

Ultimate Crisis and Resurrection

Part II: Redemption

HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI

I *What is Redemption?*

SO-CALLED "redemption" is of various kinds and different levels. The question I should like to consider is, What kind or what level of redemption should we regard as ultimate? The problem will be, Who is redeemed from what and how is he redeemed? There is no doubt that it is I who am to be saved. This does not mean that I am the only one to be saved. It should be that when I am saved all human beings are saved.

As it is said in Buddhism, "In both self-benefit and benefiting others lies the perfection of Awakening and practice." One's own redemption is not everything, for that cannot be considered true redemption. Instead of being merely subjective and individual, true redemption ought to have an objective validity applicable to any person. Otherwise, as redemption, the saying "In both self-benefit and benefiting others lies the perfection of Awakening and practice" would not apply to it.

Next, a way of thinking which looks upon a particular god as savior cannot lead to true redemption. For particularity with the savior reflects particularity with the saved. Redemption, however, ought to be equally available to all persons. A manner of redemption in which some particular savior saves some particular person can never lead to the true redemption of all human beings. Belief in the existence of a particular savior is a shortcoming peculiar to theism.

Buddhism affords an example of the kind of redemption at which we aim, redemption that is realized on the standpoint of equality. Although Buddhism includes differing viewpoints, from the ultimate standpoint of Buddhism, the savior is not different from the saved. Where is the basis for this deliverance

which is thoroughly and equally available to all human beings, with no distinction between the savior and the saved?

According to Buddhism, redemption is already present in every person. *Sentient beings are, without exception, originally saved.* This is the standpoint of Buddhism. From the viewpoint of those not yet saved, Buddhism holds that sentient beings must all be saved. This is expressed most clearly in the Buddhist expression "All beings are of the Buddha (i.e. Awakened) nature." This means that redemption is not what one is given from outside, that is, a favor by external blessing in the form of revelation from Heaven or of Grace. Rather, all sentient beings originally have the Buddha-nature.

It is Buddhism's view that, although at present sentient beings are not yet awake to their Buddha-nature, it is nevertheless true that they are the Buddha, without any distinction between the savior and the saved. This means that the ground for man's redemption is basically inherent in him. Its presence is the basic or ultimate moment in man, which makes his redemption possible.

I do not mean that in Buddhism there is no view which rejects this point and distinguishes the savior from the saved. Such a view, however, is not Buddhism's basic principle. It is of only secondary or tertiary importance. It is because of this equality of the savior and the saved that we can actually hope for redemption. Unlike the belief that redemption comes only to a particular person or persons, or the belief that redemption comes only from a savior, Buddhism teaches that everyone has the possibility of being saved. The kind of conflict which is seen in the theological dispute between Barth and Brunner does not really exist in Buddhism.

Further, when we consider the person to be saved analytically, we come to the conclusion that his actually not being saved—by which I mean his not being in his original way of being—and his being saved should consequently prove to be one. This can be seen from the nondivisibility of the savior and the saved, too. But at the same time one must consider the following.

Ordinarily it is thought that when a person is saved a certain conversion takes place whereby the person that existed before redemption is negated to become a saved person. Between the person before redemption and the person after redemption a break is thought to have taken place to sever the continuity. Yet in the case of the unsaved becoming saved, real redemption does not

ULTIMATE CRISIS AND RESURRECTION

really result from a break, in which the unsaved person completely disappears and a saved person appears in his place. Unless there is continuity, there will not be a point at which the unsaved becomes saved. Therefore, although certainly there must be a negation of the unsaved, the question arises in what respect he is negated, or rather, what is negated, and what it is that remains. That is, it is the problem of where continuity really takes place and where discontinuity really exists. Speaking from the standpoint of "awaking to the True Self," the True Self constitutes the aspect of continuity. Continuity exists in the sense that the True Self is inherent in the unsaved.

The True Self exists within the unsaved person in the sense that though unsaved one has the possibility of being saved and as a matter of fact can be saved. From the viewpoint of the unsaved, therefore, the True Self has not yet manifested itself. Consequently, the problem of redemption becomes the relation between the true way of being and the untrue way of being. In other words, although the Buddha-nature or the True Self actually manifests itself through our sensations and consciousness, when one is not in the true way of being one is not awakened to it. When one becomes awakened to it, a relationship of continuity is established by which the unsaved becomes the saved. In other words, redemption comes to mean that the True Self awakens within us, or that we are awakened to the True Self. By our getting awakened to the True Self, we become saved.

It can thus be said that one who has been considered unsaved is in truth already saved. In this sense the notion of not being saved is actually false and being saved is true. For upon getting awakened to our True Self, we can see why we are originally saved. Here we must consider the problem of truth and falsity. In some religions human beings are considered to be unsaved. Unsaved human beings are considered to be in their true mode of being. Redemption is thought to mean going beyond that way of being. Such religions, however, always expect redemption to depend upon some absolutely "other" power. When one supposes that man is originally sinful, or of life-death nature, redemption cannot but depend on what is "other" to man. Christianity holds this view, and in Buddhism as well, such a notion is not entirely lacking.

But that is not what I mean by redemption. By redemption I mean that human beings are "originally" saved, that they are originally the Buddha or "truly as they are" (*shinnyo*). Here lies the great difference. Primarily in

Buddhism *it is not the sinful, life-death way of being but the no life-death, no-good and no-evil way of being that is genuinely original.* Here the term "originally," should not be taken in the ordinary sense such as found in the ethical doctrine that man's inborn nature is good. The categories of good and evil cannot be applied to it. It is often thought that while the Buddha-nature is inherent in us, as we live our day-to-day existence, we are completely different from it. In other words, by "inherence" people often mean immanent transcendence, so that with them the Buddha-nature, immanent as it is, is far removed from the actualities of life. However, immanence is not the true way of the Buddha-nature. The Buddha-nature is neither transcendent nor, in the ordinary sense, actual. It is *the constantly awaking ultimate present.* The awakened is the true Buddha-nature; the immanent is not yet the true Buddha-nature. Therefore, redemption points, more than anything else, to the presence of the saved. It is not a matter of either the future or the past. *One's being saved at the present time is the true way of redemption.*

But as I have mentioned, I do not mean by this the presence of the saved on the basis of the existence of the savior and the saved. Redemption here means the present which is without either the savior or the saved. This I should like to call "*awaking to the original Self.*"

Often the oneness of the savior and the saved is understood in a mystic way as the union of the divine and the human. In this view the divine exists and then we empty ourselves and become unified with the divine that exists on the "other side." That is one way of union. With mystics, that is usually the case. But not with all mystics. For example, what of Eckhart (1260-1327)?

Eckhart from the Christian viewpoint is interpreted to mean that God, as an absolute Other, exists, and that man, emptying himself, is unified with Him. Buddhism also has a mode of inner contemplation, according to which there is an objective, immanent Buddha, and the contemplator attains unity with it by emptying himself. But I do not think this is Buddhism. The unity between the Buddha and the ordinary being, or the non-duality between the sentient being and the Buddha, exists nowhere else than in awaking to the True Self. In this unity or non-duality, there is no Buddha to be recognized as Buddha, no human to be recognized as human, neither savior nor saved. True religion exists not where one commits himself to the savior, but where neither the savior nor the saved exist.

ULTIMATE CRISIS AND RESURRECTION

In that sense, redemption means Awakening—awakening to the True Self. In Buddhism, the only religious activity thinkable is the religious activity of “Awakening.” I should like to characterize Buddhism not as a faith, nor as a way of contemplation, nor as the union of the divine and the human, but as Awakening. In that sense, the “Buddha” comes to be the “Self.” That I am the Buddha and the Buddha is me does not mean emptying myself to become one with the Buddha. It means that he who is awakened to the original Self is the Buddha.

This is a subtle point. When we are truly saved, our way of being ought to be that of the awakened, that is, the Buddha. This becomes clear when we dig thoroughly and unreservedly into our true redemption. Buddhism in its primary principle has always been that way. Buddhism is only one example of this to be found in the past. Sakyamuni’s *satori* also is but one example of it. Because Sakyamuni attained that kind of awakening, he is regarded as a Buddha. Since there is his example, we naturally feel familiarity with it and defend it. I am not speaking out of arrogance; I am presenting a way of thinking in which the natural flow of things is like that. So much for the problem of who is saved.

II *Value and Anti-value*

Now I should like to take up the questions, From what and how is one saved? The first, from what is one saved, also becomes the question of the ground for the objective validity of religion. In other words, it is the question of why it is necessary for man to be saved. That is, where does the objective and valid ground for religious redemption lie? Unless this becomes truly clear, the *raison d’être* of religion in man will not become clear. If the *raison d’être* of religion is not clarified, we shall not see any objective or valid reason for our religious practice or religious undertakings. Therefore, this is a very important problem for religion. Nevertheless, it has not been squarely grappled with and so I have been attempting to give it proper consideration.

There seems to be a variety of worries from which we ought to be saved. But now the problem is, what worries can be called religious worries. The nature of most of the worries man suffers from would seem to be relative rather than ultimate. Sometimes one has what seem to be ultimate worries, but upon careful scrutiny they tend to prove to be *a subjective raising of relative worries*

to the level of ultimate worries or else relative worries given undue emphasis. What, in fact, are the truly ultimate worries? What are the worries from which one can never be delivered? If religion is deliverance, not from relative worries, but from ultimate ones, or ultimate deliverance from all worries, where in man do the ultimate worries lie? We must look carefully into this.

I would conclude that ultimate worries *derive from the following two which constitute man's actual way of being. That is, first, man is a being involved with values; and second, at the same time, man is a conditioned, time-space being.* As long as we continue to be involved with values, our worries will never be exhausted. And man is a being involved with sense values and rational values. Our values begin with sense values and proceed to rational ones. That is, man's life based on value proceeds from a life of sense values towards a life of rational values. But when one leads a life based on rational values, the opposition of rational and irrational never ends.

This opposition is the basic "moment" of rational life, and its coming to an end will after all mean the negation of rational life. Needless to say, in the rational life these two opposites will never cease to exist. The irrational being overcome by the rational and transformed into the rational is the direction of rational life. Therefore, worries in the rational life lie in the never-ending opposition of these two. The worries of rational life are overcome, that is, we are delivered from them, after all, when the rational has exhaustively overcome the irrational. It is the ultimate of rational life that the irrational be completely exhausted and the purely rational alone remain.

It is only then that we can say our worries have completely ceased to exist. Therefore, when one considers the validity of his rational way of life and goes on living on that basis, the exhaustion of worries is thinkable only when the rational has overcome the irrational. Although worries from senses always haunt human life, life based only on the senses has a very subjective validity. Objectively it is without foundation. The objective validity which human life is required to have will be impossible in other than the purely rational life just mentioned. In other words, man's worries will not all be dissolved until the irrational is completely overcome. This is what all modern philosophies which base themselves on reason seem to approve of. But the aim of rational life to become purely rational, from the standpoint of rational life, must be said to be contradictory. While rational life inevitably comes to have that kind of ideal,

the very having of an ideal must be said to be *the contradiction of rational life*. Because it is a contradiction, the "purely rational life," although it is something constantly hoped for—to hope is inevitable to rational life—can nevertheless never be achieved. It must always remain an eternal "Idea."

This means that worries are never really exhausted, never removed. The wish to find the life which is the most objective and valid for us human beings is thus unrealizable. It is in this unrealizability of rational life that the ultimate worries of human beings today—the kind of worries to which all the relative worries are reduced—are considered to exist. In other words, *the ground for the ultimate worries*, one cannot help believing, *lies in the structure of rational life itself*. The ground is the contradiction of rational-irrational which is the basic structure of reason, the very contradiction inherent in reason itself. Consequently, in order to be truly delivered from ultimate worries, the resolution of the rational-irrational conflict, which is contained in rational life itself, must be brought out. But it must be brought out, not in the future as is usually thought to be the case, but at the starting point of rational life. Only then does deliverance from the worries which in rational life can never be resolved become possible.

The worries inherent in reason cannot be resolved in the future of our rational life. Rather at the root of rational life there ought to be a resolution of rational life itself. There is the reason why the basic criticism of rational life arises—criticism of the age which regards rational life as the basis of human life, the age which has reason as its fundamental subject. I believe, therefore, that through a criticism of reason, through criticizing rational life itself, there ought to arise an orientation for going beyond rational life. To speak in terms of time, there ought to be a change from the modern era which holds reason as its fundamental subject to an era which fundamentally criticizes reason. There ought to be an internal demand not only for a criticism of reason but for a new era which transcends reason or which resolves reason into its source.

In fact, I suspect that the deadlock of rational life is already manifesting itself in various fields, though unperceived. From the point of view of rational life, the "moment" in man which leads him to religion, after all, is considered to exist in the basic contradiction lying at the bottom of this rational life.

III *Existence and Non-existence*

Although inseparable from this rational life and unthinkable apart from it, our time-space existence, temporarily distinguished from values in rational life, becomes the problem here. We can say that we are at once rational existence and time-space existence. Rational existence and time-space existence, in the concrete human being, can never be separated. They are to the end one body, not two. Without time-space existence, no rational life is possible; without rational life, no time-space existence is possible.

To take up for brief consideration here the question of time-space existence, *man cannot avoid being simultaneously both existence and non-existence, both non-existence and existence.* Man's being alive means that he has time-space existence; and being alive is never being alive alone. Death, its correlate, necessarily accompanies it. Pure life is impossible. So is pure death. In this sense the time-space existence of man must be said to be of life-death nature. In the life-death type of existence the ideal goal of man's time-space being is thus the attainment of pure life, that is, eternal life. In this regard, man must be said to be always aiming at pure life.

When we consider, however, why life is so desirable to man, we realize that if life should remain mere time-space existence without any value judgment passed upon it, life itself would not be found desirable. Therefore, wherever pure life is desired, a value judgment is already inseparably joined to it. Furthermore, even if life be lived for a hundred, a thousand, or tens of thousands of years, it will never become pure life, because *life is inseparably accompanied by death.* Pure life is absolutely impossible for humanity.

Although pure life is desired, it must be said to be eternally impossible. In this impossibility there exists the basic affliction of man's existence. The source of affliction of our life lies, after all, in the life-and-death nature of life. Therefore, this is not a problem to be solved in the future—as we have seen in the case of value-based life—no matter how many years that future may extend to. This is the kind of problem which ought to be solved at the very root of life. That means, unless the problem of life-death existence is radically resolved, the problem of life, no matter how long one may strive, can never be solved. Therefore, the direction of its resolution differs from that ordinarily thought to be the correct one. The usual direction of solving the problem of

ULTIMATE CRISIS AND RESURRECTION

life, the direction of medical science or the like, is that of attempting to solve it on the temporal plane—sometime in the future. But this is open to radical criticism. Certainly we do proceed, and cannot help proceeding, in the direction of resolving the problem of life on the temporal plane in the future. Yet it is absolutely impossible to completely resolve it by proceeding in that direction. Here we must see a deep criticism of our ordinary attempt to resolve the problem of life.

As I have explained above, in both aspects of value and existence, man contains unsolvable contradictions in himself at the starting point or basis of his life. Besides, in the concrete human being, the two contradictions are found to exist in an indistinguishable, inseparable way. In that sense, they are non-dual contradictions, an absolute, ultimate contradiction. That is, they are considered to be ultimate worries, the moment in man which requires ultimate deliverance.

I am convinced that here and nowhere else lies *man's truly fundamental affliction*. I do not assert this without giving reasons. My assertion does not come out of dogmatic belief, but out of the reasons I have mentioned. And can we not speak of this affliction as the ultimate antinomy inherent in man? Besides, *far from being merely objectively cognized as an ultimate contradiction*, that antinomy comes to be experientially and clearly realized by us as our present existence itself. The actual self is such an antinomic man. No mere subjective, individual man, but every man, without exception, is that antinomic man. And that is man's fatal destiny and affliction. It is never phenomenal, relative affliction, but an ontological, ultimate one. And since it is an affliction which goes beyond our handling, we actual humans are driven into a dilemma which we, as we are, cannot in any way solve. Ultimate dilemma and ultimate agony becoming one constitutes what I am. That way of my being, it must be said, is the basic "moment" in me from which I must rid myself.

Today nihilism has come to stand out in relief in various ways, and attempts have been made to consider its "moment." But what is the real "moment" which makes man nihilistic? It can never be sought except in man's ultimately antinomic nature. From this viewpoint we can consider past religions too. Religions which are too superficial to be called religions, very primitive religions, seem to seek their "moment" in a future resolution of the problem of our sense values. In the rational world, however, these religions are doomed

to see their "moment" itself suffer criticism and negation. Therefore, for the modern man who lives a rational life, the kind of existence that seeks its moment in the sense world no longer holds good, for it has lost its validity for man.

In basing himself on his rational life, man proceeds in the direction of solving his problems in a thoroughly rational manner. We human beings belonging to a high level of modern culture are going in that direction. So is modern humanism. But *religion based on humanism*, which is conceived in the process of actualizing humanism, is a religion which eternally believes and postulates that the ultimate ideal aimed at by reason should necessarily be actualized in the future. This is called religion because, although its ultimate goal is destined never to be actualized, it believes that destiny will finally be overcome and its goal finally attained. This may be called a humanistic religion. It may give rational human life a hopeful direction and the strength to live. Without such a belief, rational life cannot but fall into despair. It is a natural postulate of rational life that this kind of religion is in demand as a relief from despair. Immanuel Kant's (1724-1804) exposition of the basis of religion is also to be understood in this way.

Since the above-described relief, a natural postulate though it is, cannot be actualized by man, the natural conclusion is that it must be actualized by some power that goes beyond man. So there comes to be postulated a super-human power to actualize it, or the divine grace of a pre-established harmony. But after all it is nothing but a postulate; it does not know how to deal with *the basic contradictions of rational life*.

The same is true of the aspect of existence. Despite the various considerations aimed at saving man from death, the destiny of man's time-space existence, after all, remains untouched. Remaining ignorant of this destiny must also be said to be the great tragedy of man. His carrying this unsurmountable tragedy within himself and *endlessly pursuing the world of empty hope* might emotionally furnish some relief. However, speaking realistically, no such emotional relief will do. Since the objectively valid, basic "moment" that necessitates man's redemption from being man is the ultimate antinomy, there is no ultimate redemption without resolution of the antinomy at its very roots.

It is not that none of the established religions were aware of this. In Buddhism

ULTIMATE CRISIS AND RESURRECTION

man is said to be the existence not exempted from the two extremes: true and false, right and wrong, good and evil, pure and defiled, and so on. This may be regarded as expressing man's ultimate antinomy from the aspect of values. But it cannot be considered to have been understood in the distinct form of what I call "ultimate antinomy." On the other hand, while Buddhism says that man must be liberated not from death, but from birth-and-death or from being-and-nonbeing, this may be looked upon as meaning that man's life is ultimately antinomic. But *I wonder to what extent the relationship* between the ultimate antinomy of existence and the ultimate antinomy of values has been clarified in Buddhism. Ordinarily the two are treated as if unrelated to one another. Birth-death has been treated as birth-death alone; true-false, good-evil, and pure-defiled are treated merely in themselves. In other words, while the ultimate antinomy of existence and the ultimate antinomy of values are inseparably related to one another and are actually one ultimate antinomy, the problem is whether that is clearly understood. For example, when birth-death is spoken of, I wonder whether it is inseparably connected with true-false, and whether when true-false is spoken of, birth-death is inseparably connected with it.

While in Buddhism the discrimination of good-evil or birth-death is said to be the basic moment of delusion, if we interpret this discrimination as ultimate antinomy, this discrimination will not be limited to mere intellectual discrimination. The totality of value-based life comes to be of the nature of discrimination. Here we must see the ultimate meaning of discrimination. The reason why discrimination is wrong can be explained only with respect to the ultimate antinomy.

In that sense, it may be possible to interpret or re-interpret the Buddhist concepts of birth-death or good-evil from the view of ultimate antinomy or, rather, from the point of our ultimately antinomic way of being. Unless they are re-interpreted in that manner, the Buddhist concepts of birth-death, of good-evil, and so on will be one-sided, and not fundamental; that is, they will not be interpreted properly. Buddhism gives the reason why sentient beings ought to become Buddha by saying that man is of a birth-death or good-evil nature. Here certainly we find a criticism of reason; *in order to make the criticism fundamental enough, one must necessarily reduce it to the ultimate antinomy.* Otherwise, no true interpretation will be possible.

Likewise, in Christianity, if sin is considered only on the basis of value it will remain based on man's rationality. It will never point to the source, man's rationality itself. Since, however, original sin is spoken of, there ought to be the objectively valid ground in man—in every human being—for the so-called original sin. Unless the ground for original sin is clarified, it cannot help remaining a mere myth or a mere matter of faith. Therefore, if original sin ought to be objectively valid in man, the understanding of original sin ought to be deepened or re-interpreted to encompass man's ultimate antinomy. While the term is an expression of value, unless original sin comes to be of one body with existential life-death, it cannot be but one-sided. Consequently, I think that original sin also, in the end, comes to mean man's ultimate antinomy.

In this way, when we ask, "From what should man be saved?" I think in the case of religion we cannot help concluding that man ought to be saved from his ultimate antinomy.

IV *How to be Saved*

Next, let us go on to the question, "How is man saved?" I should like to include here both the method by which one is saved and the state in which he is saved. This is a very difficult problem. It constitutes the methodology of religion which requires objective validity. After all, however, it means our turning now from ultimately antinomic men to those who have gotten completely free from the antinomy. It ought *not be a mere isolation of ourselves from man's actual, ultimate antinomy but an overcoming of that antinomy* and getting completely free from it. It ought not to mean, as it ordinarily does, to die to the antinomy, or to escape to some other world, or to have God or Buddha of the "other" nature lead us somewhere else. It ought to be that antinomic man is transformed into one who is completely freed from the antinomy from within. One that is antinomic himself being transformed into one who is completely free from that way of being—this is the true and ultimate conversion.

Now our problem is the method of transformation from the man of ultimate antinomy to the man who has broken through and become free from it. Since this is impossible on the standpoint of reason, that is, on that of ultimate antinomy, then any solution based on reason ought to be abandoned. Therefore, some new method must be found which is not of the rational nature. What we need is a method by which we become the Self that is not of the

ULTIMATE CRISIS AND RESURRECTION

nature of value-antivalue or existence-nonexistence. And that will be a so-called religious method. Then the problem arises whether there is any such method. This method is our awaking to our Self that does not possess a value-antivalue, existence-nonexistence nature. Ordinarily we are not awake. Our not being awake means that we are rational beings. That is, our being rational existences prevents us from awakening. When we are driven into what I have called ultimate antinomy, our original Self, taking this antinomy as the "moment" and breaking through it, awakens. This is the awakening that breaks through and emerges from the extremity-situation of reason. That is, it is the awakening of that which has not been awake until now.

For one who is not awakened, this may be almost impossible to understand. As long as one remains positive of his rational standpoint, he cannot see the limitations of reason. But when reason is deeply reflected upon and criticized, the ultimate antinomy can be realized at its bottom. It is realized not as anything objective, but as the fundamental subject. While this is self-realization, or the ultimate antinomy realizing itself, what has penetrated through it also emerges as Self-realization.

This awakened state is also we ourselves, but it is neither the self of existence-nonexistence nor the self of value-antivalue. It is the self of non-"existence-nonexistence," non-"value-antivalue." It goes beyond all definitions, beyond all forms. It is, as it were, the Formless Self. By our awaking to this Formless Self, we overcome the ultimate antinomic self and come to be saved from the ultimate antinomy. This is achieved not by the ultimately antinomic self overcoming the antinomy. Rather, *from the bottom of ultimate antinomy, the Self by which the antinomy is overcome awakens*. Of course the ultimate antinomy serves as the "moment" toward it. But it is no more than the moment. Never is it the "moment" that becomes the overcoming subject. It is by the Self awaking to Itself, which is free from the ultimate antinomy lying at the abyss of the rational self, that the antinomy is overcome. In that case, it is not that the awakened self exists outside the ultimate antinomy, separated from it as some other isolated being. Rather, the Self awakens, emerging from within the ultimate antinomy. In other words, the awakened Self is the Self that has emerged free from the ultimate antinomy. This comes to be the Self of the ultimate, true way of being, man in his true mode of being. To call it "true" does not mean that the Self harbors any op-

position between true and not true. It is free even from that opposition. It awakens as the Self that goes beyond right and wrong, beyond birth and death.

Therefore when we speak of redemption, it is not redemption in which one is saved by an absolutely other God or Buddha. The saved comes to awake from within—the one that has not been awake awakens. There even the term “to be saved” may not be appropriate, in that it may suggest we are being saved by someone else. Here, however, one is saved by no one else but the Self. By “being saved” I mean that the True Self—originally awakened though yet not awake—awakens, and that the ultimate antinomy is thereby overcome. Therefore, concerning the relation between the saved-self and the not-yet-saved-self, it is too delicate a matter to speak of either continuity or discontinuity.

From the aspect of the ultimate antinomy which is the ultimate extremity-situation of the actual man, no step forward from the extremity-situation is possible. Here continuity is considered not to exist. Should one be saved by some God or Buddha of absolutely “other” nature, only discontinuity will prevail. There will be no continuity between the saved and the savior. Redemption will be nothing but a miracle or mystery, and the saved will stand dependent on the savior. Since the one who is saved will thus be absolutely dependent on the savior, man’s autonomy or independence will be lost.

“Coming to awake,” however, means that the one who is originally awakened but at present unawakened comes to awake, and that is the True Self. In other words, by awaking of the True Self, the rational self is emerged from and negated. Having emerged free from the extremity-situation of rational autonomy, the Self is *depth autonomy*, as it were. Such is the basic, ultimate autonomy that has emerged free from the fatal, ultimate antinomy of rational independence. The rational self cannot yet be spoken of as thoroughly ultimate autonomy. This awakened Self, however, is absolutely autonomous. Its autonomy is absolute; it is free from heteronomy and autonomy. Therefore, here we need no mythically conceived or piously believed-in absolute other being. Awakening means getting absolutely independent.

We can take an example of such a way of awakening from Buddhism. Although “Buddha” is variously interpreted even in Buddhism, the true Buddha or the Buddha in its true way of being, as the original Sanskrit term “Bud-

ULTIMATE CRISIS AND RESURRECTION

dha" indicates, means an Awakened one. A Buddha means one who is awake. It never means one who believes in an Other, or one who is saved by an Other. It is not the one who is believed in, not even the savior who stands as the Other. The Buddha is *the one who is himself awake*. He is awake to the Self that transcends birth-and-death and good-and-evil, the Self that has broken through and become free from the ultimate antinomy. One can awake to this only for himself, since this is himself. Needless to say, *neither the one that is awake nor that to which one is awakened exists there separately*. In Buddhist terms, neither "actor" nor "acted upon" exist. In the terms of phenomenology, this is *an awakening without Noema and Noesis*. Therefore, it is not anything to be taught by others.

In Buddhism too, the Buddha is said to be autonomous, self-dependent, not taught by others, or obtained from without. It is the so-called "Original Face." The Original Face, completely covered because of various obstacles and not awake itself, is the sentient being. When it comes to awaken, the sentient being becomes the Awakened One, the Buddha. The ultimate Buddhist method is neither through consciousness on the sensory-rational level, nor through faith, which is called religious Noesis, but through Awakening.

In the Zen school it is said, "Cold or warm, know it yourself." This should not be asserted about ordinary experience, but about Awakening. Other things can be known in many ways other than "Cold or warm, know it yourself." Awakening, however, can be known in no other way. Just as even the self in the ordinary sense, insofar as it is self, cannot be taught by others, so Awakening, though the content differs, since it is Self, cannot awake except by and for Itself.

In connection with this, however, one must say that occasions helping one to attain Awakening are innumerable. Yet, after all, all these helping occasions can be reduced to the ultimate antinomy. Only when they are reduced to this, and when it is broken through, does the total, radical solution take place. It is a sequence in which the root problem is first solved and the branch problems second. The solution of branch problems alone will not bring about the solution of the root problem. The root problem must be uprooted. Instead of extinction of individual worries one after another, a severance of the root of afflictions must take place. Thus, the Awakening of the Formless Self is, when speaking of afflictions, the extirpation of them all. Otherwise, afflictions will

endlessly continue, and there will never be deliverance from them. Religion is the eradication of worries by awaking to the original Self.

That Self, awakened, *flows backward* into the unawakened self and fills it. The original Self becomes the fountainhead, and *the way of being of the ordinary self becomes what has come out of that fountainhead*. Or contrariwise, the ordinary self *returns to the fountainhead*. Thus does positiveness or affirmativeness arise. That direction, which is the opposite of the one toward the original Self, brings about a positive continuity with it. Previously there was *the self-negating continuity from the unawakened self to the awakened Self*. Now, on the contrary, there is effected *the affirmative, positive continuity from the awakened Self to the unawakened self*. That comes to mean *resurrection or resuscitation of the self*. It is only here that one can speak of absolute affirmation.

Upon awaking to the True Self there comes an absolute affirmation of the self. *Where the awakened Self affirmatively restores the actualities to true life, there true religion is established*. In other words, the world which has had the rational self as its fundamental subject is converted to the world which has the awakened Self as the Fundamental Subject. That world is not differently located in time and space from the ordinary world. Rather, it is the fountainhead of time and space, in which time-and-space is established and from which time-and-space arises.

The world which has this awakened Self as its Fundamental Subject is the world which, while transcending reason, freely lives the rational life, and which, transcending life-and-death, lives freely. This is what should be called the truly religious world. Transcending the negative-affirmative, fatally wrong infinity of ordinary history, it is the standpoint that goes on unobstructedly with ultimate affirmation. It is also the standpoint which criticizes religions which seek an ideal world completely different from the actual historical world, such as Heaven or the Pure Land of Bliss. These are completely different worlds, isolated from actual history.

Seeking such an isolated world is, after all, an escape from the weariness of actual history, and it never effects the redemption of the actual realities. Even if an ideal world should exist somewhere else apart from the actual world, it would have nothing to do with the actual world, which would remain unsaved. Moreover, even if such a world should be affirmed in one way or another in its relation to the actual world, the affirmation still could not be

anything but escape from reality. A world isolated from the world of actual history is no more than a fairy tale or myth.

Thus *the world of the religion of Awakening is what is established through its criticism of religions which isolate themselves from reality and its criticism of the historical idealism of modern humanism.* Such ought to be the redeemed, true world of history. Here, redemption is not a matter of an eternal future life in another world of history. It is *redemption of the fundamental subject of the actual, historical world, redeemed from the bottom of its history.* Only then can we establish a new, creative, fundamentally subjective view of history based on Awakening. And only this enables us to *transcend history within history, and create history* without being removed from the world of history.

While one can say that religion is the ultimate liberation of man, this human liberation implies two meanings, man's transcending the limitations of history within history, and the unobstructed and free creation of history by the transcending, creative, fundamental subject. Buddhism has such expressions as:

"The physical form is void; void is the physical form."¹

"The body and the mind fallen off"; "the fallen-off body and mind."²

"From the non-abiding root, all the forms are built up."³

These words have been interpreted in various ways since ancient times, but only when interpreted as above can they offer a radical criticism of real history and the ground for rebuilding it as well.

V *Self, Society, and History*⁴

Our human way of being can be understood to have three dimensions: the individual being of the self, spatial-social being, and temporal-historical being. These three dimensions—self, society, and history—are inseparable from one another in human life. To investigate the problem of how the three ought to be related, we must allow the Great Doubt to arise in us.

As human beings who are awakened in the modern sense, we ought to

¹ From the *Heart Sutra* (J. *Hannya-shin-kyō* 般若心經).

² From the *Shōbōgenzō* by Dōgen.

³ From the *Vimalakīrti Sutra*, TT. 14, p. 547c.

⁴ Division supplied by translator.

awaken ourselves to reason in its broad sense, as the way of being of the self. Since we are rationally awakened, we ought to purify reason, to build society, and always create history in a rational manner. It is not easy for the self to do this. Many obstacles rise in its path. But we ought to continue to overcome them and go on forming a rational self, society, and history.

While today we meet such obstacles in various forms, it is needless to say that since the beginning of modern times wonderful progress has been made as the result of efforts to realize this rational world. Speaking from the viewpoint of man's progress and development, this is certainly something to be celebrated. But if we reconsider the matter, this very progress and development also constitutes a great threat. Startling developments such as the discovery and uses of atomic power have aroused grave worldwide anxiety. This poses an unprecedented threat to mankind. Likewise, while the growth and enlargement of the earth's different societies is a pleasing indication of man's development, it is also true that unparalleled social forces or forces of collective bodies constitute a cause for deep anxiety in modern man.

We need not dwell upon the fact that atomic power may at any moment be the ruin of mankind. The dread of such potential disaster is countless times greater than the dread of natural calamities such as earthquakes or typhoons. It produces a contradictory anxiety and fear; man's own discoveries and inventions may destroy him. In the current political alignment, too, the confrontation of the collective forces of East and West is at a point never before equalled in recorded history. No one knows when these giant opposing powers will bring unprecedented misery to mankind. Should they ever resort to war, the most terrible confusion in history would be brought down upon man. With science as its ally it would drive all of mankind, without exception, into the abyss of ruin. *By his own productions man has created such a terrible threat, and he feels that it has gotten beyond his control.*

We may call these the secondary forces of nature. The primary forces are what are usually called simply "natural forces." The forces of science and collective power-blocs have gotten beyond man's control, even though he produced them himself. They have become terrible threats, threatening us from without. They are beyond the control not only of individual persons but of the collective bodies, the nations themselves. Nowadays, they have become such objective forces that although sensing their threat, the whole of mankind

is at a loss as to what to do with them. In this respect they may be called secondary forces of nature. This is the gravest event in the whole historical development of modern times. We can see here the peculiar characteristic of the present age, its anxiety and threat. This present age has really become the turning point of modern history, and we may say that *the modern era is in crisis*.

This unprecedented anxiety and crisis in human history has become such that it has obliged man to curse his civilization. "Such anxiety would not have arisen had there been no scientific progress, no social development." One is tempted to look back to the good old days and condemn the present. Ten years ago (1957-1958) when I travelled through Europe and the United States, I frequently met people who held such a view. The number of those who curse modern civilization seems to be increasing.

Generally speaking, religious people may consider that such a crisis is caused by a lack of awe toward God, that with faith in God there would not have been such a crisis, and that faith in God will save man from it. Usually they believe that man can overcome this crisis through theism, that is, through awe of God. I do not believe this will save the modern age from its crisis.

I believe we ought to advance our civilization even more completely and strengthen further the forces of science and society. However, we need also inquire into what causes those forces to be a threat and an anxiety for us. For modern man it is not a matter of whether or not he believes in God. The cause lies in the fact that modern man is still lacking in rational consciousness, that he lacks a moral consciousness based on the rational consciousness.

While the development of society is something to be proud of, to take delight in, it is regrettably not accompanied by a similar growth in ethical awareness. One moves ahead very rapidly whereas the other does not keep pace with it. Rather, it is going backwards. This reveals where the real crisis lies. I doubt if there is any greater need than the purification or strengthening of ethical awareness. It is in this way that we can overcome the crisis of modern times. It alone can be called truly modern. To attempt to overcome the crisis of modern times through reliance upon God is, we must say, a retrogression toward pre-modern ages.

Where the uplifting of morality is concerned, even theonomy, if it had any heteronomous nature, would contradict the independence or autonomy of

modern man. Rather, we men of the present age are expected to be already free from such a theonomy. If there remains any trace of heteronomy, we should free ourselves of it. How priceless for the development of mankind is his consciousness of his own autonomy! Any retrogression away from this autonomy toward a heteronomous theonomy would mean a degeneration for humankind. We must guard against it.

Christianity holds that the fall of Adam and Eve and their removal from Paradise was the fall of all mankind. However, I should say rather that Adam and Eve thereby became independent and autonomous, that the coming into being of man's autonomy means independence from God, freedom and emancipation from God, and that far from being man's fall, this is man's progress. Therefore, we must make ourselves, society, and history more and more rational.

As regards what is ordinarily called crisis, the large and small crises which we daily experience, it is most desirable and important to overcome them through a rational development of the world. Inquiring into their causes often reveals that they come from the lack of rational consciousness. Those anxieties or threats which arise from the lack of rational consciousness are, from the standpoint of reason, "rational" in character. In other words, the anxieties are "rational" anxieties simply because the non-rational element out of which they stem is to be removed in a rational way. However, such anxieties are phenomenal; they are not basic or noumenal.

Apart from the ordinary view which regards the present age as a turning point within the history of modern times, I should like to present here another, which sees it as a far deeper turning point, as *the critical point of the modern era*. One must not think of this crisis as being simply within modern times but rather as being a deep-rooted crisis of modern times themselves. I mean that the modern age, insofar as it remains as it is, is itself the root cause of our anxiety. There seems to be every indication that the modern era itself is in crisis, *rather than that the present age is a crisis within modern times*. This is what I mean by the basic, noumenal crisis, compared with which the crisis of the present age within modern times is no more than a phenomenal manifestation. To truly understand the real nature of this crisis and to overcome it—that is religion in the true sense of the word.

This is the crisis which is beyond any kind of rational solution, because the

ULTIMATE CRISIS AND RESURRECTION

source of worries is not any rational crisis but *the crisis of reason itself*, which goes beyond rational solution. It is this that Zen touches, in my opinion.

As the Zen expression "Under great doubt lies great Awakening" makes clear, Zen is never theism; however, it is not rational humanism either. Where is Zen to be located? I think it ought to be located in reality itself. Looking for its location in past history will never do. Zen is something that must be dug up directly from the depths of reality. The place to dig for it is precisely in the crisis of which we have been speaking. Only when the great doubt penetrates there and is broken through does the truly great Awakening take place.

By the great doubt, therefore, I mean what one may call the ultimate contradiction lying at the depths of reason, that is, the basic antinomy of reason. Besides, it is only when the great doubt is of fundamentally subjective character instead of some objective doubt that there arises the self-awareness of what is called great doubting-mass. Upon the breaking up of that great doubting-mass there is actualized the *satori* or the Awakening of the Fundamentally Subjective nature, which may be called the great mass of Awakening.

Then, the question of practice, or the problem of how to attain the great Awakening, becomes important. Since this is the crisis, as I have been mentioning, which goes beyond rational solution and which lies at the bottom of reason, that is, since this is the crisis of reason itself, its solution also ought to rely on a method which is not rational. It must break through the crisis of reason. While heretofore in Zen various methods have been considered, we must examine what method for Awakening will be most essential.

VI *The World of Awakening: F.A.S.*

We modern men ought to be those who follow reason as we independently and autonomously go about forming society and creating history. The norm for doing this should be reason in its broadest sense. Society and history ought to be constructed in a rational way. As I have already mentioned, however, the present age, in the process of forming society and history, is facing a serious crisis. This is largely due to the retardation of moral reason which fails to keep pace with the progress of scientific or collective social forces. It begins with tardiness in the awakening of moral awareness both on the part of individuals and collective bodies. This tardiness causes a vicious circle. It has

brought about the worldwide anxieties of the present age. These anxieties flow backward and cause each individual, whether he is conscious of it or not, to give birth to them anew. Each individual, under the weight of worldwide anxieties, suffers from new anxieties which go beyond individual resolution.

Besides the lag in moral awareness, another important cause is perceivable, and it is not necessarily an ethical one. As civilization has progressed, societies have become extremely complicated. We are being thrown into a kind of civilized jungle. As social structures become increasingly complicated, we are being driven deeper and deeper into that jungle. This means that we are caught in the complicated structure of civilization and society, and we have not yet established control over it. We are driven by civilization, having lost the helm and fallen into an unprecedented state of confusion.

Consequently the self that must be the fundamental subject has come to be used by things, and the controlling ability to use things has gradually been lost. The Zen master Jōshū said, "You are used by the twelve periods of the day, whereas I can use them."⁵ He was quite right. In the present age, far from using them, we are being used by the "twelve periods of the day." Besides, the complication of the world-structure and civilization is only increased by the activities of reason. Unless we can learn to live more strongly in complicated realities, even if we strive to form a solid society and a solid history, it will become completely impossible to continue forming them.

Such being the case, improving morality and establishing self-control in man are absolutely essential. Only through the strengthening of these two can the crisis of modern times we now face be overcome. We must do this by every means in our power. Independent, autonomous modern man cannot afford to lose his nerve in this crisis. He must use and keep using the whole twelve periods of the day.

But between *the man who can use the twelve periods of the day* and rational modern man there remains a deeper and still more important gap. It is *the crisis lying in the depths of modern man*. Unlike the crisis mentioned above, this crisis always hangs on man because of his very nature, irrespective of differences of time and space. I think we can call it an *ontological crisis*, after the manner explained above. Unless we solve this crisis, we can never be free from anxiety

⁵ From the *Chao-chou lu* 趙州錄 Jōshū-roku.

ULTIMATE CRISIS AND RESURRECTION

in our making society and history. That is to say, without the solution of this crisis there is no firm establishment of the fundamental subjectivity of man.

From such a viewpoint, most of the crises are phenomenal and relative; they can never be considered basic. People often mistake such *phenomenal and relative crises* for ontological and ultimate ones. In man's inquiry into the basic source of worries, which are far from phenomenal-relative crises, various misconceptions tend to arise which take the non-basic source as basic. Such misconceptions produce more empty worries. What will be the truly basic worry, the truly fundamental crisis which differs from such relative crises?

I believe man's life-death nature is the basic ontological crisis. Generally speaking, the crisis based on existence-nonexistence or being-nonbeing, as long as it is not overcome, always shadows us. No one knows when what is ordinarily called "life" or "existence" may vanish. Nowhere can life or existence be secure. Nowhere does anything eternal exist. All that lives, all that exists, does so in the manner of living-dying or being-nonbeing. This is the natural, basic crisis of all that exists.

Meanwhile, this universal existential crisis is for man inseparably connected with *the concrete form* of value-antivalue. The desirability of existence or life proves that it is already connected to value. Death or nonbeing is terrible or loathsome because value is already combined with it. Existence and value are thus inseparably intertwined and constitute *man's essential concrete structure*.

This concrete structure of man's ontological crisis is expressed by such Buddhist terms as *anitya* (nonduration), *samskṛta* (that which is made), *samsāra* (wandering through life-and-death). Here life-and-death or being-and-nonbeing is emphasized. But they too ought to imply value-and-antivalue. Unless man becomes aware of this basic crisis in its concrete form and overcomes it, unless thereby there is firmly established in him the Self that is free from the crisis, he will not be able to live without anxiety.

Here lies our most basic problem. And it is in the Self-Awakening of the Formless Self that the fundamentally subjective solution of the problem exists. This Man who is not of the nature of existence-nonexistence or value-antivalue, is in Zen called *the man of no-birth-death who is free from the thought of either good or bad*. This is why the Formless Self is advocated. In the Self-Awakening of the Formless Self we acquire true life and true value. It is the

man in whom this life and this value are one and inseparable who, having overcome the basic crisis, becomes capable of creating a world and history without anxiety. This is the Self-abiding, true Man that acts without being bound by life or death, good or bad. His being alive and active in reality is his true way of life.

Therefore, the ultimate aim of this method is to become awakened to the Self in whom the life of no-birth no-death and value without thought of either good or bad are inseparably one. *Satori* is, after all, this Self-Awakening, where man becomes *ultimately independent and autonomous*, having overcome the crisis of rational independence and autonomy. The latter is of a birth-death, good-bad nature and cannot be true and ultimate independence and autonomy. True, ultimate independence and autonomy must be that which has overcome the basic crisis lying at the bottom of existence.

Zen, after all, means being awakened to the True Self, the True man, or Original Face. The occasions for this Zen awakening are varied and without fixed form. Here also, in their being without fixed form, we see the Zen freedom. At the particular time and place where man finds himself, he takes that opportunity and awakens to the basic Self.

Since this true Self is the Self that has overcome the basic crisis, every actual existence and non-existence, every value and anti-value is *directly open to the Self*. It is like digging a well. The water of all wells is open to the same underground flow. My being here and now is in the ordinary sense phenomenal existence. From the standpoint of the true Self, however, this phenomenal existence is nothing else than the expression of the true Self. With our ordinary consciousness, we remain phenomenal. But by awakening from phenomenon to noumenon, the phenomenal becomes the noumenal expression, and the noumenon comes to be the master of phenomenon. The phenomenon immediately opening to the noumenon, or the phenomenon immediately awakening to the noumenon, is *the satori or Awakening of Zen*.

The way to be open to it is the awakening to the Self that is not bound or defined by anything at all, either by birth-and-death or good-and-evil. Emyō was asked by the Sixth Patriarch, "At the very time you do not think of either good or evil, what is your Original Face?"⁶ He struggled with the

⁶ Hui-ming 慧明 (Cf. footnote 1 in Part I): Hui-neng 慧能 Enō (638–713).

ULTIMATE CRISIS AND RESURRECTION

question, and got awakened to that which does not think of either good or evil. Only then was he awakened to the True Self that is not bound by anything. Someone asked the tenth century Chinese Zen master Daizui, "How is it when birth-and-death is come?"⁷ To struggle with whole body and mind with this basic dilemma lying at the very bottom of man—this is the method to penetrate into the root source.

But, instead of referring to "good and evil" and "life and death" separately, we can ask ourselves a single question which will lead us directly to Awakening. What kind of question is it? One that any person may ask here and now concerning his being, asked in such a manner that we cut off every fetter and attain the true Self-based life, that we die a Great Death in order to be alive anew. We must have every fetter cut off. We must die a Great Death and be born again. Our actual way of being, no matter what it may be, is a particular one, that is, it is something. So long as it is anything, it is a self that is under some kind of definition and bondage. Above all, we must be awakened to the Self that is not restricted by anything. Suppose that

Standing will not do nor will sitting,
Feeling will not do nor will thinking,
Dying will not do nor will living,
Then, what do I do?

Here is *the final, Single Barrier* against which one is pressed in order to be transformed, and through which, in being transformed, one penetrates. Zen has hitherto had countless numbers of ancient cases or *kōan*, not only the traditional "1700 cases." All of them can be reduced to this Single Barrier. It is such that penetration through one point is penetration through all points, that the single Great Death brings about renewed life, that the Formless manifests every form, and that when body and mind fall off, the fallen off comes to have body and mind.

Here alone can we have every binding fetter cut off and become *the ultimately*

⁷ Ta-sui 大随. A monk asked: "How is it when birth-and-death is come?" The master answered: "Coming to tea, take tea; coming to a meal, take a meal." The questioner stepped forward and said: "Who receives the offering?" The master said: "You should take the bowl." *Keitoku densōroku*, 11.

Self-abiding Self that goes beyond every kind of attachment. The Self that is capable of using the twelve periods of the day is such a Self.

We have been speaking of this as *the Formless Self* (referred to as "F"), that is, the Self that is without any form, beyond all characteristics, unhindered, and Self-abiding. It is this Self that is the ultimately emancipated Self, the Self that is saved in the true sense. When the saved is under the support and redemption of some "other" Buddha or God, it cannot be called true redemption. The truly independent and autonomous Self alone is truly saved. In Zen this is regarded as the true way of redemption. Because it is freedom from every binding fetter, it is called emancipation as well. Such a Self is the true Buddha. No "other" Buddha is really a Buddha. It is said that, "It is the Self-Buddha that is the True Buddha."⁸ If there were any Buddha except the Self, it would not be the true Self or true Buddha. The Buddha is never of an "other" nature. He is the completely independent and autonomous Self, the Self that is beyond self and other. Rinzai's "Solitarily emancipated, non-dependent" Self, or his "True Man of No Rank" indicates none other than this. That is why in Zen people speak of practice as inquiry into and clarification of the matter of Self.

In Zen there are numerous questions such as:

"What is the Buddha?"

"What was the purpose of Bodhidharma's coming from the west?"

"What is the pure and clean dharma-body?"⁹

This Buddha is the Self, the true man. The Buddha that exists apart from the Self is not the true Buddha and must be negated. The patriarch that exists externally must also be negated. That is why Zen speaks of "Killing the Buddha, killing the patriarch."¹⁰ Here is where Zen differs from religions which regard God or Buddha as possessing the nature of an "other." Ordinarily the self is regarded as completely separated from Buddha or God. When related at all, it is dependent on them. On the contrary, in Zen there is no true Buddha apart from the Self; apart from the Buddha there is no True Self. Rather, it is more appropriate to say, apart from the true Self there is no true Buddha.

⁸ By Enō. From the *Platform Sutra*, TT. 48, p. 352a.

⁹ See the author's *Zen and the Fine Arts* (Kōdansha Int., 1971), p. 15.

¹⁰ From the *Rinzai-roku* 臨濟錄 *Lin-chi lu*. Cf. Part I, footnote 4.

ULTIMATE CRISIS AND RESURRECTION

In Zen, the Self that has rid itself of the external "other" God or Buddha is the true Buddha. It is completely unrestricted and in everything acts Self-abidingly, the Self that acts in all things as the master. Here "act" means the wondrous activity of forming the world and creating history. The Self of Zen makes such wondrous activity, creating history *Self-abidingly*, unbound by anything. Hence the Self of Zen *creates history Supra-historically* (referred to as "S"). Further, the formation of the world is conducted on the standpoint of the True Self universal to every person. This means the True Self forms the world *standing on the standpoint of All mankind* (referred to as "A"). Therefore, the true Self is the basic subject that truly creates history, the fundamental subject that forms the world from the standpoint of all mankind. Besides, this is the Self that, while being engaged in creating, is not bound by what is created, that keeps on creating always freed from creation. The "formless Self" that we speak of is such a *Self-abiding, creative, forming Formless Self*.

Therefore, the fundamental subject is the formless self, and the wondrous activity may be indicated in terms of the "A.S." A mere "A.S." without the fundamental subject "F" would not be the true way of being of "A.S." Likewise, an "F" without the wondrous activity "A.S." would not be the true "F." The "F" ought to be joined with the wondrous activity "A.S.," yet not bound by the latter. The man that has the dynamic structure of "F.A.S." is the true man.

This "Formless Self" is likely to be forgotten. Usually, in ordinary political movements this "Formless Self" is forgotten completely. Even if it is not forgotten, those who undertake these movements are not likely to have overcome man's basic crisis, that is, to have awakened to the Formless Self. Meanwhile, in religion—and this has been true of Buddhism and Zen—so much emphasis has been laid on the Formless Self that it has been confined to itself and this has shrunk the wondrous activity, "A.S." This is a point which should be carefully reconsidered in Zen as well as in Buddhism.

In Zen it is emphasized that practice to attain the Formless Self should not become like the practice of "silent illumination," or turn into something that would fall into the "devil's cave."

They speak of an activity which will not become mere silent illumination. But how should it work? What should be the object of this Self-abiding activity? These are extremely important problems.

Only bringing an individual to the Formless Self, as has usually been the case with Zen, cannot be said to be the full, wondrous activity of the Formless Self. Leading an individual to the Formless Self to have him awake alone would leave him in the end with an Formless Self beyond which he could not go. The great activity of the Formless Self ought to work three-dimensionally so that it will not only lead the individual to the Formless Self but truly form the world and create history. Only then will its wondrous activity become full and its great Zen activity become world-forming and history-creating. That is to say, its Zen activity will have the three dimensions, Self, World, and History, which constitute the basic structure of man, closely united within itself.

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

The kind of belief held by Buddhists or Christians that after death man is to be reborn in a Buddha-land or a Heaven must be regarded as a heartless, seclusive, and narrow view which deserts the world and history and sets them apart as being beyond the pale of the wonderful activity of compassion or *agape*. The Sixth Patriarch Enō said:

Ordinary, ignorant people are not aware of the Pure Land within themselves and seek for it in the east or west because they do not awake to the Self-nature. To the awakened, however, there is no difference between east and west; every place is equally the Pure Land. That is why Sākyamuni said, 'Wherever I am, I am in ease and comfort.'¹¹

Rinzai also said, "Being master wherever I am, wherever I am is all true."¹² For this reason, 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, non-dependent, Formless Self, who will form the true world and create true history

¹¹ From the *Platform Sutra*, TT. 48, p. 352a.

¹² From the *Rinzai-roku*, TT. 47, . 498a.

ULTIMATE CRISIS AND RESURRECTION

Self-abidingly, without being bound or fettered by anything. *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.*

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 best 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 actualization of F.A.S. can be really called the ultimate Mahāyāna.

Translated by Tokiwa Gishin



Erratum: Please note the following correction in Part I of this article.
Page 12, line 15: *For nationality read the state.*