Introduction

Linda Learman

Peter Berger has noted four cultural dimensions of the worldwide communication and economic integration called “globalization”: the cultures of international business, of the Western intelligentsia, of American popular tastes and values, and of Evangelical and Pentecostal Protestantism. Although the impact of these cultures may have been the major anthropological narrative of our time, we live in an era in which non-Western traditions, such as Eastern religions, martial arts, and healing practices, have also spread around the world. Globalization has involved multidirectional flows. Given the structures of power over the last century, however, the West has had a predominant role, but not an exclusive one. The Buddhists who are the focus of this book—Theravadin from Sri Lanka; Vajrayana teachers from Tibet; Zen, True Pure Land, Shingon, and Soka Gakkai Buddhists from Japan; and two distinctive Chinese Buddhist organizations from Taiwan—are examples of transnational and cross-cultural movements resulting from and shaped by globalization but also making use of it. In the twentieth century, Buddhist traditions have not only increasingly forged links among themselves in Asia, they have also emerged from Asia, being carried by emigrants, picked up by travelers, and taught by Buddhist missionaries to new peoples of the Western and non-Western world. Moreover, now Western Buddhists are becoming influential propagators of the faith, in the West at least.

Although the papers in this book deal specifically with late-nineteenth- and twentieth-century Buddhist missionaries, Steven Kemper raised the question of whether we should view twentieth-century Buddhist missions as a critical departure from earlier Buddhists’ ethos and practice. He referred to Jonathan Walters’ dissertation “Rethinking Buddhist Missions,” in which Walters rejected the notion that premodern Buddhism was a missionary religion, at least in the Sri Lankan Theravada tradition based on Pali texts. He maintained that the texts customarily used to establish a Buddhist missionary agenda have alternative readings that were totally missed by Buddhologists, who approached their subject with Anglo-American Protestant preconceptions and purposes. “Buddhist mission,” he said,
“is an Anglo-American construct that has been maintained only by silencing the premodern Buddhists who paradoxically are depicted as agents” (1:5).

While I remained unconvinced by Walter’s arguments about premodern Theravada Buddhism, his research into the development of Anglo-American Protestant thinking on the concepts of “mission” and “missionary” is very useful, both for the background it gives for the twentieth-century encounters between Buddhists and Protestants and for the comparative examples it affords. Thus, I shall summarize the varied meanings of “mission” in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Anglo-American discourse, drawing on Walters’ and others’ work, comparing them to Buddhist examples, and pointing out their impact on the development of Buddhist missions in the twentieth century. Thereafter, I shall describe in broad terms examples of premodern Buddhist “missionary spirit” and move on to a discussion of the cases presented in this book. One of the main contributions of this work is our focus on the active proselytization by Asian Buddhists themselves. The second important contribution is sociological: comparing these cases in light of Buddhist and Western social-science concepts of conversion has allowed us to come up with a typology for missions that not only helps to explain some aspects of our Buddhist data but also should be useful in the study of non-Buddhist “mission” and “missionary” efforts. I am grateful to George Tanabe for precipitating these three types of missions from the data and pointing out their relevance to this study.

ON THE DEFINITION OF MISSIONARY RELIGIONS, MISSIONARIES, AND MISSIONARY METHODS

Walters pointed out that by about the 1840s Buddhism was being called a “missionary religion” in Anglo-American discourse, and the “first systematic attempt to use ‘mission’ as a comparative category was made by Max Muller...in 1873” (99, 105). Of the eight “great world religions,” Muller classed Buddhism, Christianity, and Islam as “missionary religions,” in contrast to the “non-missionary religions” of Judaism, Brahmanism, and Zoroastrianism (Muller did not include Confucianism or Taoism in either of these typologies; 100, 105).

Walters identified three phases of thinking with regard to “mission” and “missionaries,” although with the emergence of each, older models by no means disappeared. In the nineteenth century, the ideal missionary would have four attributes. He would be a scholar, learning the language, customs, and beliefs of others in order to undermine their religion and effect successful conversion; he would be a “civilizer,” eradicating customs that were inimical to Christian values, such as can-
nibalism, suttee, and nakedness, while offering, in addition to the Gospel, literacy, Western medicine, technology, law, and science; he would be an aggressive “saver of souls,” working to supplant false religions; and, because of his “missionary spirit,” he would be the epitome of Christian life, undertaking hardships, risking martyrdom, and, sometimes, persevering because of suffering in order to become close to God (17–22, 27–28, 29 n75, 35–36, 173). This is the model picked up by the Sri Lankan Buddhist Anagarika Dharmapala (1864–1933), founder of the Maha Bodhi Society and one of the most influential missionary figures of twentieth-century Buddhism (see Chaps. 1 and 2); and as will be seen in the essays in this book, whether by convergence or adoption, the roles of scholar, civilizer, and converter to the truth have appeared in most Buddhist missionary agendas, Theravada and Mahayana alike.

The second phase, after World War I, was marked by a reorientation of Anglo-American Protestant thinking. It was characterized by the recognition that mission work needed to be done among the secularized at home. Moreover, missionaries were to place greater emphasis on education, women’s issues, and medical, agricultural, and industrial development. This phase was also characterized by more tolerance of other religions, stemming from the idea that all paths lead to the same God and the view that “religion,” itself, should be encouraged in order to counteract science, materialism, atheism, and humanism (Walters, 85–90). Influential in Chinese Buddhist circles today (see Chaps. 7 and 8) and an early proponent of studying and learning from Christianity was the Venerable Master Taixu (1890–1947; also spelled Tai Hsü) in Republican China. What he admired, however, was not its central tenets of divine creation and the resurrection, but “its ability to organize and motivate individual adherents in normative modes of belief and practice... to engender in diverse adherents a singleness of purpose and unified commitment to mission.” Like Dharmapala, Taixu wished to adopt Christian missionary methods to promote domestic religious and social reform and international ecumenical and propagation work.

After World War II, in liberal Anglo-American Protestant circles a third model emerged in which dialog replaced evangelism. For the most liberal, it was accompanied by “universalism,” the view that it is possible to find the true essence of religion and that to further the realization of this essence through active engagement with other religious people on an equal footing was good. During this period Buddhist figures have actively engaged in Buddhist–Christian dialog, the Dalai Lama, Thich Nhat Hanh, and Nikkyo Niwano being internationally known examples. Scholars Winston King and David Chappell have observed, however, that unlike their Christian counterparts, most Buddhists have not been very inter-
ested in dialog on questions of theology or ultimate reality or in the use of dialog as a means to deepen their own understanding; rather, their motivation for engagement has tended to be to “nurture a sense of global community in a divided world,” to promote interreligious cooperation for world peace.6

Opting for an “indirect influence of Christianity on non-Christian traditions,” as Walters described post–World War II developments, was not acceptable to all Anglo-American Protestant missionaries.7 A case in point was Pentecostalism. Emerging from the Azusa Street Revival (1906–1909) in the United States and holding that glossolalia and other gifts of the Holy Spirit were signs that the end of the world was close at hand, all early Pentecostal churches felt strongly obligated to undertake evangelical work.

Taking literally the word of the Bible, Pentecostal churches gave (and continue to give) precedence to the “leading of the [Holy] Spirit’ over administrative structures and scientific church growth formulas.”8 In contrast to the paternalistic organizations of more established Protestant denominations—that is, organizations in which church structures, financial backing, and major decision making came from a home church in North America or Europe—beginning in the 1920s Pentecostal mission strategy moved toward the creation of indigenous churches. Pentecostal missionaries became catalysts for locally organized, led, and funded churches. Their principles (articulated by the Presbyterian J. L. Nevis’ The Planting and Development of Missionary Churches [1886]) were the “three selfs”: self-propagation, self-support, and self-government.9 The earliest missionaries even went into the field without financial backing or pledges, “relying solely on faith and prayer for support.”10

Given their conviction that “believers can and ought to proclaim their faith wherever they will,” nonordained Pentecostals were (and are) encouraged to make converts.11 Most churches denied women ordination; yet opportunities in actual practice gave them substantial self-confidence, voice, and authority.12 And throughout most, if not all, of their history, the majority of their missionaries have been married and single women.13

Although I have no evidence that they were influenced by Pentecostal examples, two Buddhist movements that share an emphasis on the grassroots, lay-witnessing approach to evangelism not unlike that of the Pentecostals are Soka Gakkai from Japan and the Buddhist Compassion Relief Tzu-Chi Foundation (referred to in Huang’s chapter as Ciji, and herein shortened to Compassion Relief Foundation) from Taiwan (see Chaps. 5 and 8). In both movements, women have also been empowered and are one of the driving forces behind these primarily lay organizations (see also LeVine and Rocha on missionary women). Yet there are
notable differences. In contrast to the fragmentation of the Pentecostal movement, both have had strong central leadership, making them a unified force in their home base and, for the Compassion Relief Foundation at least, tying their overseas branches closely to it. Moreover, they aim for both world and personal transformation.

While there is no doubt that most Theravada and Mahayana Buddhist organizations have engaged in what can be seen as “missionary” activity in the twentieth century, a question posed by Walters and picked up in Steven Kemper’s essay (Chap. 1), however, is whether “missions” and “missionaries” can be understood to be a part of Buddhist institutional history before the nineteenth century.

The passage from the Pali canon often used by scholars as emblematic of a long-standing, historical presence of a missionary ideal within the Theravada tradition is the following (I will discuss Mahayana traditions a bit further on):

Wander about on wanderings [carikam], monks. For the good of many folk, for the happiness of many folk, out of compassion for the world, for the good and the happiness of gods and men, don’t two of you go by one [road]. Preach the Truth, monks, which is lovely at the beginning, lovely in the middle, lovely at the end, in the letter and in the spirit. Demonstrate the purified holy life which is fully complete. There are beings with little dust in their eyes; they are falling away from the Truth because they do not hear it. There will be people who understand....

According to Walters, carikam means “moving about” or “journey.” He translated it as “wanderings,” arguing that Rhys-Davids’ earlier translation of carikam as “mission” wrongly presupposed a category of “mission.” Instead, Walters maintained that ambiguities in the Pali make it possible to read the text in two ways: one in which the monks are enjoined to wander, with preaching as secondary; and the other in which monks are sent out specifically to preach. Moreover, despite the spread of Buddhism through Asia, Walters found that the Pali word for “missionary,” dhammaduta, is of late-nineteenth-century coinage. There are quite a few words for “preaching,” as, for example, dhammadana (“gift of Truth”), dhammadheri (“drum of Truth”), dhammadhesana (“explication of Truth”), dhammadatha (“discussion of Truth”), and dhammadhaja (“flag of Truth”) (204–205, 212). But Walters wanted to reserve the rubric “missionary” for only those religions for which proselytization is the defining and essential characteristic (169, 211); a preaching tradition is not sufficient.

Whether ambiguities allow for both readings or not, I would agree that the
Theravada canon does not take proselytization as its defining characteristic. For example, canonical sources suggest that an imperative to spread the Dharma is not intrinsic to arhatship, the difference between a buddha and an arhat being the vow to become liberated so as to liberate others and the subsequent long career as a bodhisattva that finally culminates in buddhahood. Upholding the arhat ideal, the Theravada doctrinally downplays the aspiration for buddhahood, pointing to the Buddha's encouragement of his disciples to make arhatship their goal. In addition, the canons describe Pratyekabuddhas, those who achieve enlightenment without the help of a teacher and do not have disciples.

Thus, while arhats are not defined by a zeal to propagate the dispensation, central concerns have been the example of the Buddha's forty-five years of clearing away the "dust from people's eyes" and his institutionalization of the sangha through the rules for the order, so as to help others realize enlightenment and uphold a means by which the teaching could be maintained and passed on. Walter's argument only holds by using a very restricted definition of "missionary religion"; and it is clear from canonical texts and the sangha's behavior that conversion to a new viewpoint and propagation of the dispensation have been extremely important parts of Theravada Buddhism. At this point, I think that we need to abandon Walter's definition of a "missionary religion" and look at how Buddhists have approached this aspect of their practice.

Erik Zurcher suggested that the above passage does present a missionary ideal, but not one that can be characterized as a "large-scale planned missionary movement"; rather, the spread of Buddhism has depended on "the individual efforts of itinerant monks and preachers."15 In a similar vein, Walters maintained that the "Protestant" Buddhist missionary movement begun by Dharmapala was a radical break with the premodern Theravada tradition. Perhaps the best evidence that the Theravada sangha was not constituted in the manner of nineteenth-century Protestant missionary organizations was the Protestant missionaries' own assessment that the monks were just too tolerant of other religions and too non-confrontational.16

This does not, however, mean that pre-nineteenth-century Buddhists eschewed all manner of outreach or relied merely on preaching. Mahinda Deegalle, in his article on bana, Sinhala vernacular texts used for lecturing that began to emerge in the tenth century and that played an important role in a revival of Buddhism in parts of Sri Lanka from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries, showed also that such texts were intended to be read by segments of the population who were generally unable to attend preaching assemblies (that is, by common people in remote areas, sequestered queens, kings and nobles too busy to attend, and senior
monks too high in the hierarchy to listen to their juniors). In this we see both public preaching and vernacular texts for private study as methods of outreach, and are reminded that methods of propagation and revitalization have neither been static down the centuries nor, in some cases, so different cross-culturally.

As for twentieth-century missions, however, the experiences of colonial domination and English Protestant evangelizing presented many of the methods, as well as the challenge, to Sri Lankan Buddhists. Their missions’ primary supporters were the village intelligentsia and the educated, urban middle class that had emerged over the nineteenth century.

One last point. Walters noted the creation in 1989 in Sri Lanka of the Ministry of Buddhist Religion, a highly organized, state-funded, missionary project. Drawing on an ideal of an Asokan Buddhist state, the ministry focuses on missions at home and abroad, and appears to have a broad base of support. Sinhala Buddhists have, in addition, continued to use much of the nineteenth-century Protestant model, as in

“letters from the field”; conversion statistics and converts’ personal recollections; warnings about the shortages of missionaries in certain parts of Europe and the United States; criticisms of those who slack off at home; missionary biographies; missionary journals; missionary keepsake volumes; scores of missionary societies and institutions for training missionaries; missiology.

In Walters’ view, “contemporary Sri Lankan Buddhism is swimming in missionary spirit.”

Despite his evaluation of a radical change having taken place in Sri Lankan missionary practice, our two chapters on Sri Lankan missionaries show both substantial borrowings and differences from Protestant models. Kemper emphasizes how missionaries work to make “Buddhism present in the world”; LeVine points out the tension between monks’ securing their own salvation, the preservation of the tradition, and working for the secular and spiritual welfare of others.

What of the Great Vehicle (or Mahayana) traditions, in which the liberation of others is said to be an integral part of one’s own path? How has the bodhisattva ideal played out historically in terms of a “missionary spirit”?

Studies of the spread of Buddhism to and within China largely uphold Weber’s observations on elective affinities, indicating that the religious Taoists were attracted by Buddhist cosmography, ritual, vows, and meditation; the elite intelligentsia, by its sophisticated thought and the model of an aristocratic householder,
the Buddhist layman Vimalakirti; political elites, by monks who were adept at rain-making, military and political strategy, miracle working, and Indian medicine; and rural folk, by miracle working, teaching, meditation, Indian medicine, and other good works.22

Using archaeological and textual sources, Shufen Liu found that by the early fifth century rural north China was dotted with thousands of Buddhist statuary stelae, which were used as ritual sites, as visualization and teaching aids, and as a means for making merit. In addition to images of buddhas and bodhisattvas, the stelae often showed scenes from popular scriptures, such as the Lotus and the Vimalakirti Nirdesa Scriptures; from the biography of the Buddha or of his previous births; and pictures of the tortures of hell.23

At this time in north China, Buddhist monks led lay associations for public works as well. The then title of itinerant Buddhist monks meant “Master of Charitable Organizations” (yi shi), and the activities of these associations included building bridges, digging wells, planting trees, feeding the hungry, providing cemeteries, and erecting a stele at the site of each project.24 Women participated in these associations, sometimes even organizing them on their own.25 If monks were enjoined to “remove the dust from people’s eyes” through preaching and personal example in the earliest of Buddhist traditions, in fifth-century China they also employed ritual, instruction in visualization, and good works.

Evidence for Mahayana forms of “missionary spirit” can also be found in canonical sources. The strong emphasis in the Lotus Scripture, for example, on reading, copying, reciting, practicing, and broadly propagating the scripture (found throughout the scripture); on the development of the moral qualities of forbearance and perseverance in the face of physical and verbal abuse when seeking to convert skeptics (in the chapter “The Bodhisattva Never Disparaging”); and on the characterization of the bodhisattva of compassion Avalokiteswara as someone who would appear anywhere in whatever form is necessary in order to save sentient beings (in chapter 25) all strongly suggest purposeful outreach to believers and nonbelievers alike. The first of the four bodhisattva vows—however many beings there may be, I vow to save them all—is another example of such concerns.

The missionary aspect of Mahayana forms of Buddhism has had diverse manifestations. Dōgen (1200–1254), the founder of Sōtō Zen in Japan, promoted the efficacy of silent meditation, writing of the legendary sixth-century Indian monk Bodhidharma in China that “we still hear the echoes of his nine years facing a wall.”26 In the Tibetan tradition, the great Indian monk Padmasambhava (eighth century) is credited with paving the way for the conversion of Tibet to Buddhism by esoterically subduing and converting the local gods and demons. The Japa-
Chinese monk Nichiren (1222–1282) courted martyrdom with the belief that in the Dharma-ending age it was one’s duty to confront those whose faith was misplaced and convert them to the Lotus Scripture. To suffer hardships in this endeavor alleviated one’s past bad karma; to die for the cause was to ensure one’s future buddha-hood.27

As for twentieth-century Brazil, in this volume Cristina Rocha (Chap. 6) notes that Zen missionaries rely on Dōgen’s emphasis on silent meditation, while Peter Clarke (Chap. 5) documents substantial reworkings of Nichiren’s “missionary spirit” among his heirs in Soka Gakkai.

Stuart Chandler and Julia Huang offer sustained treatments of Taiwan’s Master Xingyun and Master Zhengyan, two prominent figures in the reform of Buddhism in Taiwan and in its spread in Chinese communities around the world.28 Both recognize their indebtedness to Master Taixu, whose thought has had a number of parallels with the Dharmapalan reformation of the Theravada. Indeed, Master Taixu attended a school for Buddhist missionaries that had been set up as a result of Dharmapala’s visit to China in 1893.29 Both these leaders have distanced themselves from “funeral Buddhism,” reorienting practice toward this world and to global missions that aim to cross ethnic lines. Rooted in the Mahayana, both share their approach with earlier responses to the Christian challenge.

George Tanabe (Chap. 3) offers a portrait of figures who were instrumental in the development of the True Pure Land Mission to Hawai’i during the early to middle years of the twentieth century, amply demonstrating the deliberate selectivity with which Japanese priests working in an immigrant community approached American civic and Christian traditions.

Gray Tuttle’s essay (Chap. 9) offers an exception to this pattern of selective appropriation of Western ways. It gives us a picture of Tibetan Buddhist lamas in China during the early decades of this century and shows how their agenda and methods for spreading the Dharma in the contemporary West are remarkably similar to that earlier model, one that developed along Tibetan Buddhist and Chinese administrative models independently from Western influence, and one that continues to emphasize the supernormal efficacy of ritual.

Therefore, although Buddhist missionaries in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have certainly been stimulated and influenced by Christianity, they should not be thought of as simplistically imitating or being overwhelmed by Christian ethos and practices. Buddhists already had their own versions of “missionary spirit” and traditions of social responsibility. In addition, and as a number of the chapters in this book note, changes to economic, political, and social conditions during this period—that is, colonialism, nationalism, worldwide economic
integration and travel, organizational rationalization, science, technology, and mass communications—have all contributed greatly to the character of twentieth-century Buddhist missionary efforts.

CONVERSION: FOREIGN, DIASPORA, AND DOMESTIC MISSIONS

Kemper noted that most Sri Lankan Theravada missionaries do not seem to spend much time trying to convert others, and Rocha and Clarke found that Zen institutions and Soka Gakkai in Brazil have come to have no denominational barriers, permitting practitioners multiple religious affiliations. Moreover, Chandler and Huang have observed that the vast majority of the new adherents of the Fo-guang Shan (lit., Buddha's Light Mountain) and the Compassion Relief organizations already think of themselves as Buddhist. Like “missionary,” “conversion” and “mission” have more than one meaning.

Building on Jan Nattier’s earlier attempt to understand how religions “travel to new places,” the essays in this book form the basis for proposing a new typology for the sociology of missionary efforts. Once stated, they seem so obvious as to go without saying; yet once articulated, they help to explain heretofore perplexing data: particularly relevant to the character of missionary efforts and to the role of conversion in the propagation of any religion is whether the target population is a culturally foreign group being introduced to the religion for the first time, a diaspora community drawing on its religious heritage to make its way in a culturally foreign environment, or a domestic audience deemed to be in need of religious revitalization. The essays in this volume deal with all three kinds of missions.

Buddhist scriptures recognize two processes that resonate with Western usages of “conversion,” namely, a transformation of character and viewpoint and a change of affiliation. Decisive steps on the path to “enlightenment” (such as the realization of the “four fruits”) are the first type of conversion and constitute the goal of practice. They are often accompanied by the second type of conversion, that is, an increasing identification as a Buddhist and an intensification of commitment. They are often marked by taking a particular monk, nun, or layman as one’s teacher, undertaking to keep the lay precepts, undergoing ordination, and/or receiving the bodhisattva vows.

Taking the Three Refuges is the Buddhist institutional equivalent of conversion in the sense of a change of affiliation. It is formally marked when a person, in the presence of an ordained member of the sangha, declares their intention to take the Buddha, his teachings, and the sangha as their religious guides, to the exclusion of other paths or faiths. The Pali canon records an instance in which Shakyamuni
Buddha spoke of the first glimpse of nirvana as the time when one becomes a member of the Buddha’s lineage (or gotra), thus merging the ideas of character transformation and insight with change of affiliation. This has remained a metaphor, however, for the Buddha and sangha have recognized as disciples people who have not yet entered the stream and have understood that people can awaken to the truths of Buddhism without the benefit of the Three Treasures and subsequent institutional affiliation to them (the above-mentioned Pratyekabuddha being a case in point). Moreover, because the Buddha recognized different realms of gods, the sangha also has tended to respect deities and theistic faiths while still maintaining the superiority of Buddhist goals and methods. This respect for spiritual entities may tend to soften the sense of conversion, in the sense of change in affiliation, more than Western observers might expect.

None of the authors in this book deal with conversion in the sense of enlightenment. Indeed, readers may wonder how awakening experiences and the extinction of passions figure into the political agendas, ethnic chauvinism, and generational conflicts that have sometimes characterized the Buddhists described in this book. In his analysis of Dharmapala, however, H. L. Seneviratne noted that meditation was an “ever present undercurrent” in his utopian vision. Dharmapala advocated both “active effort toward liberation” (paramattha dhamma) and social service; but he and his successors also believed that social service should take priority, even for the monastic sangha, when the people are poor, unhealthy, uneducated, and “torn by caste division”—hence their two different approaches to mission: an emphasis on economic and social development on the one hand and on meditation and insight on the other. Moreover, other voices in Theravada Buddhism are not well represented in this book. There are, as Kemper points out, Burmese, Thai, and Sri Lankan monks who are dismayed by what they feel is the politicization and worldliness of many Sinhala monks and urge a reform of the “Dharmapalan reformation.”

Future research should address how psychological conversion plays a role in the lives of missionaries and the people attracted to Buddhism. For example, Sarah LeVine mentioned that the women in her study were attracted to intensive training by the ideal of enlightenment. After training for some time, they found that what they really wanted was the capacity to help their families and community, and that this could only be accomplished through realizing “no-self” and letting go of greed, hate, and delusive habits of mind. What is more, they experienced their practice to be effective in this regard. In a similar vein, although with no reference to anything that could be regarded as the “four fruits” or satori, Huang describes the reorientation of outlook and intensification of commitment of Tai-
Hananese Buddhists in Taiwan and abroad—a domestic and diaspora revival, if you will—by means of bodhisattva service and inspired by the charismatic leadership, example, organizational skill, and political acumen (although the organization is apolitical) of Master Zhengyan, a Buddhist nun.38

As for conversion in the sense of change of affiliation, the chapters in this book examine cultural boundaries and how missionaries negotiate them. These are complex processes for which our contributors have enlisted a variety of conceptual and explanatory devices. George Tanabe offers his own particularly well-developed analogy of the “transplantation” and “hybridization” of an immigrant Pure Land temple in Hawai‘i. Cristina Rocha employs the “creolization” model from linguistics, in which elements from Buddhist culture (like “vocabulary”) are incorporated into preexisting habits of social interaction and religious cosmology (like “rules of syntax”) of Brazilians who take an interest in Buddhism. This process is akin to Richard Payne’s use of the term “assimilation.” Payne borrows from Piaget the distinction between assimilation and accommodation, in which he uses “assimilation” to mean the incorporation of new cultural elements without making any fundamental changes in worldview or practice, while he adapts Piaget’s concept of accommodation to mean the reworking of preexisting beliefs or practices when faced with differences.39

Also important to the process of conversion is the means by which cultural contact is made and maintained. Kemper’s “ethnoscape” and Payne’s “mediascape” draw on Arjun Appadurai’s work on the channels for cultural flows.40 The former refers to people on the move—migrants, tourists, refugees, students, and so on—creating complicated landscapes or networks and pockets of group identity that do not straightforwardly conform to territorial or national boundaries. Missionaries are brokers of the religiocultural boundaries of these ethnoscapes, using a wide variety of “media” to create and broadcast their message.

While no explicit reference has been made to Appadurai’s other “scapes” in this work, for example, to “technoscapes,” “finanscapes,” and “ideoscapes”—that is, the interlocking global technological, financial, and political grids that mark the contemporary world—the essays in this book do point to their impact on Buddhist missions. The Compassion Relief Foundation has chosen highly sophisticated technological media, namely, Western-type medical hospitals, worldwide emergency disaster relief, an international bone-marrow registry, and a television station to spearhead its outreach (Huang). American foreign aid in Nepal has changed the opportunities for local youth so that young men study engineering and economics rather than enter monastic life (LeVine); and there are the political dimensions of Tibetan Buddhist missionary activities (Tuttle).
The interaction between conflicting pressures for cultural survival and efforts at conversion of outsiders is explored in a number of chapters and is particularly important for understanding diaspora missions. At one end of the spectrum are the Japanese-American followers of the True Pure Land School of Buddhism (Jodo Shinshu Nishi Honpa Honganji) in Hawai'i. Tanabe argues that, while declining steadily in numbers, they have been remarkably successful in maintaining unchanged their core religious principle of “family, or ancestral, religion,” brought from Japan, even as they embraced many formal aspects of Protestant religiosity. He also points to a recurring, though not universal, idea among Japanese Buddhists, namely, that one cannot really understand Buddhism without also being Japanese. This is not the same as asserting a Buddhist identity for a particular ethnic group—for instance, to be Sinhala is to be Buddhist—or the same as a difficult relationship between Buddhists of different cultures who share a temple (see Rocha), for it asserts that authentic Buddhism cannot be truly learned by foreigners. Thus, some Japanese immigrant churches find it hard to embrace foreign devotees (see Tanabe, Payne, and Rocha).

An example of a Japanese immigrant church that emphatically does not share this ethnocentric view is Soka Gakkai in Brazil (see Clarke). In this case the leadership in Japan, President Ikeda, set the course for the organization when he targeted Brazil to be the vanguard for the spiritual transformation of the world. Like the Theravada, Zen, and Tibetan missionaries who sought to spread Buddhism beyond their own ethnic groups, Soka Gakkai in Brazil has been quite successful at attracting nonimmigrant devotees.

Focusing on cultural presuppositions of Americans that have helped to shape conversion patterns, Richard Payne explores the invisibility in the United States of a Japanese Buddhist tantric tradition, Shingon, despite a contemporaneous avid interest among some westerners in Tibetan Buddhist tantra and Zen. As immigrant churches that assimilated Protestant forms, they have not been attractive to westerners who seek something altogether different from their known worlds. His observations may also be relevant to the relative lack of success in reaching beyond their ethnic communities of the two Chinese organizations discussed in this book: both Buddha’s Light Mountain and the Compassion Relief Foundation use charitable work and the concomitant pressure for fundraising and proselytizing as their primary means of self-cultivation. Apart from the appeal of Chinese culture to some foreigners (Chandler), these churches’ practices are perhaps just too similar to Western day-to-day experience and mainstream American church organizations to be attractive to those who are disaffected with Western religious alternatives.
Class and caste differences need to be reckoned into the analysis of domestic, diaspora, and foreign missions. As Rocha ably points out for Zen Buddhists in Brazil, and LeVine for Newar Buddhists in Nepal, these divides are no less distinct than commonly understood “cultural” ones.

Methods used for reaching beyond ethnic and class barriers for conversions described in this volume include the translation and publication of scriptures, commentaries, and practice manuals into the vernacular (and more and more into English as the internationally accessible language), the preparation of clergy explicitly for missionary work and training them in local languages (again, often English), and the use of the latest technological advances in communications.

Other propagation methods for conversions include building magnificent temples to pique the interest of non-Buddhists (Chandler); establishing personal ties, “links of affinity,” which are given important religious significance in Chinese missionary efforts (Chandler and Huang); and the Tibetan use of ritual empowerments, which have been quite successful in attracting devotees in war-torn Republican China and in the modern West (Tuttle). None of these strategies are different from ones used by Buddhists for their own ethnic groups.

The Brazilian missionary to the Sōtō Zen temple in São Paulo described by Rocha, as well as the Theravadin monks described by Kemper, however, have adopted a dual strategy, tailoring their teaching to the respective interests of their diaspora and foreign congregations. As mentioned above, they also both point out that conversion, in the sense of formal affiliation, is not emphasized. While downplaying formal affiliation in some Buddhist missionary circles can have a variety of motivations, it may also draw on Buddhist gradualist models, in which adherents are given only so much teaching as they appear willing to accept, and injunctions against craving, which can be applied just as much to craving converts as it can to sensual desires, intellectual knowledge, or spiritual success.

Similarly, Peter Clarke found in Brazilian Soka Gakkai a “strategy of reflexive syncretism,” born of confidence in the power of their own religion, that replaced shakabuku, a strongly exclusive, sectarian approach to conversion. In placing his study in the larger context of plural societies and globalization, he suggests that their further shift toward nonsectarianism—their acceptance of multiple church memberships and the idea that individuals can decide for themselves what is best for them—is a response to a trend in which people seek a religious consciousness beyond any specific religious identity. This latter trend toward “nonsectarian universalism” (my term) contrasts with the “sectarian triumphalism” that has characterized much of the thinking of the True Pure Land Church in Hawai‘i described by Tanabe. By “sectarian triumphalism” Tanabe means the belief and practice that
only one’s own tradition transcends all ethnic and sectarian claims (Tanabe). Earlier in the century, this kind of thinking was used to enlist Buddhist missionaries to further Japanese nationalism and colonialism (Tanabe).

None of the above approaches stands against another trend noted by Chandler, namely, that religious identities are not only reaching across national boundaries, but perhaps in some cases even superseding patriotic sentiment. All of these observations dovetail with Rocha’s point that, under the pluralistic conditions of our contemporary world, people are presented with more and more choices, including religious choices, from which they need to construct their own individual identities.

CONCLUSIONS

The chapters in this volume are roughly arranged in the historical order of when a particular Buddhist tradition began to send missions beyond Asia, although many of the essays analyze domestic revivals and diaspora conditions that stimulated an outreach to foreigners in the first place. This ordering is not to ignore the importance of East–East connections, which form an appreciable part of over half of the chapters, some notable examples being the extension of Chinese Mahayana bhikkhuni ordination to Theravada nuns, the influence of Sri Lankan Theravada on Buddhism in Nepal and Vietnam, and the financial support offered by Japanese Buddhists to Sri Lanka and elsewhere. All of the essays bring the reader up to the late twentieth century.

What also stands out in the essays is the observation that a globalizing, evangelical Christianity stimulated and/or gave shape to much of what we see as a globalizing Buddhism, including Theravada, Japanese, and Chinese organizations. This should not be taken to mean, however, that Buddhists have not drawn on their own traditions of “missionary spirit” or methods. What is more, the rationalization of organizational life and the sense that the whole world is much more tangibly within one’s reach, which characterize modernity and of which the Christian missions have been a highly visible example, are probably two of the more lasting recent changes to Buddhist institutions.

Charity, nonreligious education, and other public works are not new to Buddhists; but instead of what has been a more ad hoc and even anonymous approach in some traditions (as Huang points out in Chapter 8), the search for worthy charitable causes and the mobilization for these services on the scale that we see today may be new, especially for Buddhist sects working without the backing of a state. This reflects not only the modern push toward rationalization, but also a shift
in thinking to embrace social welfare as an essential component of Buddhist organizational life. The recent salience of social activism also has had Christian and Western stimuli; but given the historical evidence for social service by Buddhists, I suspect that a large measure of this recent thrust comes from the gains in health and human welfare made possible by science and technology, the need for a modern education generated by current economic organization, and favorable political conditions for Buddhist organizations, rather than from the awakening of a new social conscience. In addition, an emphasis on social ethics has not replaced the ultimate, and ultimately legitimating, goal of supramundane insight and compassion, although the latter may become submerged in the exigencies of day-to-day practice or even be lost on some devotees.

Involuntary exile has placed Tibetan missionaries in a very different position from their counterparts in other Buddhist traditions. Without the safety net afforded by immigrant congregations, they have been forced to make a success of the cross-cultural transmission of their teachings quickly. This, together with the esoteric nature of their teachings, may help to explain their success among westerners, in contrast to the ethnic limitations encountered by even such charismatic figures as the Taiwanese Master Zhengyan. What is more, the timing of the exile in relation to the crisis of faith of some American and European youth beginning in the late 1950s and gaining momentum in the 1960s perhaps has been an important factor (see Payne and Tuttle).

Last, the separation of politics from mission work is by no means the norm in the Buddhist world (see Kemper, Tanabe, and Chandler), but the theocratic tradition of the Geluk school (and other Tibetan Buddhist schools), which shapes much of the current political agenda of the Dalai Lama, sets it off from the other forms of Buddhism described in this book (see Tuttle).

If understanding the Buddhist impact on cultures outside of its historical milieus in the last 150 years is still in its infancy, the indigenization of Buddhism has been found to be deeply significant and ongoing. Its responses to Christianity and other agents of modernity are examples of this process. Indeed, Peter Gregory has suggested that the changes to Buddhist institutions and doctrines that began during the colonial period are likely to be as significant, in the long run, as the emergence of the Mahayana and the Vajrayana traditions in centuries past. The essays in this book attest to this process of cross-fertilization, yet they show very significant continuities as well.

Last, noting the three kinds of missionary work—namely, domestic revivals, support for diaspora communities, and foreign conversions—helps to explain variable Buddhist attitudes toward conversion and the trajectories of specific missions.
It will also assist in comparisons of Buddhists with other religious people and organizations involved in missionary work.
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