaus, "Critical Buddhism and Returning to the Sources," in Jamie Hubbard and Paul L. Swanson eds., *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm over Critical Buddhism* (Shanghai: Ancient Books Publishing House, 2004), 31 (see footnote 4).
- 46 「外向性的神秘體驗」和「內向性的神秘體驗」-Ed.
- 47 「自然的(宇宙的)神秘主義」、「心靈的神秘主義」和「一神論的神秘主義」-Ed.
- 48 Zhigang Zhang, *A Study on Philosophy of Religion* (Beijing: China Renmin University Press, 2003), 230-9.
- 49 《大般若經》-Ed.
- 50 「忽然失卻身心世界，泯然空寂中，靈光湛湛，無數塵刹煥然炳現，如凌虛影像，明照無邊。座經數小時，如彈指頃；曆好多日，身心猶在輕清安悅中。」-Ed.
- 51 Taixu Shi, "Autobiography," in *The Complete Works of Venerable Taixu* (Taipei: Shandao Si Liutongchu), Vol. 58.
- 52 民國四十三年，我在宜蘭雷音寺主持佛七，有特別的感受，今天回想起來，不曉得那七天究竟如何渡過的？只覺得佛號綿綿不斷，嘹繞於耳際。吃飯的時候，吃的彷彿是阿彌陀佛、阿彌陀佛……刷牙的涮涮聲，也變成一聲聲的阿彌陀佛……睡覺的時候，人雖然睡著了，但是神志清明，心中仍然阿彌陀佛、阿彌陀佛地響個不停；走路的時候，腳步輕盈，好像騰空一般，不是自己在行走，身後似乎有一股力量在推動著自己前進，而每一個步伐，也是阿彌陀佛……任何時刻所感受到的都是阿彌陀佛、阿彌陀佛……七天就在綿綿密密的彌陀聖號之中，一眨眼地過去了，忘記了自己的存在，忘記了「時間」為何物？感覺七天只不過一彈指罷了！這次的佛七所給予我的信心、宗教的體驗，比過去膜拜觀世音菩薩更深刻，讓我體會了物我兩忘、時空俱泯的境界！-Ed.
- 53 Hsing Yun, "My Religious Experience," in *Master Hsing Yun's Lecture Series* (Vol. 2).
- 54 「依人乘行果趣進修大乘行的末法時期。」「在現代社會，依聲聞行果，是要被誣為消極避世的；依天乘行果，是要被誣為迷信神權的。不唯不是方便，而反成為障礙了。」-Ed.
- 55 Taixu Shi, "How I Categorize All the Buddhist Teachings," in *The Complete Works of Venerable Taixu* (Vol. 2).
- 56 「現代化的佛教，應該從對自然圖騰的崇拜、英雄式的神權信仰，走向淨化身心、提升生命的層次；現代化的佛教，不可以如過去知識低落的時代迷信怪誕，以神奇轟惑民眾，而應該將人心導引至正信的領域。」-Ed.
- 57 Hsing Yun, "The Modernization of Buddhism," in *Master Hsing Yun's Lecture Series* (Vol. 2).
- 58 「攝小(乘)歸大(乘)」-Ed.
- 59 苦呀！空呀！無常呀！不錯！這是佛教的基本思想，是佛陀所說的三法印。但在當今說法布教時，要應用善巧方便。佛教為什麼說苦？是為了追求幸福快樂的；若是人間的現實，但非我們的目的，佛教的目的是要脫苦、尋求快樂。說到空，天也空，地也空，四大皆空……，讓大家都很害怕，覺得什麼都沒有了。其實「空」是建設「有」的，只是一般人不瞭解。空有空的內容，在空的裡面才能擁有宇宙的一切，不空的話，就什麼都沒有了。真「空」生妙「有」，我們先有「妙有」，才能入空；先建設現實「有」的世界，從「有」的真實中，方能體驗「空」的智能。-Ed.
- 60 Hsing Yun, "How to Build Modern Buddhism," in *Master Hsing Yun's Lecture Series* (Vol. 4).
- 61 妙有常樂-Ed.
- 62 滿耕-Ed.
- 63 「平常心即道」-Ed.
- 64 他們除了堅持佛光山規定的早晚功課之外，還盡力秉持「平常心即道」的理念，作為學生，就在學習與研究中修行，把研讀中遇到的煩惱作為對修行的考驗。生活雖然繁忙，但過得很充實。他們對佛教、對培養他們成長的佛光山，充滿著感恩之情，絲毫也沒有將來離開佛光山的打算。有人可能以為這是星雲著意栽培的弟子，因此不具備代表性。但另一位並未被送去深造的佛光山徒眾私下告訴學者，上述問題對他們來說，其實根本不成為問題。-Ed.
- 65 「在佛門只是早晚課誦、誦經、下田、拔草、誦戒，還要做什麼？」逢「初一、十五，再加上為信眾消災、祈福、薦亡等婚、喪、喜、慶，有時候進塔、進牌位，年復一年，就這樣過去了。」-Ed.
- 66 Jianye Shi, "Record of An Interview with Shi Wuyin, Part 5 (釋悟因訪談記錄五)," in *Shi Tianyi: A Nun who Went through the Transitional Period in Taiwanese Buddhism*, 363 and 366.
- 67 「吃三餐，一個床位、死亡入塔、入功德堂。」-Ed.
- 68 Jianye Shi, "Record of An Interview with Shi Wuyin, Part 2 (釋悟因訪談記錄二)," in *Shi Tianyi: A Nun who Went through the Transitional Period in Taiwanese Buddhism*, 341.
- 69 「歡欣快樂，突破守舊形象的宗教，致使台灣的佛教徒對自己的信仰感到驕傲，面對西方宗教的評比，再也不必退縮」-Ed.
- 70 Canteng Jiang, *Contemporary Taiwanese Buddhism* (Taipei: SMC Publishing, 1997), 9.
- 71 〈當前華人佛教在教義與實踐上的若干問題〉-Ed.
- 72 「人類至上」-Ed.
- 73 「財富，是我們每一個人所希望、所喜歡的。」同時指出，「但是，財富對於每一個人，並不一定是最好的東西。」-Ed.
- 74 「佛教講的最高究竟的財富是一般若。」-Ed.
- 75 Hsing Yun, "The Buddhist Perspective on Wealth," in *Master Hsing Yun's Lecture Series* (Vol. 2).
- 76 生權政治。In contrast to democracy, which is prefixed with "demo," which derives from the Greek "dēmos," meaning "people,

- land” (see [https://www.etymonline.com/word/\\*da-#etymonline\\_v\\_52834](https://www.etymonline.com/word/*da-#etymonline_v_52834)), here 生 refers to all life forms, or at least all sentient ones, thus the prefix “demo” is replaced with “bio.”
- 77 在人類最早的政治是神權政治，一切委諸於天意、神旨。神權政治慢慢地演變，國君抬頭了，成了君叫臣死，臣不得不死的君權 至上的政治。君權政治經過長久的年代，人民意識逐漸抬高，紛紛要求參政權，於是君權時代又進化到今日的民權時代。那麼，民權政治再發展下去，又將是怎樣的 政治呢？民權政治再發展下去，將成為生權政治的時代，一切眾生都有參政權。現代許多著名的輿論和法律，也都惠及到人類以外的其它動物，並且主張保護他們。譬如不可虐待動物，雞鴨未殺前不可倒吊、捆綁，牛馬不可令其操勞過度，稀少的動物不可濫殺，不可令其滅種，凡此種種，都已證明了人以外其他生物的生命權已獲得逐漸的重視，未來將走到生權政治的時代。-Ed.
- 78 Hsing Yun, “Looking at the Future of the World from a Buddhist Perspective,” in *Master Hsing Yun’s Lecture Series (Vol. 2)*.  
79 生命關懷協會-Ed.
- 80 Zimei Deng, *A Complete Biography of Master Taixu (Taipei: Huiming Wenhua Chuban Gongsu (慧明文化出版公司), 2002)*, 223.
- 81 《為了第三個千年的神學：一種普世觀》-Ed.
- 82 [美]約翰·希克：《理性與信仰：宗教多元論諸問題》，成都：四川人民出版社，2003年，頁20-30。Hick John, *Problems of Religious Pluralism (Chengdu: Sichuan People’s Publishing House, 2003)*, 20-30.
- 83 台東師範學院, today the Teacher’s College, National Taitung University.
- 84 Qing-hua Zhou, “The Construction of Post-Humanistic Buddhism (後人間佛教的建構),” in *2001 Buddhist Philosophy Research Papers Collection: Humanistic Buddhism (Kaohsiung: Fo Guang Publishing House, 2001)*, 193 and 202.
- 85 「到了今天是人間圓融的時代。不論是小乘的、南傳的、大乘的、西藏的、中國的佛教，今日提出的人間佛教，是要把最原始的佛陀時代到現代的佛教，融合起來，統攝起來。」-Ed.
- 86 「五乘共法」、「五戒十善」、「四無量心」、「四攝六度」、「因緣果報」、「禪淨中道」-Ed.
- 87 Hsing Yun, “Fundamental Ideas of Humanistic Buddhism,” in *Master Hsing Yun’s Lecture Series (Vol. 4)*.  
88 《阿含》-Ed.
- 89 「不管佛教有小乘、大乘，有顯教、密教，不管它怎麼分，應該要有人間性，這是很適合時代的潮流。不僅承繼傳統，而且是時代所趨，人間佛教必然是未來的一道光明」-Ed.
- 90 Hsing Yun, “Fundamental Ideas of Humanistic Buddhism,” in *Master Hsing Yun’s Lecture Series (Vol. 4)*.  
91 《阿含》-Ed.
- 92 On its continuity and differences, please see Zimei Deng, “On the Modern Character of the Humanistic Buddhism,” *Chan Studies 1 (2002)*.
- 93 關於「不同經論或宗派在教義上的衝突，使現代人無所適從」的問題，關於「如何對待主要宣導者們對『人間佛教』同一命題的不同詮釋」-Ed.
- 94 「星期六共修念佛法會」-Ed.
- 95 《阿含》-Ed.
- 96 「我們唯有走出去，將佛教人間化、國際化及現代化，不分彼此，團結一心，未來在世界上，才能更好地展現佛教淨化人心的力量。」-Ed.
- 97 Hsing Yun, “A Letter for Readers,” *Universal Gate Buddhist Journal 25 (January 2005)*.