

CHAPTER 3

THE DISCOURSE STRATEGY OF BUDDHISM

:Language Games, Rules and Texts

In this chapter, we are going to describe Buddhism as a movement with using language games as its model.

Two points are worthy of note with regard to the argument concerning the language game. One is the way in which it refers to the enlightenment, which has something in common with the language game reporting private sensations. The other is the way in which the Buddhist priests follow the rules of Samga, which will be well understood in the light of Wittgenstein's speculation on rule following. As a result, we will have a clear-cut image of Buddhism as a movement which forms a specific complex of both discourses and physical disciplines.

3.1 Discourse Strategy as Σ Discourse Techniques

3.2 Buddhism as a language game

We start our investigation with picking up arbitrarily a couple of interesting phenomena found in Buddhism.

(1) The characteristic discourse ethics that cover Buddhism. It demonstrates with false utterances in any form of discourse, not limited to some specific form such as oaths or witnesses in a law court. Refraining from telling a lie is a moral for almost every society. However, it is rare for not telling a lie to be counted among one of religious practices.

(2) The characteristic personal structure in the holy scriptures.

All of them start with the same phrase "Thus I heard that ...". They should be the collection of the discourse of Buddha, but they are hearsay. Buddha is responsible for none of them as an author.

(3) The characteristic way of forming faction sects. The fundamental split between Joza-bu (the Presbyterian sect) and Daishu-bu (the mass sect) is followed by branch splits and many successive splits. In any of these cases there occurred no opposition between the orthodox and the heresy. There is a kind of freedom of thought among Buddhism, and its organizing principles cannot regulate the thought of Buddhist priests.

(4) The Buddhism as a movement necessarily becomes weakened and transfigured through time. Many religions, including Buddhism, have developed their doctrine in a long time. But in the case of Buddhism, Gotama Buddha himself knew that it would become weakened and extinguished in the future, which was actually happened afterwards. It seems to have some reason.

Is it possible for us to put all the characteristic features of Buddhism, including above four, in order and understand them from a consistent point of view? It is possible, I believe, if we follow the idea of the language game. Then we can describe Buddhism as a movement with mixing up the internal and external point of views, instead of standing solely in the position of Buddhist belief.

3.3 The Discourse Strategy of Buddhism (1): Buddhist Text

There are a huge number of holy sculptures in Buddhism. We cannot analogize their reason d'être and functions to the case of Christianity, nor estimate the value of texts from the Western tradition, though we are apt to do so unawaredly.

The holy sculptures of Buddhism are classified usually into three categories: Kyo-zo (sutra), Ritsu-zo (vinaya) and Ron-zo (agama). Ritsu or vinaya regulates the rules of the community (samgha) of Buddhist priests (described later). Ron or agama is the writings of individual priests which refer to the texts of other two categories (sutra and vinaya). Therefore, we should consider the style and structure of the first category, i.e., Kyo-zo

(sutra). The orthodox doctrines of Buddhism should be expressed in any one of them.

By the way, the conditions to be a Buddhist are Three Respects and Five commandments. Three Respects mean a confession of respect to the Three Treasures: Buddha, dharma (the law) and samgha (the community of the priests). Five Commandments mean observing five regulations to ordinary people (non-priests): Don't Kill, Don't Steal, Don't Commit Adultery, Don't Tell A Lie and Don't Drink Alcohol. Buddha (a person with enlightenment), dharma (the truth of this world) and samgha are not identical with each other (Three Treasures, Three Entity). If you don't confess your respect to the Three Treasures as a whole, then it cannot set forward Buddhism as a movement.

Samgha is a kind of guild formulated by many Biku (male priests) or Buddhist exercisers. They follow the rules legislated by Gotama Buddha which are recorded in Ritsu-zo (vinaya), form a harmonious community, and lead a collective life outside the secular society. The purpose of their ascetic exercise is to acquire the enlightenment that Gotama Buddha did. Therefore, they follow the given regulations (250 rules for Biku, and 348 rules for Bikuni or priestess). It is samgha that inherits the holy scriptures by oral tradition. Samgha is a core for the movement of Buddhism.

These facts mentioned above, well known as common sense, are the assumptions for our investigation. Now we can start our consideration.

What kind of situation will you face to when you are engaged in the movement of Buddhism? We can make a very simple model for it. Namely, we can assume that Buddhism to be a kind of language game concerning enlightenment.

(1) Game of inquiring of enlightenment each other

Bikus (Buddhist exercisers) eagerly pursue enlightenment. One thing which is absolutely clear to them is that they have not attained enlightenment yet. Otherwise, they do not need to continue exercise. It seems extremely hard to attain enlightenment. Still, it is not completely impossible for them to attain enlightenment. Otherwise, it would be meaningless for them to continue exercise at all. In this way, they are apt to be interested in other ascetic exercisers who might have attained enlightenment.

Thus, the situation which the exercisers fall into is something like what to be called "a game of inquiring to enlightenment each other". Moreover, this game is somewhat similar to the language game of reporting private sensation or experience. We can learn much from the argument of Wittgenstein concerning toothache or so.

Enlightenment will come to each ascetic exerciser independently. There is no distributing it to or sharing it with others. This is the same as a toothache which is solely mine. Enlightenment is a kind of private inner experience (mental state). Exercisers believe in the existence of such enlightenment, and keep inquiring of it each other.

The throughgoing investigations of Wittgenstein tells us that such kind of language game generally leads to undetermination. First, if there is a person who declares that he attained enlightenment, it is impossible for other people to determine whether or not he really attained it. There might be the case in which someone didn't attain enlightenment and says he did, and on the contrary, there might also be the case in which someone attained enlightenment and doesn't declare that he did. There is no criteria for judging whether or not someone has attained enlightenment from outside.

Moreover, assuming that we could know that both some person and another person attained enlightenment, there is no knowing if the enlightenments attained by these two people are the same.

The largest difficulty in Buddhism is the fact that no one (except true Buddha) can observe and know the contents of enlightenment. We can assume that all problems about Buddhism come out from here.

The line of argument above seems like a proof of impossibility of the game inquiring after enlightenment each other. In fact, some people take Wittgenstein's investigations on language game only in a negative way. However, what he says is simply that if there is something like a game inquiring of enlightenment each other, it cannot be pursued upon any doubt-proof ground. This game was started not because there surely existed enlightenment. Instead, it would be better for us to understand it inversely, that is, once a game of inquiring of enlightenment each other is set forth, then enlightenment comes to "exist" in it. Strictly speaking, it remains still undecided if there exists enlightenment at all, and who is the person that attained enlightenment *.

These are only "believed" notwithstanding a great amount of undetermined discourses of people inquiring of enlightenment. In this way, enlightenment is regarded as the truth beyond discourse.

* N.B. In some cases, although, there be possibly a procedure of deciding that someone did not attain enlightenment. Great lie (a lie of declaring that one did attain enlightenment to the public though one did not actually) is counted among one of the Seven Serious Crimes. It seems quite difficult to judge that someone is telling a lie when he says that he attained enlightenment. In the text of Ritsu-zo (Haradai Mokusha or Commandments for the Buddhist Priests) the necessary and sufficient components of this crime are described as follows: more than the fact that someone declared that he did attain enlightenment to the public, also the fact that he confessed afterwards that he did tell a lie, he said that he saw without seeing and that he knew without knowing. If these two utterances contradict each other, we can easily conclude that one of them should be false. In any case, we can safely judge that he did not attain enlightenment. This is a very skillful criterion for judging. But, at the same time, we should be conscious about that in the case in which this criterion doesn't work, that is, someone doesn't confess that he told a lie and insists on his having attained enlightenment, there is no way for judging him.

By the way, these discourses inquiring of enlightenment, if they are let floating around without any determination, will be dissolved into the sea of other discourses. In order to give the game of inquiring of enlightenment a form of an established movement, it is necessary to cancel out the ambiguities surrounding the game. Namely, it is necessary to bring in a certainty about who is the one that did attain enlightenment and to put discourses concerning enlightenment in order.

(2) Game of enlightenment with Buddha as its sample

Sample, or Muster(G), is a device in order to give a certainty to the use of language in a game. A sample is an object matter which serves as a criterion for the use of language. See Wittgenstein's argument of the defini-

tion of a color by a color sample, or "the metric system of language" in 1.5 of Chapter 1.

If we add one more assumption that Gotama Buddha did attain enlightenment to the original game stated in the previous pages, then we will have a game more close to Buddhism so far as we know. If we assume Buddha's enlightenment, then (1) the existence of enlightenment is ensured, and (2) the relation between enlightenment and discourse become clearer.

The position of Buddha in Buddhism is, first of all, a sample in this sense*. Buddha is an ascetic exerciser, same as many other exercisers, and there is no doubt about his existence. Exercisers (or Biku) can establish an equal relationship with one another by setting Buddha as a criterion. Thus samgha, the community of Buddhist priests with Buddha at its criterion, was generated. Buddhism as a movement promoted when samgha started to acquire new priests one after another as its members.

* N.B. This was, I suppose, what really meant by Max Weber when he called Buddha as an "exemplarische Prophetie".

As mentioned before, Three Respects are essential to Buddhism as a movement. Here I define a movement as a form of life (Lebensform) or language game which spreads over people inter-corporally. Three Respects is a declaration of belonging to "the game of enlightenment with Buddha as its sample", and at the same time a procedure of joining samgha (a group of people who already belong to the game).

Through Three Respects, a person expresses three beliefs, that is, (1) a total belief in the fact that Gotama Buddha did attain enlightenment and in His personlity, (2) a total belief that the content of His enlightenment is the wonderful truth of the universe and that he also can reach His stage, and (3) a total belief that samgha is a pure community of ascetic exercisers and that it holds the doctrine of Buddha. Three Respects are ineffective if it is maintained in his mind secretly (or privately). Only after expressed in the form of observable utterance (or speech act) to other priests, they become valid.

Here, a new antinomy arises among the followers of Buddha as fol-

lows: on the one hand, the enlightenment of Gotama Buddha should be extremely wonderful, high above others, therefore it should be extremely difficult. On the other hand, however, the enlightenment of Gotama Buddha should serve as an example to them. If His enlightenment has nothing to do with them, the ascetic exercises in samgha can not be authorized. This antinomy can be mitigated only by describing enlightenment as a process of long and gradual transition *. Thus, the process to enlightenment is supposed to be, combined with the Indian one-by-one enumerationism, of almost infinite steps.

* N.B. The antinomy is also observed in the declining of Arhat's position against Buddha in samgha as a tendency. Arhats, who attained Nirvana in samgha as a disciple of Buddha, could be regarded as equally supreme as Buddha in the game of inquiring of enlightenment each other, but later demoted inevitably into secondary or tertiary positions in the game of enlightenment with Buddha as its sample.

In this way, Buddha as a sample is located at a far remote place from the exercisers in samgha, especially after His death. And as its reaction, samgha of the exercisers with Buddha as a sample can have a clear organizing principle. The legislator of their rules is believed to be Buddha because samgha was organized with Buddha as its criterion.

(3) Game of maintaining the discourse of Buddha

How are Buddha as a sample and Biku (the exercisers in samgha) related through discourse? We concentrate on this question here. The rules of samgha will be discussed in the next section.

The discourse of enlightenment now comes from Buddha.

After Buddha being a sample of enlightenment, the definition of enlightenment was rewritten as follows: enlightenment is the state in which Buddha used to be. Enlightenment of other exercisers don't attract any attention because they are uncertain. The discourse of their enlightenment will be excluded from samgha, and solely that of Buddha is maintained as most precious.

Buddha was a real member of samgha whom, as a sample, other members could see, hear and touch. But before long, Buddha was dead, and no more pre-

sent. After the death of Buddha, there is no other means than His discourse left in samgha in order to know Him.

Therefore, samgha maintains His discourse instead of Himself as a sample, and tries to continue the original game of enlightenment. The endless succession of samgha and its huge number of exercisers following Buddha, as a whole, "points" to His supreme enlightenment (Buddha's Being in Samgha).

If we observe the game of maintaining the discourse of Buddha thus started from the external point of view, then it simply seems that samgha maintains the discourse of Buddha. But if we observe it from the internal point of view, then it inversely seems that all what samgha maintains are the discourse of Buddha. This is why various folktales and legends stuck to the discourse of Buddha and mixed themselves into the holy scriptures (sutra).

Someone might think here that I am trying to separate the true discourse of Buddha from the whole Buddhist scriptures (or eliminate folktales, legends and apocryphal texts). Such separation is possible from the Buddhism studies approach. Still it is not such point of view that supports Buddhism as a movement. The holy scriptures which the members of samgha maintain are nothing more than the real discourse of Buddha for them, since this discourse is the transformed Buddha as a sample. We can imagine a strict metric system in which there is no expansion of the original scale, instead in such a case it is interpreted that the universe has contracted proportionately. Likewise, Biku, who are in the line of inheritance of the discourse of Buddha, has no ground for doubting its authenticity.

All these circumstances, however, do not mean that the holy scriptures were identified as the doubt-proof discourse of enlightenment, because there is no positive proof for these scriptures to be the real discourse of Buddha describing enlightenment. The Buddhist scriptures are, in this sense, not positive. They are negative texts.

Next, we take the relation between enlightenment and the text (sutra) into consideration. In "the game of maintaining the discourse of Buddha", enlightenment comes first. Its position is indicated by Buddha as a sample. Then follows the discourse. This order cannot be inverse.

The discourse of Buddha assumes that He did attain enlightenment. Those who listen to it will learn it, still they cannot verify it. It is quite

probable that someone among the exercisers would speak in the same way as Buddha, and that there are completely similar discourses to that of Buddha from every aspect. The exercisers, not knowing what enlightenment is really like, cannot select the genuine one out of them. The discourse mentioning enlightenment is uncertain in the same way with the game of inquiring of enlightenment.

The discourse of Buddha is believed to be based on enlightenment. However, it is not because its proof is found in the discourse, but only because it is Buddha's (that is, a sample's) discourse. Therefore, His enlightenment itself is certainly more valuable than His discourse. As a result, His enlightenment, once spoken out and expressed into the discourse, devaluated. This devaluation accelerates in accordance with adding of articles, commentaries and notes to the discourse. Thus, the Buddhist texts lack the positiveness of restricting people without reservation.

The negativeness of the discourse of Buddhism will become clearer in contrast to the monotheism.

In the case of the monotheism, the uncertainty of the game is concentrated in the existence of God. The existence of God is an assumption of this game. Through performing the game, its assumption (God) came into "existence". All the discourse derives from God.

Contrarily, in the case of Buddhism, the uncertainty of the game is prevailing over everywhere of the discourse of enlightenment, instead of its outside (the negativeness of discourse). Buddhism, in order to sustain such negative discourse, should cooperate with physical discipline. It would be better to make a careful consideration on the allocation of the discourse and physical discipline in Buddhism.

As Gotama Buddha had attained enlightenment, there could be no objection against His preaching lessons to others. The members of sangha, who had expressed the respect and obedience to Him, all assume His having attained enlightenment. However, at the same time, Buddha also followed the rule of Don't Tell a Lie. For example, he didn't give any positive answer when invited to a dinner by a believer fearing that He might break His promise if the worst happened, instead He kept silence representing agreement. From the monotheist tradition, such negative use of language seems very strange.

Every sutra is a preach of Buddha, and it has a particular person structure of speech.

"Evam maya srutam (Thus I heard that)..." is the first phrase for every sutra. According to some scholars, this form was created by Anandah, a disciple of the best memory, when he spoke out what he remembered before the assembly of priests in the First Compilation of Holy Scriptures held just after Buddha's death. Other scholars say that it was introduced by Buddha in order not to be confused with the scriptures of heretical religions. In any case, the discourse is stated not by the responsibility of Buddha, but by the responsibility of His disciples. Of course there are a lot of quotation of His remarks, but the personal structure of sutra concentrates on the experience of hearing them.

The personal structure of Buddhist texts reflects the social structure of sangha (the community of Buddhist priests). What was Buddha's position in sangha while he was alive? He had a supreme status over other exercisers as a spiritual leader and guided them. Nevertheless, He remained one of equal members in sangha as their sample. Sangha was managed by the spirit of "agreement" by priests who have the same intention. Their rights and duties are strictly the same disregarding their stage of exercise, only slightly differentiated with their years of service. Each priest is concerned in his own enlightenment, not in Buddha's, after all. Therefore, the phrase "Thus I heard that ..." fits them.

Sutras beginning with the phrase "Thus I heard that ..." are transferred from mouth to mouth among disciples. "Surely, thus I heard that ..." is the actual experience of a priest hanging on the end of the line of oral tradition. Then he is involved in the movement when he tries to make his experience of exercise overlap with that of Buddha.

The discourse of Buddhism is not only negative, but also plastic. It can be transformed according to the reality of exercisers. This plasticity was often referred to as "Expedients".

3.4 The Discourse Strategy of Buddhism (2): Rules and Regulations

In this section, we are going to describe the exercise of Buddhist priests as a special case of rule-following. Here, Buddhist type of rule-following, other than monotheist type, will be considered in detail.

Following rules with sanction is meaningful in monotheistic religions. The order of a society was introduced by the commandments of God, and sanctions for violations of these commandments should also come from God. Obedience of subjects with the free will to absolute God is the starting point of the monotheistic tradition which formed the dogma of Western modernity.

In contrast, rules and sanctions are incompatible for Buddhists. Observing regulations for fear of being sanctioned is not a spontaneous rule-following. Furthermore, if we do not follow rules spontaneously, it cannot have any value as ascetic exercises. According to the doctrine of Buddhism, the order of the universe (or dharma) is already accomplished before the coming of Buddha as a sample. Dharma is a very complex order, but basically, it is based on the logic of causality. So long as enlightenment itself occurs too in this order, it needs corresponding causes. Good deeds forced by compulsion cannot be counted as causes which might lead to enlightenment. Secular society is organized with legal regulations with sanctions, therefore Buddhist exercisers were necessary to set up their own community outside it, where they became free from observing these regulations with sanctions. They tried to separate their rules, or their games, from ordinary peoples'.

Samgha tried to pursue the game of following rules without compulsion. The organizing principle of samgha, seemingly strange, is well understood from this point of view.

To begin with, we have to be careful about the "ideal" character of Buddhist samgha. It is, on the one hand, a group of priests living together in some particular area in a particular time. On the other hand, this term also indicates an abstract whole of all priests in the past, present and future, in any place. Dr. Hirakawa named them samgha present and samgha omnipresent respectively.

The ideal character of samgha derives from its being a kind of guild. A priest, after passing the entrance ritual at a samgha present, moves around through many samgha. The status of Biku (a priest) is valid at every

samgha present, because all samgha has been produced through segmentations of the initial samgha.

Next, what makes samgha as it is is a regulation of community which is believed to be legislated by Buddha. It controls the behavior of priests, and prescribes the procedures of an entrance ritual, of setting up a new samgha present, of organizing a meeting, and so on.

After the death of Gotama Buddha, there was no leader with authority. Samgha always makes a segmentation and increases in number. There is no coercive control over samgha and priests.

Recent studies show us that the religious precepts of samgha are twofold (consisting of sila and vinaya), though they are confused in the East Asian Buddhist tradition.

Sila, or rule, is personal, means that someone is following a rule by himself. Sila is observed as a spontaneous activity, which is the core of Buddhist exercises. When Gotama Buddha was an exerciser, there were many other exercisers following their own rules. Buddha brought an agreement among them, and His followers share one common set of rules.

In contrast, vinaya, or regulation, is an organizational prescription. It is a coercive regulation with sanction, nothing different from other secular regulations.

The religious precepts for Buddhists are reserved in Ritsu-zo which is composed of two parts: rules (Haradaimokusha) which each priest should follow personally, and regulations which are necessary for the collective life in samgha. As is easily noticed, both seem contradictory with each other. We will see how the crash of rules is avoided in the Buddhist movement.

(4) Game of following the rules of Buddha

Sila, or rule, is more essential to Buddhism as a movement than vinaya, or regulation. In order to understand this point, we can make a series of games again.

In the previous section, we considered how the discourse of Buddha had been maintained. The rules that Buddha had recommended to their disciples were naturally included in the discourse. Sila is a description of rules, most of which are negatively expressed. A game which starts by following the rules

maintained as the discourse can be called "the game of following the rules of Buddha". It is a personal game. Belonging to this game is the substance of Buddhist exercises.

Personal rule-following is difficult because rule violation is hard to manage. Rule violation itself is not harmful to rule-following. If there is no rule-following, then there would be no rule violation. Rule and rule violation are complimentary. Instead, what is dangerous is the case in which rule violation and absence of rule are undetermined. For example, can we call a man refraining from smoking if he lights a cigarette every hour, not to say every month?

Sila for Buddhist priests is prepared for this awkward situation as follows. It is written down rules which prescribe what kind of rules a priest is going to follow before he starts the game. Furthermore, sila should be given by another priest through a specific ritual. Thus, though rules are followed personally, it is observable and transparent before others if he is following rules or not. Still, if a priest only believes in his following a rule, it doesn't assure that he is really following it.

It is again an awkward situation. If nobody can ensure that who is following a rule and who is not, then the exercise of following Buddha's rule became invalid. The existence of samgha is also threatened.

If sanctions against rule violation could be adopted, then the story becomes simple. As H. L. A. Hart stated, if there is a secondary rule of adjudication (with picking up of rule violation and sanction), then the existence of the primary rule which it refers to is obvious. However, with the game of enlightenment in question, there cannot be any sanction, because personal (and spontaneous) rule following and sanction are incompatible.

Here, Buddhism adds a new rule and shifts to a definite game.

(5) Game of confessing rule violation

Individual exercisers following the same rules get together and constituted samgha with the spirit of harmony. Samgha adopts their rules as a part of its regulations. Rule violations are now a matter of the community.

Sila (rule) is now at the same time vinaya (regulation). In the case of checking if someone else is following a rule, then the rule is a regu-

lation to him. But to oneself, it remains to be a rule as long as one follows it. Each priest observes the regulations with the spirit of rule following.

Then, is there any good way which is neither letting everyone follow rule spontaneously nor depending on sanction?

Thus begins the game of confessing rule violations. It adds, besides those of the game of maintaining Buddha's rule, rules such as (1) the procedure of announcing of rule following to the others, (2) the procedure of self-reporting rule violation, (3) the procedure of restoration from rule violation. Those rules (1)-(3) might be regarded as the secondary rules in Hart's sense.

Twice a month, Samgha holds a regular meeting called Kamma where the regulations by Buddha are read aloud one article after another to the priests, and each of the defenders confesses the rule violations, as prescribed in Ritsuzo text. Attending this meeting is obligatory to the priests. This system is completely different from ordinary legal systems with sanction in that, while it has a mechanism of sanction, it asserts that there are only spontaneous rule following in this game. "Sanctions" assigned in samgha are put into operation (1) only after one's own confession, and (2) only with one's consent. Therefore, sanctions are one's self-punishments, other priests only bear witness of its execution. So, in case of minor offenses, speaking out of rule violation itself is just its sanction (the procedure of restoring rule violation). Thus, the lost assumption of one's following rule is rebuilt. In case of grave seven offenses, the capital punishment is applied, that is, an eternal purge from samgha omnipresent.

The introduction of a new rule, reporting of one's own rule violation and self punishment, dissolves the uncertainty of the former game. Yet, there still remain some problems.

One problem is that the spontaneity of priests is only assumed. Offenders of rules may keep silent and cover up. Covering up is prohibited again by rule and therefore doubles the offense, which is not probable to the disciples of Buddha. This is the assumption of the game. There is no testifying of the assumption in the game itself. Instead, it is substantialized within the game. There is a continuous tendency toward corruption in Buddhism as a movement.

Corruptions are not rare in all religions, but in the case of Buddhism, there can be no such form of fundamentalism or restorationism as in the case of monotheism. Because coercion of making them follow rules is meaningless.

Another problem is impossibility of setting up any permanent organization in samgha. As spontaneity is given top priority in Buddhism, formal procedures cannot be complete within it.

For example, let us consider the opening procedure of the Kamma meeting in samgha. Kamma is required to be both harmonious (attendance of all members) and lawful (justifiable with regard to Ritsu-zo regulations). Then, how can the chairperson of Kamma meeting be selected? The meeting chaired by the legitimate procedure is lawful according to the regulation. If they try to select the chairperson lawfully, another Kamma meeting in order to select him is necessary before the meeting opens. Again, how can the chairperson (or temporary chairperson) be selected for this meeting? One more Kamma meeting becomes also necessary. ... and so on. Strict equality between members is assumed, therefore any member cannot be regarded as privileged to be a chairperson. As a result, there is no formal procedure for opening with selecting chairperson. Instead, the Kamma meeting opens without notice by speaking out of someone. (Any priest can be chairperson according to regulation.)

The decision of Kamma meeting should be unanimous. Its decision cannot restrict any other samgha. Therefore, no permanent organizations lack among priests, which explains partially the reason why Buddhism disappeared in India.

3.5 Buddhism as a Movement which leads to dismantlement

.....

Translated partly from

Hashizume, Daisaburo 1985 Bukkyo No Gensetsu Senryaku (The Discourse Strategy of Buddhism), Tokyo, Keiso Shobo Publ.

by the author 15/Dec/1999