

美國佛教裡的境遇：

## 開啟亞洲與西方佛教徒之間的對話（續）

*Recalling the Encountering the Other in American Buddhism:*

**CREATING DIALOGUE BETWEEN**

**ASIAN AND WESTERN BUDDHISTS** (continued)

揚帆文·凌峰 中譯

Written by Yang Fan, Chinese Translation by Ling Feng



BODHI FIELD | 菩提田

While the future of American Buddhism is unknown, we might say that historically and currently there are at least two “Buddhisms” in America. From a surface-level perspective, the cultural factors and differences between Asian immigrant Buddhists and Western Buddhists are considerable. For Asian immigrants, their religious communities often serve as a social and cultural touchstone, in addition to being a place for spiritual practice. Western Buddhists are often drawn to Buddhism due to their interest in meditation, psychotherapy, and the sense of Buddhism being non-dogmatic and an alternative to Judeo-Christian religions. There is not very much overlap between these two groups, at least on this level. Both groups may be satisfied with the idea that what they have is the more genuine form of Buddhism.

Based on personal observation, however, committed and serious practitioners of both groups, regardless of culture, treat Buddhism as a teaching for profound spiritual transformation and a path to becoming fully awakened. In that case, for there to not be dialogue is the loss of valuable opportunities for mutual learning and sharing of experience.

Much of these observations is drawn from my experience growing up in a Buddhist monastic community that has dealt with a lot of cultural and ethnic change, and which continues to negotiate these cultural boundaries and differences. While the rigor of the schedule and strict moral guidelines as well as the functions of the monastery

雖然美國佛教的未來是未知的，但從歷史和現狀看來，或許可以說美國至少有兩個「佛教」。從表面上來說，亞洲移民佛教徒和西方佛教徒兩者間，文化因素與差異是不容忽視的。對於亞洲移民而言，宗教團體除了具備精神層面的功能，同時也扮演社會和文化的試金石。然對西方佛教徒而言，學習佛法往往是出於對打坐、心理治療的興趣，以及覺得佛教有別於猶太教和基督教，不那麼強調唯神論。因此兩者至少在此一層面，沒有太多的交集，同時也自認所依循的是比較正統的佛教。

基於我個人的觀察，無論文化背景如何，在兩個群體裡都有堅定認真的修行者，他們將佛法視為深度轉化自我，通向覺悟的教導。在這種情況下，彼此若缺乏對話交流等於喪失了相互學習的寶貴機會。

前述的許多觀點，是來自於我在聖城成長的經驗。多年來，這個團體歷經明顯的文化和成員變遷，彼此差異的磨合也持續不斷進行。儘管緊湊的作息、嚴謹的家風以及團體的功能（教育、翻譯、社區服務）沒有太大的改變，但族群結構卻有極大的轉變。雖然上人當年應中國弟子之邀來



70年代，深受當時嬉皮文化影響，許多徘徊在虛幻與真實之間的美國青年，紛紛來到上人座下學習佛法；並在上人觀機逗教之下，體驗各種不同修行法門。圖為1975年，於奧立岡州佛根地舉行的戶外念佛法會。

In the 1970s, influenced by the Hippie Subculture, many American young people lingering between confusion and clarity came to the Venerable Master Hua and studied Buddhadharma. With Master's expedient methods, they explored many different kinds of Buddhist practices. This picture was taken in 1975 during an outdoor Buddha Recitation at Buddha Root Farm, Oregon.

(education, translation, community work) have not changed much, the ethnic makeup has, drastically. Master Hua, the founder of the City of Ten Thousand Buddhas and Dharma Realm Buddhist Association, came to San Francisco at the invitation of Chinese disciples, but after arriving he also attracted a number of American disciples, many of whom became monastics. “By 1971, more than two-thirds of [Hsuan Hua's] disciples were Caucasians... In 1972 at the Gold Mountain Monastery there were ten fully ordained monks and nuns—all but one of them Caucasian.”

There was yet another cultural and ethnic change after that, however. “The Dharma Realm Buddhist Association has not yet turned away from immigrants to become an American Buddhist group. In fact, after changing from a mostly Euro-American group in the 1970s, it has changed back to a predominantly Chinese group in the 1990s.” This has led to what Stuart Chandler notes as an ironic situation in which Euro-American monks and nuns provide instruction in Buddhism for the Chinese American laity.

From personal and more recent experience, the situation is less clearly marked than that – there are a large number of monks and nuns from other parts of Asia, and though there are large numbers of the Chinese diaspora (immigrants from Taiwan, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Mainland China, etc.) and a growing number of Vietnamese American Buddhists, there is also an active minority of Western Buddhists. Further, many of the longtime Western disciples, both monastic and lay, have remained in the community. What this meant for me growing up was that it was a culturally and ethnically mixed environment with an Asian majority, while also hearing stories about the monastery when it was primarily populated by Western Buddhists.

When I look at my own spiritual practice and values, which have been profoundly informed by my background and models for practice at the City of Ten Thousand Buddhas, I can see how I have been influenced by Western as well as Asian approaches. In the Asian

到美國，但之後接引的卻是更多的西方人，許多甚至跟隨他出家修行。Emma McCloy Layman在所著之《佛教在美國》中描述：「1971年宣化上人的弟子中，超過三分之二是白種人……。1972年，金山寺裡十位受具足戒的比丘和比丘尼，只有一位不是白人。」

然而，團體內的族群結構與主流文化正逐漸改變。Stuart Chandler的〈在美國的中國佛教〉文中提到：「作為一個美國的佛教團體，法界佛教總會尚未脫離（亞洲）移民族群。事實上，在70年代總會成員大多是白種人；90年代，又變回一個以中國人為主的佛教團體。」正如 Stuart Chandler的描述，就出現美籍出家人指導中國人學佛的有趣現象。

但根據個人的觀察以及最近的經驗來看，情況並不像上述所說充斥著大量的亞洲出家人。聖城裡雖然有許多來自亞洲各處（台灣、香港、馬來西亞、中國等）的移民，以及越來越多的越南裔美籍佛教徒，但仍有少數非常積極投入的西方佛教徒。此外許多早期跟隨上人的西方出家和在家人弟子，現在仍然繼續在聖城裡幫忙。因此雖然在一個以亞洲人居多的多元種族文化下成長，我同時也能聽得許多當年西方人居多的那個時代的故事。

我的精神生活與價值觀，極大部分是來自從小在聖城的成長背景，以及聖城所遵循的修行方式，並深受東西方兩者的影響。在亞洲佛教徒的身上，我看到犧牲奉獻、嚴謹持律，以及強烈的凝聚力；而西方的佛教徒，往往（似乎說更主要）是強調打坐、個人成長以及社會參與。兩者

immigrant community I see devotion, strict moral discipline and commitment, and a strong sense of community; and in the Western Buddhists in my community (and this seems to be a larger tendency) there is often a greater emphasis on meditation, personal growth, and social engagement. The great unifying quality that they share is an emphasis on personal transformation, and their different approaches may not be mutually exclusive at all. For me, they have in fact been mutually enriching and beneficial.

Having both approaches provides me with a rooted and rich tradition that is relevant to my contemporary needs and perspective. I am thus situated in a larger world where I have the company of peers with whom I can relate on cultural, social, and personal levels, but which stretches out in time and space so that I am also able to tap into the wisdom of preceding generations of skillful Buddhist practitioners across the span of many countries and cultures.

However, these two groups have been largely isolated from each other and, it seems, self-isolating. This self-isolation may not be intentional so much as the natural result of the divisions covered earlier, which make dialogue difficult. One might say that if this kind of division is natural and does not impede either group meeting their needs, then it is not a real problem and therefore does not especially require a solution. Rather than seeing it as fractured, the American Buddhism that is being formed might be more positively seen as being pluralistic and diverse.

It seems to me, however, that this lack of dialogue between the two groups does not pose a problem so much as it represents a number of missed opportunities for mutual learning and sharing. Beyond learning about those who are very different from us, dialogue is also about stretching ourselves and growing, and the more difficult the dialogue the more it offers a valuable chance to better understand ourselves and our blind spots. In fact, the practice of difficult and uncomfortable dialogue may be itself a beneficial practice for spiritual growth.

It is neither realistic nor necessary for Western Buddhists to become like Asian Buddhists, nor for Asian Buddhists to become like Western Buddhists, as their needs as shaped by culture and background can be very different. However, that does not mean that there cannot be mutual learning, and the learning in fact may be enriched by the differences that are there. Martin Verhoeven writes of the process of the “Americanizing” of Buddhism,

*Buddhism will no doubt continue to be assimilated through our basic ‘sense-making’ categories: Christianity, science, and liberal-modernism. Such assimilation is inevitable and in some ways healthy... [however, Buddhism] offers fundamental challenges to our prevailing worldview, especially in the areas of humanity’s basic relationships: (1) humans with Nature, (2) individual with individual, and (3) a person with him or herself – that is, the natural, social, and psychological*

的共同優點就是重視內在自我的改變與轉化，雖然過程採用的方式不同，但卻不相互排斥。我認為，大家是相互切磋和彼此利益的。

同時與兩種文化生活相處的經驗，使我的精神信仰擁有豐富紮實的傳統基礎，又可以符合現代的需求與理解。相較於其他人的宗教歷程，我有比他們更寬廣的領域，因為有年齡、經驗、思想相仿的同儕團體，又接觸到多元的種族文化，從前述的東西方佛教徒身上擷取他們的經驗與智慧。

然而，這兩個團體很大程度上是彼此孤立的——而且看起來是自我孤立的。這種自我孤立可能不完全是故意的，而是前面提到潛在分歧的自然結果，所以要建立之間的對話顯得頗為困難。有人可能會說，既然這種分歧是自然的，也不妨礙任一團體滿足他們各別的需求，那就不算是個真正的問題，所以也不需要刻意地去尋求解決；與其說是分裂，應該樂觀地說美國佛教是朝向多元化與多樣化發展。

然而在我看來，兩個團體之間不溝通交流，雖然不會構成什麼大問題，但卻意味著錯過許多相互學習和分享的機會。對話除了能跟與我們非常不同的人學習之外，也是一種自我的成長與延伸。對話可行性越困難，就越能提供一個寶貴的機會，幫助我們認識自我以及根深的盲點。事實上，接受不願意面對的溝通，本身就是一種修行。

讓西方佛教徒像亞洲佛教徒一樣，或者要讓亞洲佛教徒像西方佛教徒一樣，這種想法是既不實際，也沒必要的，因為彼此的文化背景和需求是非常不同的。然而，這並不意味彼此無法互相學習；相反的，可能還會因為這些差異讓學習變得更充實。Martin Verhoeven 博士曾這樣描述佛教「美國化」的過程：

在美國，佛教無疑地將被幾個基本的「合理概念」所同化：基督教精神、科學、自由的現代主義。這種同化是不可避免的，從某種角度看也是健康的……[然而，佛教]也對現行的世界觀提出了根本性的挑戰，特別是在人類的基本關係：(1) 個人與自然 (2) 個人與群體 (3) 個人與自我，也就是個人與自然、

*dimensions of existence. The Buddhist perspective could initiate a provocative dialogue leading to a reexamination of some of the most entrenched paradigms governing our culture.*

Though the topic he addresses here is the process of Buddhism entering and adapting to American society and not the dynamics between Asian Buddhist and Western Buddhist populations, it does provide a model for dialogue as a form of reexamining the self and challenging one's established worldviews. One of the implications of this is that when very different parties come into dialogue they are offered a rare opportunity for profound inner transformation. Though the first instinct may be to make sense of it, a large part of the value in dialoguing with a drastically different other comes from having to recognize and being unsettled by that otherness.

In an article about the socio-cultural nature of knowledge construction, Gregory Kelly and Judith Green, both Education professors, build on the late British philosopher Stephen Toulmin's theory that conceptual change in intellectual traditions is an evolutionary process. More specifically, they argue that conceptual change is a group process. Though their topic is scientific knowledge, we can see how it applies to other intellectual traditions, including religion.

*Construction of scientific knowledge... is a dynamic group process that shapes what counts as "science." Thus, a conceptual ecology is constructed by members of a group. This ecology, in turn, through the actions of members, creates pressures and niches that allow some ideas to be accepted, becoming scientific knowledge, and others to be ignored. Following this argument, concept development and conceptual change can be characterized as interrelated and interactive processes at a group level, not merely individual constructions.*

Seeing knowledge construction and conceptual change as a group process lends an even greater urgency to developing lines of dialogue between the culturally divided groups of Asian and Western Buddhists in American Buddhism. An intellectual/religious tradition is developed through the interrelation and interaction among different members of the group. It seems that the gap between Asian immigrant Buddhists and Western Buddhists provides us with an opportunity to learn from each other and to be in relationship with each other, so that there might be growth and benefit from this collective wisdom. To miss out on these opportunities for learning because of negligence or discomfort would be a great loss – not just to those involved but also to the evolution of an inclusive and fully representative American Buddhism. ❀

社會和心理三方面的關係。佛教思想可以引發挑戰性的對話，讓我們重新審視美國文化裡邊一些根深柢固的觀念模式。

以上陳述，雖然主要討論佛教傳入以及適應美國社會的過程，非指亞洲佛教徒和西方佛教徒之間的互動，但它確實提出了一個以對話形式檢視自我和挑戰現存價值觀的先例。

對話帶給彼此的影響之一，就是提供參與者一個深度內在轉變的難得機會。雖然可能先是心態上要能接受這樣的對話形式，然而真正最大的價值是，與觀念截然不同的人進行對話，促使我們意識到差異的存在以及其所帶來的不穩定性。

教育學教授 Gregory Kelly 和 Judith Green，在一篇關於知識建構的人文本質文章中，進一步詮釋已故英國哲學家 Stephen Toulmin 的理論——知識傳統的觀念轉變是一種進化過程。更具體地說，他們認為這是一個群體的過程。雖然他們的研究主題是關於學術性的知識，但我們也可以看到同樣的理論，如何適用於包括宗教在內的其他理性傳統。

學術知識的建構……是一個動態的群體過程，從而形成所謂的「學問」。一個概念的生態圈，乃由群體內的成員所構成；然當生態圈形成之後，又相對地通過各成員的行動，在群體內形成一種壓力和條件，允許某些想法被接受或者不接受，由此建構系統性的知識。按照這種說法，概念的發展和觀念的轉變，可以定位為群體層面的相互關聯和互動過程，而不僅僅是個體構造的產物。

瞭解了知識建構和觀念轉變乃是一種群體的過程之後，更凸顯出美國佛教發展歷程中，由於文化而分裂的亞洲和西方佛教徒兩個團體，必須推動對話的迫切需要。因為理性和宗教性的思想傳統，必須通過團體內不同成員的關聯互動，才能發展建立起來。由此看來，亞洲移民佛教徒及西方佛教徒之間的差異，反而提供一個機會能互相學習，建立彼此的和諧關係；集思廣益而得的智慧，將使團體獲得成長與利益。因此若是因為疏忽或是不習慣，而錯過這些學習機會，將會是一個巨大的損失——不僅僅是個人層次的損失，而且是違悖兼容並蓄、多元化的美國佛教之發展。❀