

A BUDDHIST VIEW OF HUMAN SALVATION

With Special Reference to Shin'ichi Hisamatsu's Notion of FAS

by

Masao Abe
Margaret Gest Professor
Margaret Gest Center
Haverford College
Haverford, Pennsylvania USA

The Fourteenth International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences
Houston, Texas November 28-December 1, 1985

© 1985, Paragon House Publishers

A BUDDHIST VIEW OF HUMAN SALVATION

- With Special Reference to Shin'ichi Hisamatsu's Notion of FAS -

Masao Abe

In this presentation, I would like first to discuss the Buddhist view of human salvation as I understand it--in comparison with the Christian view of salvation and, on that basis, to clarify Shin'ichi Hisamatsu's notion of FAS as an example of a contemporary Japanese Buddhist view of the issue. In this way I hope to contribute something to the general theme of this Committee, namely "The Search for Unifying Global Philosophy."

I

Any religion, if it is authentic, is concerned not only with the salvation of the individual person, but also with the salvation of all humankind. Needless to say, these two aspects are inseparable. When, however, religion is concerned with the salvation of the individual, it opens up a most fundamental dimension which is beyond time and space, because religious salvation of the individual person is not possible in a merely humanistic, secular, and relative dimension which is limited by time and space, but only in a transhuman, sacred, non-relative eternal dimension. In this regard, religion is concerned with a "vertical" dimension which elucidates the height and depth or transcendence and ultimate ground of human existence. On the other hand, when religion is concerned with the salvation of all humankind it is involved, even while deeply rooted in a vertical dimension of human existence, in "horizontal" dimension of breadth and chronological length or world and history. In its

breadth and length dimension, then, religion is involved in social transformation and the development of history.

Although these two aspects, individual salvation and the collective emancipation of humankind, are, as already mentioned, inseparable from one another, and are included equally by all higher religions, the relation between transcendent individual salvation and social liberation, between vertical and horizontal, differs among the various religions, some religions placing stronger emphasis on transcendent ultimate ground, some giving greater priority to liberation in history. Buddhism, for instance, which emphasizes self-awakening through meditation, may be said to lay less stress on the horizontal socio-historical dimension than does Christianity, which places much weight in God's rule of the universe and the divine plan for creation. The issues involved in this regard, however, need further detailed clarification. For the apparent difference in degree in stressing the horizontal dimension in contrast to the vertical is deeply related to the difference in the understanding of the vertical dimension itself, that is the understanding of the nature of the transhuman divine reality and the ultimate ground of human existence.

II.

In Christianity, the transhuman divine reality is the One God who is creator, judge and redeemer and who is believed to be the ruler of the world and history. Although Jesus as the Christ

or savior takes human form as the incarnation of God, the Christian understanding of the transhuman divine reality (God) is fundamentally transcendent and supernatural, and is essentially different from man. Human beings are not creator but creature, not judge but the judged, not redeemer but the redeemed because human beings are finite and originally sinful, and can be saved not by their own acts, but only through pure faith in the self-sacrificial love of God. Although God is believed to be the ruler of the whole universe, God is also believed to express himself through Logos (Word) to human beings while nonhuman creatures, especially in Protestantism, have no direct connection with God's Word but are dominated by human beings and participate in the divine administration through them. This is the reason in Christianity human history rather than nature is understood to be the stage of God's work. Furthermore, the Christian notion of God indicates a God of love and righteousness as we see from Jesus' words, "Seek first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things shall be yours as well."¹

By contrast, in Buddhism the transhuman divine reality is not the One God who is the ruler of the world and history but the Dharma, i.e., the law of dependent coorigination. This law of dependent coorigination indicates that everything in the universe, including human and nonhuman being, is interdependent. Nothing exists independently or can be said to be self-existing. Accordingly, in Buddhism everything without exception is relative and relational, impermanent and changeable. There is nothing

absolute, external and unchangeable. This is the reason Gautama Buddha, the founder of Buddhism, did not accept the age-old Vedantic notion of Brahman which is the eternal, unchangeable reality underlying the universe. For a similar reason Buddhism cannot accept the Christian notion of God as the ultimate reality but instead advocates nirvana and sunyata (emptiness) as the ultimate reality.

In order to properly understand this Buddhist position we must clarify the following three points:

(1) As I said before, in Buddhism everything, including man and nature, is understood to be relative, changeable and impermanent. Thus the life and death of human beings are grasped in terms of samsara, the endless process of transmigration. The goal of Buddhist life lies in overcoming samsara and attaining nirvana--the blissful freedom from transmigration--and in clearly realizing the "suchness" or "as-it-is-ness" of everything in the universe including oneself. This can be done in the light of wisdom realized in nirvana without attaching to impermanent, relative things as if they were permanent and absolute. This is why Buddhism emphasizes "In order to attain wisdom one should not abide in samsara." However, if one remains in nirvana one may enjoy the bliss but may forget the suffering of his or her fellow beings who are still involved in the process of samsara. This is attachment to nirvana which Mahayana Buddhism particularly emphasizes must be overcome. Accordingly Buddhism stresses "In order to fulfill compassion one should not abide in nirvana."

This means that true nirvana in Mahayana Buddhism does not lie either in "samsara" or in "nirvana" in a fixed sense of the terms but in a dynamic movement between "samsara" and "nirvana," between time and eternity, without attaching to either.

2) In this dynamic movement, not only samsara or living-dying in the secular dimension, but also nirvana or the eternal bliss in the sacred dimension, are done away with. For in Buddhism not only attachment to samsara but also attachment to nirvana must be overcome in order to attain true emancipation and liberation. In attachment to samsara, the secular phenomena are objectified and substantialized as if they were the unchangeable true reality. Such attachment in the Buddhist view comes from the "ignorance" (avidya) innate in human existence and is the primary cause of human suffering. Thus Buddhism urges that every human being overcome the attachment to samsara, awaken to wisdom, and attain nirvana. As I mentioned earlier, however, if we simply abide in and enjoy nirvana by ourselves without considering the suffering of our fellow beings still involved in samsara, we must be said to attach to nirvana. This attachment to nirvana is nothing but objectification and substantialization of nirvana which Mahayana Buddhism strongly admonishes to be gotten rid of--because an objectified and substantialized nirvana is not true nirvana. Buddhist liberation can be fulfilled only by the complete overcoming of every attachment, whether attachment to the secular or attachment to the sacred, and every

objectification, whether objectification of the immanent in human dimension or the transcendent in divine dimension.

This means that the Buddhist understanding of the transhuman divine reality is significantly different from that of Christianity. In Christianity, it is the One God who is fundamentally transcendent and supernatural. In contrast to this, Buddhism insists that the transhuman ultimate reality is beyond even any "transcendent" divine entity. It is neither immanent nor transcendent, neither human nor divine, neither secular nor sacred. Accordingly, Buddhist ultimate reality is called Sunyata, literally meaning "emptiness." This is especially clear in Zen Buddhism, as illustrated by the following account.

When Emperor Wu of Liang dynasty asked Bodhidharma, the First patriarch:

'What is the first principle of the holy doctrine?'

'Vast emptiness, and there is nothing in₂ it to be called holy, Sire!' answered Bodhidharma.

This "vast emptiness," however, is not a negative, nihilistic notion, but rather a most dynamic, creative notion. For, precisely because "vast emptiness" is neither human nor divine it can be both human and divine without being confined by either of them. Although "vast emptiness" is beyond the secular and the sacred it does not exclude but rather includes both as the moments of its eternal self-emptying activity. While in Christianity the vertical dimension of human existence is understood finally to establish its root-source in the One God who is fundamentally transcendent and supranatural, all loving and just,

in Buddhism, the vertical dimension is rooted in vast emptiness which is neither transcendent nor immanent, but which is the source of both transcendent and immanence, wisdom and compassion.

III.

3. On the basis of their differing understandings of the ultimate reality to be realized in the transspatial and transtemporal vertical dimension, Christianity and Buddhism also have different approaches to the issues occurring in the spatial and temporal, horizontal dimension of human history. In other words, the different understanding in Christianity and Buddhism of the ultimate reality which constitutes the ground of personal salvation lead them to contrasting standpoints as regards the problem of collective salvation in the world and history.

In Christianity, God is believed to be the ruler of the world and history; creation and the last judgement are the beginning and the end of the world established by God. God is also believed to reveal himself directly in the midst of human history through the person of Jesus as the Christ, and Jesus' death and resurrection, being the center of history, is the historical event crucial to human salvation. The personal salvation as well as the collective salvation of humankind are possible in Christianity only through the historical event of Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection. In short, history is understood to be the work of God whose purpose is centered on and fulfilled in Jesus as the Christ. In this scheme, nonhuman

nature is regarded as something peripheral, for it is the divine-human relationship which is central for Christian salvation.

By contrast, in Buddhism sunyata as ultimate reality is entirely unobjectifiable and nonsubstantial in that sunyata is neither immanent nor transcendent, being beyond even the One God. In the realization of sunyata, immanence and transcendence, the secular and the sacred, are paradoxically one. Each and every point of the world is fully immanent and fully transcendent, fully secular and fully sacred at one and the same time. Again, in the realization of sunyata, the world and history are understood to be without any beginning such as creation and without an end such as the last judgement. The world and history are grasped to be entirely beginningless and endless, and thus eternity is not realized beyond the end of the world and history, but right here and right now, because the beginningless and endless process as a whole comes to converge into the absolute present which constitutes the locus of awakened self-hood. This realization of the paradoxical oneness of immanence and transcendence, and of time and eternity in the here and now, however, is not the goal of the Buddhist life but rather its ground and its point of departure. Without this realization, Buddhist life and activity do not properly and legitimately begin.

This implies at least the following three points:

- (1) Unlike Christianity which is based on the divine-human relationship, Buddhism is not anthropocentric in its salvation and opens up a boundless dimension of liberation common to both

man and nature. Nature is not regarded as something peripheral to the basis or ground of Buddhist salvation. Rather, the problem of human living-and-dying cannot be resolved apart from the problem of impermanency common to man and nature. Unless the boundless dimension is opened up in which liberation of both inorganic nature, and sentient beings occurs, human emancipation from transmigration and transcency is not conceivable. But, the opening up this limitless dimension common to man and nature does not preclude the special significance of human beings in the universe. This is because it is only in human beings who are endowed with self-consciousness, that the boundless, transanthropocentric dimension is consciously opened up. Only human beings can go beyond their own centrism and actualize the transhuman boundless dimension common to man and nature.

(2) This transhuman, boundless dimension common to man and nature is the basis or ground for the Buddhist salvation; Buddhist life and activity are therefore established on this basis. In this way, Buddhists are involved in the socio-historical events of the horizontal dimension while deeply rooted vertically in the realization of emptiness which is beyond time and space. Buddhist activity on the horizontal dimension is motivated by compassion, a soteriological concern with the other's awakening which is rooted in the wisdom of one's own awakening. In reality, compassion and wisdom, salvational concern with awakening of others and self-realization of one's own awakening are not two different things, but fundamentally

one. Just as true nirvana is the dynamic movement between "samsara" and "nirvana" without attaching to either, true awakening consists of the dynamism of self-awakening and awakening others, wisdom and compassion. The endeavor to awaken to self without awakening others is selfish, whereas the attempt to awaken others without awakening to self is powerless. Wisdom without compassion is still self-centered whereas compassion without wisdom is feeble. Accordingly, every step of the Buddhist activity on socio-historical, horizontal dimension is based on the dynamic "intersection" between self-awakening and awakening others, between wisdom and compassion. Indeed, the Mahayana notion of the Bodhisattva emphasizes the fundamental necessity of the compassionate work of awakening others even more than it emphasizes self-awakening as can be seen in the Four Great Vows which are recited by all Buddhists after every service:

However innumerable sentient beings are,
 I vow to save them;
 However inexhaustible the passions are,
 I vow to extinguish them;
 However immeasurable the Dharmas are,
 I vow to master them;
 However incomparable³ the Buddhist-truth is,
 I vow to attain it.

The first vow, directed toward innumerable sentient beings concerns the salvation of others. The second, third and fourth vows, which pertain to passion, Dharmas and the Buddha-truth point to one's own awakening. Thus the Bodhisattva idea expressed in the Four Great Vows give first priority to the

salvation of others as the necessary prerequisite for one's own awakening.

(3) The Buddhist view of history is neither teleological nor eschatological. This is because in Buddhism history is understood to be beginningless and endless. In the West, the Buddhist view of time and history is often understood, in contrast to the Christian linear view of history, to be cyclic. But this understanding, I believe, is entirely wrong. The Buddhist view of history is neither linear nor cyclic because it is grasped as entirely without beginning and without end. When the beginninglessness and endlessness of time and history are fully and clearly realized at this very moment with our whole existence, the beginningless and endless process of time and history is centralized into our own existence at the external present. At that moment, time and space are overcome. Everything in the universe, including ourselves, is fulfilled. Time ceases and history actualizes itself as eternity. This is so in the light of the wisdom of awakening from the side of the one who has already awakened. In the light of compassion of this same awakening, however, we immediately realize that myriad human beings, from their own side, understand themselves to be not yet awakened. Thus we must help them to awaken to their fulfillment here and now. With this compassionate work time and history come to have a new meaning. Because those as yet unawakened are innumerable in the present world and will appear endlessly in the future, the compassionate work will also be endless.

From what has been said it may be now clear that we are always standing at the intersection of the socio-historical horizontal dimension and the transspatial and transhistorical vertical dimension, the intersection of self-awakened wisdom and other-awakening compassion. At each and every moment of our life we are standing and working at this intersection. Since this intersection is an intersection of beginningless and endless horizontal dimension and the bottomlessly deep vertical dimension, every moment of our life has a dynamic solid or cubic structure and embraces the infinite boundless universe extending both horizontally and vertically. In other words, every moment of our life is the eternal now and universal here. This is the structure of each moment in which horizontal and vertical dimensions, compassion and wisdom are crossing each other. And yet we move from this moment to the next moment, and from the next moment to the subsequent moment, thereby moving endlessly toward the endless future. In this movement, however, an advance toward the future is not merely a forward movement on the horizontal dimension, but an advance which is at once a return to the root-source of time and history on the vertical dimension. Likewise, the return to the eternal root-source of time and history on the vertical dimension is not simply a "downward" movement but a return which is simultaneously an advance toward the endless future on the horizontal dimension. The advance is a return; the return is an advance--this dynamic movement is possible through each and any moment which as awakened time is

the intersection of the horizontal and the vertical dimension of human existence. It is on this basis that in Buddhism, the salvation of all sentient beings and the salvation of the individual person are pursued.

IV.

What has been said above is the Buddhist view of human salvation as I understand it. With this view as a background I would now like to discuss Shin'ichi Hisamatsu's notion of FAS as an example of a contemporary Japanese Buddhist view of human salvation. It is worth noting that his notion of FAS particularly advocates a reformation of traditional and current forms of Zen Buddhism.

Shin'ichi Hisamatsu (1889-1980) was the most outstanding Zen philosopher of twentieth-century Japan. He was closely related with D.T. Suzuki although he was about twenty years Suzuki's junior. Hisamatsu was Professor of Buddhism at Kyoto University during the period around World War II. But, far more than a scholar of Buddhism, Hisamatsu was a living personification of Zen, a man who lived his daily life and performed various activities deeply from the ground of his clearcut Zen awakening. He was an excellent tea master, calligrapher, and poet, and yet a reformer of traditional Zen in Japan.⁴ All aspects of his personality and activities stemmed from a single religious realization which he called "awakening."⁵ His notion of FAS was not an exception to this. Rather FAS represented Hisamatsu's basic understanding of human existence on which his philosophy,

religion, art, and particularly his idea of the reformation of traditional Zen were firmly established. (Hisamatsu used this English acronym, FAS, because there is no adequate Japanese abbreviation to express his threefold notion.)

What, then, is FAS? "F" stands for "Awakening to the Formless Self" referring to the dimension of depth of human existence, i.e., the true Self as the ground of human existence. "A" stands for "Standing on the standpoint of All Mankind," referring to the breadth of human existence, i.e., human beings in their totality. And "S" stands for "creating history Supra-historically" referring to the dimension of the chronological length of human existence, i.e., awakened human history. Accordingly, the three aspects of FAS indicate a threefold structure of human existence, that is, depth, breadth and length of human existence, or, more concretely speaking, self, world, and history. (This threefold notion may correspond to the traditional Western threefold notion, the soul, the world, and God. However, in Hisamatsu's threefold notion God is absent.) In the notion of FAS, these three dimensions of human existence are grasped dynamically, and though different from each other they are inseparably united with each other.

The first dimension, that is, "F," which stands for "Awakening to the Formless Self," signifies nothing other than satori in the Zen sense. Traditionally, it has been said that the primal concern of Zen is koji-kyūmei 己事究明, "investigation of self," that is, to inquire and awaken to one's true Self, or

original face. Hisamatsu calls true Self the "Formless Self"⁶ because, being entirely unobjectifiable, true Self is without any form which can be objectified. Unlike Zen masters in the past Hisamatsu deeply studied Western philosophy and highly appreciated "autonomous reason" as elucidated by modern Western philosophy. At a certain period in his life Hisamatsu took modern autonomous reason as his own basic principle and through it criticized religious faith as something heteronomous. But he came to painfully realize that however he deepened the standpoint of autonomous reason he could not solve the problems of evil and death. The more he tried to utilize autonomous reason to break through these problems, the deeper he fell into self-contradiction and self-entanglement. Finally he fell into what Zen traditionally calls "Great Doubt." This, however, was not an intellectual doubt which could be overcome by another philosophical theory, but a total, existential doubt realized at the extreme point of the self-contradiction inherent in autonomous reason as such. In this Great Doubt, it is not that one's self doubts something external or internal to one's self, but rather it is the self itself which radically doubts itself to the extent that the doubter and the doubted are one, not two. It was at the point of breaking through this Great Doubt by means of severe Zen practice that Hisamatsu awakened to his true Self. Traditionally it has been said in Zen that "at the bottom of Great Doubt lies Great Awakening." In the long history of Zen before Hisamatsu, however, the kind of self-contradiction found in modern

autonomous reason had never before constituted the dynamic force underlying the actualization of Great Doubt. Again, traditionally, "true Self" as awakened to in Zen satori has been called the "Original face before the birth of one's parents" or the "true person of no rank." As I said earlier, Hisamatsu calls the true Self the "Formless Self" in that it is completely unfettered by any form--physical, mental or spiritual, including the forms of life and death, good and evil, form and matter, subject and object, divine and human, etc. "Formless Self," however, is not simply "formless" as distinguished from form. For formlessness as distinguished from form is nothing but another kind of form simply called "formless." True formlessness is free not only from form but also from formlessness without attaching to either. Further, true formlessness in this dynamic sense must not be realized outside of oneself because formlessness thus realized outside of oneself is grasped as an object and thereby turns into a form. To Hisamatsu, true formlessness is always Self and true Self must be always formless. Thus Formless Self is the ultimate reality for him and "awakening to the Formless Self" is the basic requirement for human salvation.

Traditionally Zen has been aware of a danger of attachment to formlessness. Accordingly, while traditional Zen greatly emphasizes the importance of investigating and seeing into the Self it also admonishes not to remain in "silent illumination," mokushō 默照 or fall into a nihilistic "ghostly cave," kikutsuri, 鬼窟裡 by attaching to the formlessness of the

self. Zen thus stresses the necessity of great dynamism or the wondrous activity of helping others. Hisamatsu, however, although in basic agreement with this direction of Zen, criticizes this formulation of traditional Zen by saying that if the so-called the "wondrous activity" signifies only the process leading other individuals to awaken to their true Self its activity remains limited to the problem of self without penetrating more widely beyond it by even one step. He says:

If, as has been the case with traditional Zen, [wondrous] activity starts and ends only with the s-called practice of compassion involved in helping others to awaken; such activity will remain unrelated to the formation of the world and creation of history, isolated from the world and history and in the end turn Zen into a forest Buddhism, a temple Buddhism, at best, a Zen monastery Buddhism. Ultimately, this becomes "Zen within a ghostly cave."

In Zen, the all-out compassionate practice ought to be to have man awake to his original true Self, that is, to the solitarily emancipated, nondependent, Formless Self, who will form the true world and create true history self-abidingly, without being bound or fettered by anything.

According to Hisamatsu, a formation of the true world necessitates the second dimension of human existence, that is "A" which signifies "Standing on the standpoint of All Mankind." For unless we grasp racial, national, and class problems from the perspective of all humankind, we cannot solve any of them adequately.

In this regard, Hisamatsu insists that in our time, while conflicts between individual persons are understood to be solvable not by force or violence, but by reason or law, conflicts

between nation-states are thought to be solvable by the irrational means of violence or war. Despite humankind's ardent wish for world peace, particular nation-states are still trying to pursue their self-interest and consequently utilize inhuman and reckless violence against one another. This is simply because nation-states are fundamentally motivated by a national egoism which asserts itself even at the expense of the welfare of all mankind. Even the United Nations, though apparently standing on the global standpoint, is in the final analysis nothing but an egoistic union of nation-states which are still limited by national egoism. Accordingly, in 1960 Hisamatsu published an "Appeal for an Ethic for All Mankind" in which he insists in the urgent necessity of establishing a political organization "of All mankind, by All mankind, and for All mankind." In order to establish such a political system, in addition to the aforementioned "investigation of Self," sekai-kyūmei 世界究明 or an "investigation of the world" is needed to elucidate the nature and structure of the world.⁹

Furthermore, a creation of true history requires the third dimension of human existence, that is "S," which stands for "creating history Suprahistorically, because true history cannot be created by an approach simply immanent in history, such as class struggle in Marxism or social reform in humanism which does not clearly understand self-contradiction inherent in human nature and history. Unless we take a suprahistorical religious

standpoint, which in Hisamatsu's case means the awakening to the formless Self, as our basis, we cannot create true history.

From such a suprahistorical point of view, religion judges and criticizes not only particular historical events but also human history as a whole. In this way religion makes a radical judgement of history itself. Christianity, for instance, insists that human history begins with sin and is a history of sin which can be saved only by God's work in and through history. Buddhism holds that human history is an endless process of transmigration (samsara) based on ignorance, which can be overcome only by awakening to wisdom and compassion. On the basis of a radical judgement of history itself and a transhistorical principle of overcoming the problematic innate in human history, religion provides a way of salvation for humankind at large only on which basis particular historical event can be properly coped with. In Christianity, the transhistorical principle of overcoming the problematic innate in human history is the self-sacrificial love of God which forgives even man's original sin insofar as people have faith in Jesus as Savior. In Buddhism, it is the Self-awakening of the Dharma which emancipates people from fundamental ignorance, an awakening which Hisamatsu describes as the awakening to Formless Self. When we awaken to our true Self as Formless Self, we can work in history while being rooted in a realization transcendent to history, and can thus assume any form freely according to the given situation. This is the meaning of "S," the third aspect of Hisamatsu's notion of FAS, referring to

"creating history Suprahistorically." In order to open up such a suprahistorical dimension, rekishi-kyūmei, 歴史究明, or "investigation of history"¹⁰ is necessary so as to clarify the real meaning of history and its origin and purpose.

Currently, we have different peace movements, human right movements, and various other social reform movements. However, if these movements are pursued only from a political and social standpoint without a basis in our deep realization of the true Self, such approaches may not yield adequate solutions. Even though those who participate in such movements are full of much good will and possess a strong sense of justice, if they lack an awakening to the original nature of self and others, their actions will be ambiguous and can therefore create worse confusions and conflicts. On the other hand, if only the internal religious aspect of the human being is emphasized and priority is given to one's own salvation, at the expense of affairs of the world, however serious an individual may be in his religious quest, he cannot attain a profound religious solution. Mere concern with self-salvation is contrary to even the Bodhisattva's "Four Great Vows." Nevertheless, contemporary Buddhism is apt to be removed from social realities and confined to temples, and engrossed only in the inner problems of the self.

Thus, together with his group of disciples Hisamatsu formulated "The Vow of Mankind" and proclaimed it in 1951, shortly after the Korean War. "The Vow of Mankind" reads as follows:

Keeping calm and composed, let us awaken to our true Self, become fully compassionate humans, make full use of our gifts according to our respective vocations in life; discern the agony both individual and social and its source, recognize the right direction in which history should proceed, and join hands without distinction of race, nation, or class. Let us, with compassion, vow to bring to realization mankind's deep desire for self-emancipation and construct a world in which everyone can truly and fully live.

Koji-kyūmei, the "investigation of self," will necessarily become abstract and without reality if it is sought only for its own sake. Therefore, we should work upon sekai-kyūmei, the "investigation of the world," that is, the problem of what is the true world, what is the root and source of the world in which we live. Accordingly, the "investigation of the world" is not separate from the "investigation of self." Further, to study and clarify the nature of the world is inseparably linked with rekishi-kyūmei, or the "investigation of history," that is the studying and clarification of the origin and true meaning of history.

In short, the questions of what the self is, what the world is, and what history is, are all related to one another. The problem of what the self is cannot be resolved in its true sense if it is investigated independently of those problems of the nature of the world and the meaning of history. On the other hand, world peace, for example, cannot be established in the true sense, nor can history be truly created, unless one clarifies what the self is. These three problems are inseparably related and united at the root of our existence.

Hisamatsu thus emphasizes as follows:

Without the Self-Awakening of the Formless Self, world-formation and history-creation will miss their fundamental subject. Without true formation of the world and creation of history, the Formless Self cannot help ending in an imperfect practice of compassion.¹¹

And again,

Consequently, we may conclude that we should get rid of the imperfect narrow character of the former so-called "Self-awakened, others-awakening" activity, which disregards the world and history, and which satisfies itself at best¹² by "hammering out only a piece or half a piece." We should awake to the Formless Self ("F"), form the world on the standpoint of All Mankind ("A"), and, without being fettered by created history, Supra-historically create history at all times ("S")--that is to say, only the realization of¹³ FAS can be really called the ultimate Mahayana.

Hisamatsu's notion of FAS is a remarkable example of a new understanding of human salvation in contemporary Buddhism.

Notes

1. Matthew 6:33.
2. D.T. Suzuki. Essays in Zen Buddhism. First Series, p. 187.
3. D.T. Suzuki, Manual of Zen Buddhism, p. 14.
4. Masao Abe, "Hisamatsu Shin'ichi: 1889-1980," Eastern Buddhist, Vol. XIV. No. 1, pp. 142-149.
5. Masao Abe, "Hisamatsu's Philosophy of Awakening," Eastern Buddhist, Vol. XIV. No. 1, pp. 26-42.
6. Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, Zen and the Fine Arts, Kodansha International, Tokyo. 1975. pp. 45-52. See also Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, "Ultimate Crisis and Resurrection," II. Eastern Buddhist, Vol. VIII. No. 2, p. 62.
7. Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, "Ultimate Crisis and Resurrection," p. 64.
8. Ibid., p. 64-65.
9. Sekai-kyūmei and rekish-kyūmei are Abe's terms: see Masao Abe, "A History of FAS Zen Society," FAS Newsletter, Autumn, 1984, pp. 1-12.
10. Masao Abe, "A History of FAS Zen Society," FAS Newsletter, Autumn, 1984, pp. 1-12.
11. Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, "Ultimate Crisis and Resurrection," p. 65.
12. A Zen set phrase often indicating the role of Zen master who should bring up at least a small number of enlightened disciples throughout his life.
13. Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, "Ultimate Crisis and Resurrection," p. 65.