

The major biographies, though too short to give much indepth analysis of the figures, does provide more than the basic encyclopedia entry. The approach is balanced and the contents informative, though sometimes the attempt to end the article on an upbeat note tends to become a bit maudlin (e.g., the chapter on Saichō ends with an appeal to the image of “the Japanese cedars on [Mt. Hiei]...shrouded in mist,” while “the lamp of the dharma...will never be extinguished”).

One section that I found particularly informative and touching was the final section of the chapter on Suzuki Daisetz, which takes up the young Umehara Takeshi's criticism of Suzuki's work on Japanese culture. The brief account is a sensitive and balanced treatment that raises important questions without resorting to unnecessary attack on Suzuki's character.

Finally, the seventy-five brief biographies give basic, encyclopedia-like information on numerous figures that could not be given longer treatment. As with the major biographies, this section includes many modern and contemporary figures (e. g., Inoue Enryō, Nanjō Bun'yū, Murakami Senshō) that are probably overlooked in general histories of Japanese Buddhism.

Since the work takes the traditional “lives of great men” approach, it does not provide analysis of the broader flow of the development of Buddhism in Japan. It may not serve well on its own as a textbook for an introductory course, though I find it quite handy for checking information or for a quick reading while preparing for lectures on Japanese Buddhism. Students should also find it useful for gaining an overview of the major figures of Japanese Buddhism. In short, this is a reliable and informative work that should serve well both as an introductory work for beginners and a source of reference for the teacher.

Rude Awakenings: Zen, the Kyoto School, and the Question of Nationalism

James W. Heisig and John C. Maraldo, eds.
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press,
1995.

*Reviewed by Joseph O'Leary,
Sophia University, Tokyo*

The Kyoto Zen Symposium, funded by the Taniguchi Foundation, brings together annually a score of scholars for a week of intensive debate. As a participant in the thirteenth symposium, on “The Challenge of Modernity to Religious Doctrine,” I was impressed by the authenticity with which each speaker presented his own tradition's response and by the philosophical open-mindedness of the discussions. The present work, based on the proceedings of the eleventh symposium, held in Santa Fe, is marked by the same spirit of frank and courteous inquiry. The topic it deals with is an explosive one, but there are no voices raised in shrill indignation, despite a great difference of emphasis between most of the Japanese contributors and most of the Western ones.

The complicity of Zen and the Kyoto School in “a Japanese nationalism whose practical adventures brought untold suffering to other countries in Asia and was ultimately catastrophic for Japan itself” (p. 235) is discussed fairly and calmly, with a constant effort to retain respect for honored teachers and predecessors. This forms an instructive contrast to the tone of the Heidegger controversy in Europe and the U.S.A., often marked by opportunistic sensationalism, self-righteous political correctness, a readiness to interpret every detail in the worst possible sense, and philistinism towards Heidegger's thought and philosophy in general.

The present volume has, however, the faults of its virtues. It juxtaposes contradictory viewpoints with no effort to provide an overview, either in a preface or an epilogue. If each paper were followed by a critical response, the points of discord might have emerged more clearly. The low-key tone of the discussion may arouse suspicions that what is going on here is a subtle edulcoration of the painful questions which are robbed of their sting by being taken aboard in a display of disinterested reflection. The Japanese contributors gravitate towards *apologia* and show little awareness of what Japan's imperialist ideology meant in practice. Most of the contributors base their views on close reading of the Kyoto philosophers' texts, without a sufficient background in historical and political analysis. Politics is not as easy to think about as philosophers and Zen monks tend to imagine. To decipher the true political sense of an event or a speech may require the dialectical versatility of Hegel and Marx, the psychological acumen of Freud and Lacan, and the lawyer's or the detective's eye for significant detail. Common sense can show up the blind spots of the Kyoto philosophers, but a thorough understanding of how these delusions arose or how they functioned within the play of the political interests of the time would require a skill in historical analysis which few possess.

Yet the unease which this book generates adds to its thought-provoking quality. A more conclusive work might have short-circuited the process of judgment; a more cautious one would have robbed us of a vivid picture of Japanese attitudes to a troubling heritage. The very fact that critics and apologists meet within the covers of one book is a major step towards confronting that murky past, and allaying the fear expressed by one contributor: "Given the apparent reluctance of the Zen tradition to look squarely at the issue of war responsibility, the possibility of its being 'doomed to repeat' past mistakes is not insignificant" (p. 29).

The Kyoto school philosophers had a facility in spinning dialectical webs with abstract concepts which gave them the illusion that they had provided a rational basis for Japan's wartime activities. Infatuated with Hegel, they lacked Hegel's political canniness and his ability to recognize brutality and tragedy in human affairs. As if in the grip of some cunning dialectic, their claims to a lofty universalism constantly flopped over into imperialistic chauvinism. They saw the emperor as supreme mediation of the absolute, and envisaged a postwar role for him as a "symbol of Absolute Nothingness" (p. 303). They saw Japan as a unique and superior country, the foremost agent of world ethics. Thus Nishitani Keiji wrote in 1942: "There is no country other than Japan where Eastern religiosity has been so closely bound to national ethics as to become the cornerstone of the nation and tap its primal energies....In our country today the moral energy that is the driving force of national ethics must at the same time directly energize a world ethic" (p. 219).

Abbot Hirata Seiko asks why Zen monks failed to speak out on the Buddhist ideal of nonbelligerence and instead lent their active support to the war effort. Ichikawa Hakugen's suggestion that the Zen detachment from ethical reasoning might be to blame is met with an *ad hominem* riposte: "Ichikawa became involved in a some what radical movement in Japan against the war in Vietnam. As the protests led to violent clashes with authority, some from the Buddhist world questioned Ichikawa's collaboration in the movement on the grounds that anything which provokes violence is opposed to Buddhism." It rather sounds as if the Buddhist world was straining out gnats while swallowing camels. Hirata concludes that Zen is basically concerned with the self and its freedom, not with politics. Such a disjunction of spiritual enlightenment and political deludedness seems highly problematic.

Christopher Ives expounds Ichikawa's critique more sympathetically, pointing out that he was virtually the only Japanese Buddhist to examine critically Zen's role in Japan's Fifteen-Year War. The Zen attitude of inner freedom and indifference in regard to all circumstances translated in practice into accommodation with fascism. Imagining themselves to be masters of external circumstances, almost all Zen figures became opportunistic in their adjustment to them. In Nishida's philosophy, a glorification of actuality undermines the critical freedom required for ethical thought. Though Nishida was "trying to steer his country away from destructive imperialism and hence was not a nationalist in any narrow or belligerent sense" (p. 32), he still deserves censure for (1) absolutizing present actualities in an unethical way; (2) seeing the state as source and embodiment of moral value; (3) promoting the divine emperor myth; (4) advocating submission to the state and fusion with the emperor; (5) lacking economic analysis; (6) a bias toward harmony and unity, which caused him to confuse the realities of politics with personal longings for serenity; and (7) an espousal of Japan's taking the lead in Asia at a time when this meant military aggression and colonial rule (p. 32).

Ueda Shizuteru, a major Kyoto school figure, notes that in his advice to the Army in 1943 on the "new world order," Nishida urged respect for the autonomy of individual nations, accusing Army leaders of creating a coercion sphere rather than a co-prosperity sphere. Nishida engaged in a semantic struggle, trying to give an acceptable content to such slogans as "the Imperial Way," and warning against those who "would turn the Imperial Way into an imperialism" (p. 93). When Nishida calls the imperial family "a self-identity of contradictories, a being of non-being," the important point is that he does not say an "absolute self-identity of contradictories"

(p. 94). Ueda concludes that the entire debate about Nishida's complicity in the war effort is unfounded, since there was no such complicity. But the impression remains that Nishida's rhetoric lent itself easily enough to misinterpretation as the philosophical foundation of the war effort, and that to break that identification a far bolder critique of the war government's policies would have been required.

Horio Tsutomu deals with the notorious *Chūōkōron* discussions of 1941-42. He seems to believe that this notoriety is entirely due to the "unrepentant bias and partiality" of critics who have refused to assess the debate "for its value as thought" (p. 291). He sees the Greater East Asia War as "an attempt by the nations of Asia to create a new pluralistic world order in which the hegemony of modern Western culture and its values would be overthrown" (p. 292). The Kyoto thinkers "put logical order into the three pillars of wartime thought: 'all-out war,' 'eternal war,' and 'the founding ideals of the nation.'...They did not produce an apology for fascism and the war. All they did was formulate public ideas, or perhaps we should say interpret them" (p. 294). They interpreted all-out war as a "philosophical war" mediating a change in worldview, "a unique mode of war hitherto unseen," "a war to overcome modernity," "a war that has welled up from the deepest recesses of history, superseding the distinction between peacetime and wartime" (p. 311). Their talk of "Japanizing the Koreans" shows "an excess in the aim of realizing a 'co-prosperous' autonomy and independence for the peoples of East Asia through a show of strength against the imperialist countries of the West" (p. 315).

In contrast, Jan Van Bragt describes the *Chūōkōron* debates as follows:

Here we see a group of intellectuals stumbling about in a kind of euphoric haze, groggy with the excitement of a war and its coming adventures. In their

paean for the war effort, no mention is ever made of the immense suffering it is inflicting.... What kind of a detour must conscience make to go along with Nishitani's plea to make other Eastern high-quality peoples into "half-Japanese," or the musings of the participants about the destiny of the Korean people, capped off by Kisaka's declaration that "by becoming Japanese in a broad sense, the true historicity of the Koreans will come to life"? (pp. 239-40)

Van Bragt probes behind such Kyoto school nationalism to an entrenched Japanese particularism rooted in "the preponderance of the social nexus over the individuals and over the transcendent" (p. 237). He claims that "the nationalistic-sounding pronouncements of Nishida, Tanabe, and Nishitani are not simply turns of phrase or idle thoughts without any organic link to the body of their philosophical thinking" (p. 245). They saw their philosophical ideals as already embodied in Japanese culture and the Japanese state; even their sincere criticisms of totalitarianism lacked a solid anchor in their philosophy, because they had no conception of transcendence that could warrant "the refusal to identify the Absolute with anything this-worldly and with it the 'absolute' grounding of the individual" (p. 251). Here Van Bragt seems to be putting Mahayana Buddhism on trial.

John Maraldo singles out the most offensive themes in the Chūōkōron debate: (1) Japan's unique mission to uplift the peoples of East Asia; (2) the identification of Britain and America, not Germany or Japan, as the oppressors; (3) the justification of Japan's role by a claim to superior historical consciousness and achievement. He goes on to recontextualize this jingoistic rhetoric by drawing an analogy with contemporary America's sense of having a unique world mission: "wartime Japanese rationalizations have something in common with cur-

rent American ideals" (p. 355). America has not yet reached the point of even considering an apology for its aggressions in Latin America and Southeast Asia.

Mori Tetsuri accepts Nishitani's postwar account of his role: "I tried to explain the position of the nation in the world for the intellectual standers-by, and at the same time to open up a path in thought that might overcome from within the ideas of ultranationalism that were taking control at the time" (p. 316). The phrase "intellectual standers-by" refers to the ongoing "failure of the Japanese intelligentsia to participate in society and develop a sense of history." But it is directed especially against leftist "critics who have not suffered" and who "no longer know what it is to write out of a sense of historical necessity" (p. 317) in contrast to Nishitani himself. Certainly, facile scapegoating of wartime rightists is not a historically deep strategy, but Nishitani's method of turning the table on the scapegoaters does not argue a profound self-critique on his own part. Mori defends Nishitani's wartime writings as "unequivocally clear" and "astonishingly consistent" in their projection of a philosophical ideal of global universality wherein each nation would practice self-negation. "It is in Nishitani's critics that one finds a deliberately ideological agenda, not in Nishitani himself" (p. 323).

But even if Nishitani's ideas were put forward in resistance to state absolutism, they could easily be coopted by it as its own propaganda, as Kevin Doak shows (p. 186). Nishitani may have intended his agenda as purely philosophical (if one can credit him with such naivete) but in practice it bathes in an ideological atmosphere. Andrew Feenberg points to the influence of German reactionary modernism (Ernst Junger), which enthused about the aesthetics of total mobilization and a fusion of *moralische Energie* and technological prowess (p. 153).

Rude Awakenings is an extremely valuable contribution to our understanding of Japanese political thought in the war period and its ongoing echoes today. It throws a harsh light on the ideological failure of the Kyoto School. But, as in the case of Heidegger, this should not lead us to devalue the abiding philosophical achievement of these thinkers, their synthesis of Mahayana spirituality with Western dialectics to create a new kind of thinking from the standpoint of emptiness or Absolute Nothingness. No thinker is above ideological suspicion, but neither can any critic claim the high moral ground of utter innocence. That there is a transmission of wisdom, despite the crookedness of history in which we are all involved, is the wager on which philosophical and religious tradition rests.

A Broader Vision: Perspectives on the Buddha and the Christ

Richard Henry Drummond
Virginia Beach, VA: A.R.E. Press, 1995.
xxii, 344pp. US\$16.95

*Reviewed by Joseph O'Leary,
Sophia University, Tokyo*

Professor Drummond's vision is "broader" in the sense of "There are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in your philosophy." His seventeen years as a missionary in Japan have given him a wide ecumenical tolerance towards the preternatural or miraculous dimensions of religion. When he speaks of treating lightly subordinate critical issues in order "to delineate more clearly and emphatically the larger picture" (p. xi), what he means is the picture of a full-blooded supernatural universe, in which such phenomena as levitation, psychometry (p. 169), and miraculous creation of matter have their rightful place.

Well-versed in New Testament exegesis, versatile in argument, exuding moral and spiritual wholesomeness, Drummond subjects one's rationalistic prejudices to a severe buffeting. In contrast to exegetes who reduce the empirical facts of the resurrection to pneumatic events along the lines of Paul's conversion experience (cf. I Cor 15:5-8), he takes seriously "the combination of bilocation with tangibility and the eating of food" and seeks comparisons with other "out-of-the-body events" (p. 150). The miracles of Jesus, an obligatory accompaniment of prophetic claims, are paralleled by preternatural phenomena in the careers of such figures as St. Joseph of Cupertino, Padre Pio, Therese Neumann, and Sathya Sai Baba ("reported to have performed operations after having materialized the instruments," p. 275). The problem, however, is not to get people to admit that such events occur, but to convince them that they are significant and not merely embarrassing. Some theologians talk of outgrowing the huge concessions the Gospels make to popular religiosity, and point to gospel texts that tone down the significance of miracles.

The most controversial aspect of Drummond's work is the role he ascribes to psychics in the substantiation of Christian claims. Thus we learn of "supportive evidence from clairvoyant sources for the historic Christian belief in the virgin birth of Jesus" (p. 271) and of Rudolf Steiner's "clairvoyant perception of events of the life of Jesus and of their cosmic significance" (p. 169). Steiner taught that "the Buddha 'in sending down influences from the spiritual worlds' has been a cooperator with the risen Christ and from the beginning of the Christian movement has contributed and continues to contribute to the activity that we call Christian" (p. 178).

Drummond's publishers are devoted to spreading the teachings of Edgar Cayce (1877-1945), "the American Protestant seer best known for his phenomenally accurate