Zen. . . . Why don't you see, why don't you realize that not only Zen, but literally every single thing is beyond understanding?"

Indeed, the self-centered consciousness lacks access to the Mystery. The negation of the self-nature of things once it is turned into dogma can only lead to further our reifying and dichotomizing tendencies.

Ruusbroec's fierce condemnation of a turning inward as a search for quietude, for "rest," as a mere sitting in immobility, denying the mind's built-in mobility, sends me back to Hui-neng, Zen's Sixth Patriarch's denunciation of the Northern School of Shen-hsiu who propagated sitting meditation as the observation of inner purity. "Should you find true immobility, there is immobility within activity," says Hui-neng, who also stresses that as far as Buddha Nature is concerned there is no other difference between an enlightened and an ignorant person than that the one realizes it, the other does not.

Hui-neng, Ruusbroec's senior by some five hundred years might also have wagged a finger at him: "If you find fault with others, you too are in the wrong," and "when neither love nor hatred disturb our mind, serenely we sleep."

It is a remarkable feast, this conversation at the end of the 20th century, uniting a fourteenth century Flemish mystic, two Flemish Christian savants and a borderland artist, somewhere in Japan. Still, I wish we could have been joined on the Buddhist side by Fa-t'sang whose *jiji muge hokkai* predated us by thirteen hundred years with Kegon's "unimpeded mutual interpenetration of all the phenomena in the universe," that macro-ecological awareness without which all the perennial Wisdom ever gathered by our species seems destined to perish without leaving a trace.

Mysticism Buddhist and Christian is an unconditional must.

FREDERICK FRANCK

RUDE AWAKENINGS: Zen, the Kyoto School, & The Question of Nationalism. Edited by James W. Heisig and John C. Maraldo. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1994, pp. xv + 381. ISBN 0 8248 1746 X (pbk.)

IN MARCH OF 1994 near Santa Fe, New Mexico, a symposium was held to discuss the question of whether or to what extent parts of the intellectual legacy of Japan from the early twentieth century were "implicated" in or actively supported the Japanese war effort. Sixteen scholars from Japan, the United States, Canada, Mexico, and Belgium participated. There were no par-

ticipants from Asian countries other than Japan. The essays were divided into four groups, representing the four aspects of the intellectual legacy that were questioned: Zen (including D. T. Suzuki), Nishida Kitarō, Modernity, and the Kyoto School (notably Tanabe Hajime and Nishitani Keiji). The book was given the descriptive title of "Rude Awakenings."

The title seems appropriate, for it must have been a very difficult and contentious symposium. Consensus is not a word that springs to mind on reading the essays. Indeed, although the editors note that the book is "the result of the long hours of discussion and debate during the symposium" (viii), the reader can't help wondering what it was they actually talked about for so long. Most of the papers show no signs of the effect of discussion.

Even though it would be too easy to say that the Japanese participants were playing defense while the non-Japanese played offense, it would only be somewhat of an exaggeration. The perspectives found in related essays more often than not directly contradict each other. One author's hero is the next author's villain. The one example of D. T. Suzuki will have to suffice to give an idea of a much more common trait. Is D. T. Suzuki to be castigated for having simplified the differences between the "East" and the "West" to the point of caricature while relying on an anti-Chinese "rendering of East Asian Buddhist history," as Robert H. Sharf claims (47–49)? Or, is he to be congratulated for the fact that "Not only did he maintain a balanced perception of events in the world around him, but he also refused to let himself be swayed by the demands of competing ideologies and 'isms'," as Kirita Kiyohide would have it (64)? Throughout this collection of essays, supporting historical narratives proliferate to the point of near confusion. Assertions about the history of the world and that of one country, about the ideas and activities of certain groups of intellectuals, about the world view of one religion: These all pile up in a Rashomonesque kaleidoscope of truth-claims. No doubt it was a rude awakening.

The uproar over Heidegger's Nazi-era involvements seems to have been the pretext given by Western scholars for an investigation of the relationship between the Kyoto School and nationalism. But one of the interesting facets of this investigation was how much it evoked memories of a debate that originally took place completely within Japan and seems to have ended in a stalemate. When Ueda Shizuteru builds his case for Nishida and against "criticisms depicting Nishida as a nationalist, a promoter of the 'Japanese spirit,' a supporter of the war, an ideologue of the Greater East Asian War, an absolutizer of the emperor, and so forth" (96), he may this time have Westerners in mind, but one has the sense that previously a similar argument had been used against other Japanese—the left-wing among the Japanese intelligentsia, who burst out after the war, once they had been released from the state's suffocating

grip, with vituperative criticisms of the Kyoto School.

There is no doubt that liberal or leftist Japanese critics of Nishida and the Kyoto School were consulted by some of the authors in preparing their essays. But with the exception of the scholarship of Furuta Hikaru (whose work is cited by both supporters and detractors), the influence of this earlier, more ideological critique is not so much in evidence. We do see James W. Heisig recounting the criticisms levied against Tanabe Hajime for his logic of species (257–68), but the point of his discussion was to show how simplistic the criticisms against Tanabe were. In other words, instead of a reliance on previous and simply ideological attacks on the Kyoto School, one sees on all sides of the debate a great reliance on the philosophical texts themselves—which does not make for agreement, but suggests to me that disagreement need not be so closely related to one's opinion of the "war in question" as Professor Ueda would have it.

A few of the contributors in this volume focus not solely on historical questions but on the task of deciding how the Kyoto School philosophies—to which they are favorably inclined—may be made usable in the current philosophical environment. These authors would like to see the problem of nationalism as incidental rather than essential to Nishida and the other Kyoto philosophers. This is clearly the case with Andrew Feenberg's insightful essay and it is also true of James W. Heisig's treatment of Tanabe's thought as well as of John C. Maraldo's stocktaking in the final essay. In this regard, analyses such as Kevin M. Doak's—which refines the notion of nationalism into statist and ethnic varieties and contrasts the importantly different yet sometimes coalesced roles of each—shed new light on the very meaning of nationalism, make for a more nuanced interpretation of the period, and allow for construals of Kyoto philosophy that may distance it from the state.

All told, however, conflict wins the day in *Rude Awakenings*. When seen in the context of the continuing scholarly discussion, this book does the service of highlighting the contradictions that are to be found in the scholarship concerning Nishida and the Kyoto School. This is, I believe, necessary and good; it will provide stimulus to further research. And it may eventually lead to some consensus, but only if the questions are squarely faced. In this regard, it seems to me that for proponents of Kyoto School philosophy, *Rude Awakenings*, taken as a whole, implicitly asks the same profound question that was explicitly raised by Jan Van Bragt: Is it possible within this philosophy truly to open up onto the other? My inclination, simple as it is, is to think that if such an opening is possible it must be actively shown in scholarly interaction. The concerns and claims of the other must be met, recognized, and respected, not merely shunted aside and denied, as happened in so many of the essays in this volume.

Finally, it is my recommendation that *Rude Awakenings* be read by everyone concerned with twentieth-century Japan, Zen, the Kyoto School, or Nishida. In addition to the points mentioned above, the book is a windfall especially for non-Japanese intellectual historians and philosophers. It provides numerous leads for new studies, including the names of historical actors whose actions and ideas need to be known in order to expand our understanding of prewar philosophy beyond the confines of the Kyoto School, which will in turn sharpen our perspectives on the Kyoto School itself. I would also like to express my hope that the Japanese participants will see to it that this volume is made available in the near future to a Japanese-speaking audience as well.

ROBERT W. ADAMS

Rude Awakenings is Volume 11 of *Zen Buddhism Today*, published by the Kyoto Zen Symposium.

BUDDHIST SPIRITUALITY: Indian, Southeast Asian, Tibetan, Early Chinese. Edited by Takeuchi Yoshinori, in association with Jan Van Bragt, James W. Heisig, Joseph S. O'Leary, and Paul L. Swanson. Volume 8 of *World Spirituality: An Encyclopedic History of the Religious Quest,* New York: Crossroads, 1993. ISBN 0 8245 1277 4 (cloth)

THIS VOLUME, EIGHTH in a series of a projected twenty-five dealing with different spiritualities of world religious traditions, is one of two devoted to Buddhism, covering its earlier phase as it took form in India, Southeast Asia, Tibet and China. The second volume, still in preparation, will continue with later Chinese, Korean, Japanese, as well as contemporary developments in Buddhist spirituality, and also promises a comprehensive treatment of Buddhist iconography.

The introduction provides an overview, summarizing the individual articles in the three major sections of the volume, and marks out the two key themes seen by the editors as the connecting thread for understanding Buddhist spirituality in its particularized expressions through various epochs and widely differing cultural matrices of its historical development: meditative practice, and the notion of Emptiness.

The first section covers Early Buddhism and Theravāda, opening with a presentation of the spiritual message of Gotama Buddha and its earliest interpretations (G. C. Pande), and closing with a reflective essay on monasticism