

Where is the One Dharma to Which all Dharmas Return?: The Horizon of Buddhist Inclusivism in Religious Pluralism

Yong-pyo Kim

The Present study is concerned with the problem of Buddhist attitude toward other religions and religious pluralism from the Mahayana perspective. The Buddha discoursed with many religious people which enabled him to see the true nature of dharmas, from a diversity of religion's claims on truth, in accordance with dependent origination. But at the same time, Buddha emphasized generosity and peace towards other religions. Open inclusivism in religious pluralism towards other religions is a preferred attitude by contemporary Buddhists. By embracing the twin ideas of ultimate truth as emptiness and Buddhism as open and boundless, in its foundational principles and religious expression, we may potentially inherit dharma by helping others through dialogue to attain their own enlightenment. In this manner of dialogue we can obtain peace which is naturally desirable to Buddhists. In general, Buddhists are inclusive in their interpretation of Buddhist doctrines but tend to be pluralistic

The first draft of this paper was read at the International Conference of the World Fellowship of Buddhists, Oct 9, 2007, Kyungju Korea. The main theme was "the Role of Buddhists and a New Direction."

Yong-pyo Kim is a Professor of Religious Studies at Dongguk University and President of the Korean Association for Religious Education.

International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture February 2008, Vol.10, pp.105-122.

© 2008 International Association for Buddhist Thought and Culture

toward religious experiences. As a religion embracing inclusive and pluralistic thought, Buddhism has a doctrinal base which supports understanding and cooperation with other religions, particularly the Mahayana teachings on emptiness, with its dynamic potential to promote harmony by dissolving all exclusive boundaries concerning doctrines or traditions. It is a maturity of perspective which offers opportunity for dialogue and a conceptual framework that can acknowledge the essence of all religions.

Key words: Buddhist Inclusivism, Religious Pluralism,
Emptiness, Dialogue, One Dharma.

I. The Problem of Pluralism in the Age of Dialogue

Presently the world religious community is connected to global generation through pluralism.¹ Discourse on pluralism can no longer be avoided, and for societies where there is a diversity of cultures and religions coexisting, religious pluralist values are becoming increasingly important to aid understanding and acceptance. Fortunately, religious discourse is also becoming more acceptable. Take the recent occurrence where Christians were sent by their church to Afghanistan as volunteers and were subsequently kidnapped by the Taliban, this certainly points to an urgent need for discourse. In this case, the actions of both parties gave rise to a great deal of conflict around the meaning of peace among religions which highlights just how important dialogue is.

Current issues and dilemmas around religious pluralism raise many questions for religious people everywhere and no less for Buddhists. So what is an appropriate response from the Buddhist community in this regard? With present-day pressure bearing down on all major religious bodies and

¹ Pluralism can be defined as the people's attitude towards accepting the existence of other and different faiths or principles. Accepting difference is not only a reflective attitude in the sense of how it relates to the superiority of one's own doctrinal truth, it is also the manner in which people are willing to discover cooperatively with other cultures.

institutions the search for truth and clarity has become critical. Here, Buddhism can offer clear pathways to help clarify direction. This paper will address the issue of pluralism in civilization from the Mahayana Buddhist view of harmony.

The contemporary approach to discourse among religious pluralists is about uniqueness, diversity, and openness, in a post-modern world.² Before the 19th century the European view of truth was unconditional, fixed, and exclusive, largely determined by the Aristotelian view of Logic of Contradiction, the gist of which is that two identical things can occur at the same time making it impossible to fabricate. The Modern era's view of truth is the opposite. The truth as absolute, static, and exclusive, has been turned on its head in this contemporary age, and is now understood as dynamic, dialogic and relational (Swidler 1987: 7). The notion of relational truth is also having an influence on established ideas in studies of civilizations and religious philosophy and is bringing about change.

Around 2500 years ago the major centers of civilization were undergoing a similar shifts in perception about the nature of truth. As the Buddha already addressed this issue 2500 years ago through dialogue and teaching, Buddhist discourse potentially offers a conduit for current thinking and dialogue among contemporary civilizations.

Where pluralist ideas may conflict with religious philosophy, particularly with the notion that each religion has an equivalent means to some kind of salvation (Hick 1988: 331-333), this conflict has been the basis for great world religions to collaborate in order to find shared meaning and acceptance. Modern day pluralist scholars such as John Hick have responded by suggesting the necessity for a shift away from earlier religious thought which is based on the Copernican way of thinking. Thus,

2 Jacques Derrida criticizes logos-centralism which focuses on Western philosophical history. He considers the free thinking among humans to be evidence a post-modern movement. He insisted upon the Theology that is centered in existence-divinity-metaphysical concepts cannot be liberated from its 'box' of speech-centralism and reason-centralism, hence the need for it to be dismantled. This theme of dismantlement of dualism theology that existence-divinity-metaphysical theology could not be getting out of the fence which it was built in: speech-centralism and reason-centralism so it was dismantled. This dismantling of dualism is also central in Buddhist understanding of *prajna* (wisdom), *sunyata* (emptiness), and dependent origination.

One can then see the great world religions as different human responses to the one divine reality, embodying different perceptions which have been formed in different historical and cultural circumstances (Hick 1980: 18).

Copernicus believed the sun not the Earth, was at the center of the universe; from the Copernican viewpoint human existence is central and pivotal, not necessarily how faith is the core of Christianity. For John Hick, great faith is dependent on various conditions, where religious differences are based on a person's level of consciousness and understanding, as well as experience and environment.

So if the intention is to become 'One Religion' what might constitute a genuine religion? Great religions all have a similar basis; teaching followers how to find the path of salvation (Panikkar 1981: 24).³ From this standpoint John Hick promotes Christianity's unconditional exclusivity and is critical of traditional Asian inclusivism, and of religious pluralism as a whole.

The problem with this paradigm of religious pluralism is that it cannot overlook vagueness and address the impact of present day influences of religious ideology. Pluralist logic only addresses and contributes to discourse about similarities among different religions concerning the means of gaining salvation.

II. Conflict and Opposition: Text without Context

Current conflict and opposition in religious discourse is not only arising from doctrinal differences, it is also due to contemporary Western secular union of politics and economics which is generating uncertainty for the future of the human race.⁴ Religion is concerned with mind and personal

3 Raimundo Panikkar claims that different traditions among other religions seem to be myriad colors, due to the light of divine reality which pure white light, is refracted through the prism of human experience.

4 Conflict, in relation to religious discourse, can be understood as hostile interaction over differences of opinion on subjects which, when fueled with emotional charge triggers a collision of faiths.

psychology in contrast with collective society. Yet, these days religion is increasingly searching for a societal definition which has the unfortunate potential for hostility, violence, and perhaps even war.

It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that religious conflict has always played a large role in directing the history of humankind. Exclusivity or direct collision of religious ideas has more than once called for military force, and religious wars were not uncommon. Even today religion is still an important factor in international conflict.

During the Cold War Samuel Huntington predicted there would be continuing conflict between civilizations following the Cold War.⁵ He foresaw that the core conflict for our civilization in the 21st century would be religion. Huntington predicted that differences in ideology would no longer be the main focus, rather, there would be clashes between ideology and civilization, and the conflict between Christianity and Western Civilization would be at the center of a clash with Eastern Islam and Confucianism.⁶ It seems that in order for Islam to expand there must be a collision of civilizations. Today many young Islam extremists feel they are fighting a holy war (*Jihad*). If followers believe that Western influences on government and economy conflict with expansion of the Islam faith, these young followers are more than willing to pursue acts of terrorism. In Islamic society most hostility stems from religious reasoning.

Commonly, the background to most of the warfare in our present day situation can be traced to age-old conflicts and opposition among religions.⁷

5 Religions are a primary criterion in distinguishing between spheres of civilization; Huntington specifically named the spheres of Christianity, the Greek Orthodox Church, Islam, Confucianism, Buddhism, and Hinduism. In addition to these spheres, he named the primary territories as Latin America, Africa (non-Islam), and Japan (Huntington 1996: chapter 5).

6 Because Huntington considered Islam and Confucianism in East-Asia as serious obstacles he has been criticized as an agent of Western centralism. And he has been further criticized because he ignored tribal populations and individual ethnics by not including them in his classification of the nine races.

7 There are presently several conflicts in the East: the independence movement of Tibetan Buddhists and conflict between the Sinhali tribe of Sri Lanka and the Hindu Tamirs. And of course, there are other conflicts including, Palestine and Israel, Lebanon's civil war, conflict of the Northern Ireland conflict, Kosovo, the Gulf war, disputes between Christianity and Native Americans in the United States, Quebec's independence war in Canada, Bosnia's conflicts between Serbians and Croatsians, conflicts between the republics of Cyprus and Turkey, the Taliban civil war, the Algerian and the Sudan civil wars, the conflict in Kashmir between India and Pakistan, conflicts between Islam and the Russian

This is a complicated intersection between religion and people, characterized by a turning towards exclusivism and ‘The Just War Theory’ in which the origin of conflict and doctrine is founded in a religious attitude.⁸

Exclusivism requires that the truth of salvation can only be found in one’s own religion and not in any other religion. Thus, an essential element of conflict arises from the exclusiveness of religious doctrine. Attitudinal beliefs may vary amongst religions but it is inevitable that they will appear (Lee 1994: 173-205). And because of this, many people will puzzle over the source of underlying causes. Religious ideologues profit from ego, and beliefs in exclusivism render dualistic religions and monotheism a necessity. The doctrinal structure of Judaism, Christianity, Islam, etc is especially focused upon prayer.⁹ Exclusivist adherents view Religious Pluralists as a serious challenge. Religious ideologues have a common commitment to the importance of missionary work. In order to convert more people to the faith, believers are exhorted to be martyrs, potentially sacrificing their life for the greater cause of the mission work. And so it is not surprising that exclusivists and exclusivist doctrines are not sympathetic to a softening of the boundaries between religions, as this is viewed as contamination of fundamental ideals.

It is not that Christianity has given up on the idea that Jesus Christ is the one and only saviour, but from a pluralist perspective the question is whether other religions can also offer certainty for a valid salvation? If Jesus Christ is the only great saviour of humankind then is it possible for other religions with their own

Orthodox Church in Russia and the independent movement of Muslims in China’s Islamic movement.

8 The Justice War Theory was developed by Augustine (306-337 CE). This theory claims that any war under certain conditions can be justified. There are several examples: punishment for evil, blockades of invasions, where innocent people exercise legitimate self-defense or there is failure in all attempts to keep the peace, minimal demolition for properties or civilians, mercy for the enemy. Additionally, wars waged between legitimate countries are considered justifiable.

9 Dogmas which reflect Jesus-centered exclusivism, church-centered exclusivism, and bible-centered exclusivism are notably Christian. Jesus-centered exclusivism is found in the Book of John where he states: “No one can come to the Father, but by me” John 14:6. Church-centered exclusivism was initiated with the establishment of the Roman Catholic Church. The Church decrees that there is no salvation outside the church (*no salvation, extra ecclesiam nulla salus*).

particular faith and means of salvation, such as Judaism, Hinduism, Islam, Buddhism, to coexist? (Richard 1981: 3).

It is very difficult for Christians to admit to Pluralism when the basis of their faith is Christ's sacrifice. Fundamentalism is an extreme attitude based on the interpretation of scriptures.¹⁰ Faith is an absolute adherence to the scriptures. It can also be interpreted as 'Text without Context' (Oommen 1998: 455-477). Many insist on the infallibility of the Bible, believing it ensues from the Holy Spirit and is thus, free of error. In a general sense, there is definitely a difference in how Buddhist Upaya relates contextually to the doctrinal teachings of other religions, this of course, reflects historical and cultural differences. The interception of profound religious experience which is outside strict doctrinal teachings along with a narrowing of interpretation, has led to the making of followers with rigid thinking (Gil and Kim 2001: 20-22). Religious movements have also lost followers as a result of inability to adapt to changing times and conditions. This is a naturally occurring phenomenon for any religion, where changing social conditions will gradually weaken the original doctrinal base, which inevitably gives rise to a counteractive force of doctrinal exclusivism. There is no room for compromise within the fundamentalist stance.

Now, in 21st century discourse on religious pluralism, we are clearly witnessing this same phenomenon, where religious exclusivity is on the rise, while Buddhism continues to explore new territory. Hence, it may be useful for us to consider how Buddhism might respond within a religious pluralist matrix.

¹⁰ The term 'fundamentalism' originally from American Protestantism refers to a religious movement having aggressive faith and conservative political power and challenges liberal ideas towards state, family, and church (Caplan 1987: 1). Since the 1980s, the term also has been used in Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism. It is common in religious societies to have a formal and conservative tradition which inclines towards orthodox beliefs.

III. Harmonious Thought of Buddhism for Dialogue and Peace

1. Buddhism Moves towards Pluralistic Inclusivism

How does the Buddhist perspective compare with other world religions? From its inception up to present day Buddhist foundations and principles have been firm and consistent. In the beginning with all new religions followers insist on the ultimate truth of their own religion, but the inclusivist view recognizes other religions and quests to find truth. Where inclusivism is found, because there is not rejection of other religions it is much easier to develop tolerance.¹¹

Buddhist inclusivism and inclusivism from a Christian viewpoint, are fundamentally different.¹² In the Buddhist view of inclusivism, where it relates to problem solving or seeking of truth, it goes directly to the source of the issue. Christianity, on the other hand, strives for confirmation from other religions that all faith is based on absolute, substantial faith. In this regard Christianity holds to a sense of superiority and exclusivism. Whereas Buddhism, rather than upholding absolutes, can easily accommodate teachings of religious pluralism with an open mind, in fact from a Buddhist stance, pluralism is inclusive.

In his early teachings on dependent origination the Buddha was critical of other religions.¹³ But his later wisdom teachings were about realizing things as they really are, in order to help people find a way of truth amidst chaos and confusion. Essentially, Buddhist teachings emphasize tolerance and peace towards other religions.

11 People may accept the values and efficacy of other religions, but at the same time have a sense of their own superiority to others. Where this extends to holding steadfastly to belief in the ultimate truth of salvation according to one's own religion, this standpoint is a form of exclusivism.

12 At the 2nd Vatican meeting in 1962, the Roman Catholic Church proclaimed inclusivism, *Nostra Aetate*; revelation of God can be found in other non-Christian religions. Also, several kinds of inclusivism are found in liberal divinity. Karl Rahner suggests the term "anonymous Christian" for those who do not know Christian teachings but receive God's grace and live in love.

13 Reference to claims by religious thinkers concerning 62 kinds of truth can be found in the *Brahmajāla sutta*. They include theism, materialism, fatalism, asceticism, epicureanism and skepticism.

In India at the time of the Buddha there were many diverse religious ideologies with at least 62 religious opinions of relative length. People were aware of these other teachings but did not wish to pursue them, fearing that in their search for greater wisdom they would forgo an early opportunity to free the self of all attachments. But paradoxically, because of a lack of desire for these higher teachings they were not able to reach Nirvana and find deliverance.

The Buddha did not teach exclusivity of any one truth. It is not required of Buddhist followers to embrace any notions of Buddhist truth. Buddha is not a creator, he did not cause truth, it was through his own direct mind investigation that he apprehended and realized truth, but this same truth is available to anyone who sincerely seeks it.

Yet one who is deeply realized can be an exemplar, worthy of respect. Thus, one purports to be a follower of the Buddha but attempts to resolve conflict by way of violence, cannot be a true adherent. Nor should one struggle for religious supremacy by going against the Buddha's teachings. Yet Buddhism also teaches tolerance and understanding of other religions.

2. Buddha Merely Taught the Way to the Dharma

Buddhist teachings are concerned with how to seek Dharma while at the same time, not attaching to attaining Dharma. If we believe that truth has substantiality we may find ourselves in conflict over seeming contradictions and encounter hatred in ourselves towards other religions. Buddhism is critical of the notion of an absolute existential truth. The Buddha teaches us how to follow the path in obtaining truth (*marga*), not on obtaining truth itself. Buddhist scriptures can only point to truth, scriptures are not truth in themselves. What is true is within special context, which the scriptures are recognizable and understandable.

For example, the Mahayana Prajna-paramita view can guide people to discard notions of truth of substantiality. A correct attitude in regard to Dharma is not to cling or attach to any view of truth. Even the Buddha's

teachings are not exclusive to Buddhist understanding, for instance, the Prajna-paramita teaching on emptiness is an inclusive teaching for all religions (Kim 2002: 36-41). From the perspective of teachings on emptiness, religious discourse adopts a certain standpoint without a standpoint, simply as the standpoint it takes. Emptiness is not abiding, it is a process, which in its very nature denies absolute truth or inherent existence.

According to John Hick's viewpoint all great religions are based on truth, a realistic proposition regardless of religious pluralism. This one truth is substantial enough to make it possible. If we were to seek for commonality between world religions it would probably be the mutual recognition of a metaphysical universality. A hallmark of all religious studies is persistence in seeking to obtain truth, this is the one solid metaphysical factor. Yet, the Buddhist *Diamond Sutra* is supreme among doctrines concerned with deconstructing notions of absolute faith.

Subhuti, do not say that the Tathagata conceives the idea: I must set forth a Teaching. But he really slanders Buddha and is unable to explain what I teach. Subhuti! As to any Truth-declaring system, Truth cannot be declared; an enunciation of Truth is merely to name (The *Diamond Sutra*: T.8.751c).

In the above quotation, Buddha counsels not to attach to the language of the Dharma because the true nature of Dharma is unattainable. In which case, why give teachings behind the additional information that various great monks have contributed? The great monk Taego Bowoo (1301-1382) explained that extrinsic teachings are intended to turn the mind back on itself, back to its origin.

These profound teachings are not just of Buddha or other great Patriarchs. In pointing a finger at the moon and saying the teachings are there and that truth is the moon, it merely aids in shifting the emphasis for the unenlightened who cannot let go of actual doctrinal teachings. Yet it is also important to not only attach to contextual teachings (severing the finger) but to care about attaining a serious affair with nature (Taego: HPC.6.681a).

Buddha and other great monks are not the only ones to teach in such a manner. There are other religions which are also instruments for teaching truth. In understanding this point we can be free of struggle and avoid the danger of fundamentalism. Buddhism teaches, 'no longer should opinions be a concern,' so that we can free ourselves of all struggle and live in peace.

3. The Horizon of a Free and Harmonious Mind

From the beginning, Buddhism has always stressed the importance of harmony. Mayahana Buddhism emphasizes the one voice of Buddha as a foundational and unifying principle among the various Buddhist sects. The *Lotus Sutra's* teaching of 'harmony in one vehicle and one truth' has been at the centre of Korean Buddhist thought from early days. In which case, what is Buddhism's view concerning disputes and insistence over truth? Harmony, according to Mahayana thought, is maintained through understanding that all barriers, whether of doctrine, tradition, language, scripture, etc., are essentially insubstantial and can therefore be dismantled. So an understanding of harmony, in the Buddhist sense, can allow us to loosen our hold on exclusionary ideas and let down the barriers. Harmony can free us from the need for absolutes, separating dogma from ideology, recognizing the symbiosis of faith and experience, so that we no longer need to insist on one religion as the true way.

During the Korea Silla Dynasty the great monk Wonhyo made a significant contribution to harmony by unifying seemingly disparate ideas and teachings with his inspirational thought on openness and harmony. He saw a society that was divided by conflicting standpoints about Buddha's teachings, and in seeking a means to resolve these differences he realized the essential truth, that is, all truths return to the one.

Wonhyo's means of resolving 'truth' conflicts was through a view of synthesis rather than analysis; synthesis being a combining of different parts into a whole, whereas analysis is to separate and examine the individual parts.

Wonhyo's notion of harmony is based on the Buddhist teaching of returning to original mind where there is no division or separation, a mind that is open and harmonious, the one that embraces all. This state of harmony is the highest goal. Wonhyo's dissatisfaction with the logic path led him to seek for another way according to the Buddha's teachings, and because of his persistence and sincerity he was able to uncover the consummate teaching of harmony.

Wonhyo insisted that, in order to reconcile dualistic thinking and achieve social harmonization, one must suspend attachment to logical thinking and disparate opinions and open to the possibility of arriving at the idea of ultimate truth.¹⁴

Wonhyo's ideas were respected both in Buddhist religious discourse and in discourse concerning principle and theory (Choi 2003: 245). He urged people to be wary of religious egoism and dualistic logic, instead to penetrate the one truth which reveals the truth of all religions.

4. Where Is the One Dharma to Which all Dharmas Return?

In the early period, Buddhists sought to become a '*raḍaṅṅjaha*,' the Buddha's epithet for a person free from all conflict. Buddha said that he would not fight with others even if they were to start a fight with him. Because a person who attains spiritual enlightenment is like a rock, they are totally free of reprobation and praise. This is a foundation principle for the Buddhist view on resolving opposing truths and conflicts.

When the great monk Taego went to meet the great monk Shiwu to show him his enlightenment poem, "Taegoam-ga," Shiwu said to him "Now throw away ideas of attainment of truth through study and its inherent prejudices. Such things are obstacles to obtaining truth. When you discard

¹⁴ "There is no obstruction or distraction on the way to Dharma. All great bodhisattvas are on the way to Dharma, and all Buddhas of the past, present, and future appear out of the way into the Dharma. Arahants attaining nirvana become a deaf or blind in this state, and laymen would laugh or be surprised. When a person attains the way into Dharma, which encompasses past, present, and future then the world will disintegrate into fine dust. How can people understand this subtle principle?" (Wonhyo: HPC.1.495a).

all relative perspectives and distinctions then qualities of kindness and mercy will arise naturally and perfectly” (Taego: HPC.6.695c).

When we observe other religions and religious ideas from a perspective of selflessness and emptiness, any traces of exclusivity, prejudice and pride will have no foothold in us. Harmony in the Buddhist sense, rejects all attempts to systematize knowledge and theory.

Buddhist teachings on emptiness are intended to cut through attachment to these kinds of philosophical systems. So Shiwu’s instructions to Taego highlight the pointlessness of searching for the one truth that supports an absolute entity, in fact this is a definite impediment in realizing truth.

Taego’s own spiritual awakening was triggered by the question, ‘Where does the one Dharma to which all dharmas returns, return back again?’ He wrote a poem about this, as shown below.

A place where all dharma returns one cannot attain
After awakening, it was a stone in a house
Looking back, there are no traces of enlightenment,
And every person peaceful
The light brightens with every obvious wish (Taego: HPC.6.696a).

If all religions arise from only one entity, where would this one entity go? This is not the Buddhist teaching on religious pluralism. The idea that all beings return to one being, in that all beings are only from that one being, is the same as John Hick’s idea of pluralism, which is based on reality of actual existence.¹⁵ Yet, if we suspend belief in this idea of a substantial being and ask ourselves deeply and sincerely where does that the one return to, then we can find our true self and the truth of one. Taego says that this one has not actually existed at all.

84,000 Buddhist teachings come to end
Bright green mountains are beyond the sky (Taego: HPC.6.682b).

¹⁵ The discourse on religious pluralism can be divided into unitary pluralism and plural pluralism. When attained, all religious differences become meaningless. This latter point means that all things are different; because all people are on different ways and their goals are also different. And furthermore, the ultimate stage of each religion cannot be same.

The inner world of the great monk Taego embraces heaven and earth with magnanimity, while at the same time, beginning and end are complete, and there is no remaining in the east, west, south, or north. Beautiful scenery has no boundary and transcends not only distinctions of 'in' and 'out' but also the whole of the Buddha's teachings. With an open mind, Taego, having no borders, affirmed all actual beings.

Names and labels such as cosmic logos, ultimate reality, God, Dharma, Tao, Brahman, heaven and earth, and other names for truth, only constitute reality within the relative boundaries of language and thought. Whereas the Buddhist horizon stretches beyond limitations of universal religious theology, the ground claimed by Western religious pluralists.

One perspective in Buddhist understanding is that mind does not dwell in any place, there is therefore no 'place' for an ultimate reality or God as an absolute, particularly as a universal principle underpinning world religions, which is the ground claimed by reality-centered pluralists. And as for God-centered pluralism which views God at the very center of all religions, this universal principle is denied by Buddhists. In this view, John Hick's version of religious pluralism is of substantiality which is considered the same as reductionism.

Even though all religions may continue to insist upon their unequivocal possession of truth, none can actually attain universalism. Buddhism however, is not restricted by doctrinal positions or claims about truth, and teaches that each one must ultimately awaken to truth regardless of religious predisposition in order to be liberated in one's original nature.

IV. Closing Remarks

When we examine general attitudes among Buddhists toward other religions, most lean towards exclusivity concerning the hierarchial order of religions, and in this sense they are inclusive in their interpretation of Buddhist doctrines but tend to be pluralistic toward religious experiences. In

early times Buddha discoursed with many religious people which enabled him to see the true nature of dharmas, from a diversity of religion's claims on truth, in accordance with dependent origination. But at the same time, Buddha emphasized generosity and peace towards other religions.

Open inclusivism in religious pluralism towards other religions is a preferred attitude by contemporary Buddhists. By embracing the twin ideas of ultimate truth as emptiness and Buddhism as open and boundless, in its foundational principles and religious expression, we may potentially inherit dharma by helping others through dialogue to attain their own enlightenment. In this manner of dialogue we can obtain peace which is naturally desirable to Buddhists. But regrettably there are few Buddhists who are actively interested to discourse with people of other religions. In fact, it is Buddhists who lead the movement committed to religious dialogue.

Buddhism perhaps offers an alternative for future civilization. As a religion embracing inclusive and pluralistic thought, it is true that throughout history Buddhism has never been the cause of conflict or religious wars. In fact, Buddhism has a doctrinal base which supports understanding and cooperation with other religions, particularly the Mahayana teachings on emptiness, with its dynamic potential to promote harmony by dissolving all exclusive boundaries concerning doctrines or traditions. It is a maturity of perspective which offers opportunity for dialogue and a conceptual framework that can acknowledge the essence of all religions.

Glossary of Chinese Terms

(K=Korean, C=Chinese, P=Pali, S=Sanskrit)

Analects of the great monk Taego (K) 太古語錄

Brahmajāla sutta (P) 梵動經

Diamond sūtra 金剛般若波羅密經

Emptiness (Śūnyatā) 空

Free and harmonious mind 無碍圓融心

Kim Yong-pyo (K) 金容彪

Lotus sūtra 妙法蓮華經

Mahāyāna (S) 大乘

Patriarchs 祖師

Prajñā-pāramitā (S) 般若婆羅密多

Raṇaṃjaha (S) 離塵, 寶斷 (無諍者)

Shiwu (C), Seok-ok (K) 石屋

Silla (K) 新羅

Subhuti (S) 須菩提

Taego Bowoo (K) 太古 普愚

Taegoam-ga (K) 太古庵歌

The true nature of dharma 諸法實相

Where is the one dharma to which all dharmas return? 萬法歸一 一歸何處?

Wonhyo (K) 元曉

Abbreviations

HPC *Han'guk pulgyo chunseo* (韓國佛教全書: *The Collected Texts of Korean Buddhism*), Seoul: Dongguk University Press, 1984.

T *Taisho shinshu daizokyo* (大正新修大藏經: *Japanese Edition of the Buddhist Canon*), Ed. by Takakasu, Junjiro, et al (高楠順次郎). Tokyo: Taisho Issaikyo Kankokai, 1924-1935.

References

Diamond Sūtra (金剛般若波羅密經: *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*), Chinese trans. by Kumārajīva (鳩摩羅什). T.8, no.235.

Fandongjing (梵動經: *Brahmajāla Sutta*), In *Foshuochangahanjing* (佛說長阿含經). Chinese trans. by Buddhayaśas (佛陀耶舍) and Zhu Fonian (竺佛念). T.1, no.1.

Lotus Sūtra (妙法蓮華經: *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*), Chinese trans. by Kumārajīva (鳩摩羅什). T.9, no.262.

- Caplan, Lionel
1987 *Studies in Religious Fundamentalism*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Choi, Yu-Jin
2003 “Religious Pluralism and Wonhyo’s Harmonizing Disputes.” *Chulhak-Ronchong (Journal of the New Korean Philosophical Association)* 31.
- Hick, John
1980 *God has Many Names*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- 1988 “Religious Pluralism.” In *The Encyclopedia of Religions*, Ed. by Mircea Eliade, vol.12. London: Macmillan.
- Huntington,
Samuel P.
1996 *The Clash of Civilization and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Touchstone.
- Gil,
Hee-Sung, and
Kim, Yong-pyo
2001 *World Religions and Scriptures*. Seoul: Research Institute of Traditional Culture.
- Kim, Yong-pyo
2002 *Buddhism and Philosophy of Religion*. Seoul: Dongguk University Press.
- Lee, Won-kyu
1994 “Empirical Research on the Relationship between Religious Exclusivity and Religiosity.” In *Religious pluralism and religious ethics*, Seoul: Jipmundang.
- Oommen, T.K.
1998 “Religious Nationalism and the Democratic Party.” *Sociology of Religion* 55/4.
- Panikkar,
Raimundo
1981 *The Unknown Christ of Hinduism*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Richard, Lucien
1981 *What are they Saying about Christ and World Religions?* New York: Paulist Press.
- Swidler, Leonard
1987 *Interreligious and Interideological Dialogue: The Matrix for All Systematic Reflection Today, Toward a Universal Theology of Religion*. Maryknoll, N.Y. Orbis Book.

- Taego 1984 *Taego Eorok* (太古語錄: *Analects of the Great Monk Taego*), HPC.6. (韓國佛教全書: *The Collected Texts of Korean Buddhism*). Seoul: Dongguk University Press.
- Wonhyo 1984 *Hwaeomgyeongseo* (華嚴經序: *Preface to the Avataṃsaka Sūtra*), HPC.1. (韓國佛教全書: *The Collected Texts of Korean Buddhism*). Seoul: Dongguk University Press.