

A Mind of Mountains and Rivers

The Nondualist Ethics of Buddhism and Deep Ecology

David Loy

山と川の心

デービッド・ロイ

超大国の緊張関係は、われわれが今日直面する真の問題の正体を見極める作業に、ちょうど間に合うかたちで終焉した。その問題とは、生態的な大災害、あるいは生態的自殺（エコサイド）である。多種多様な環境破壊に対処するため、首尾一貫しない方策が取られているなかで、われわれはますます次のような疑いを抱くようになった。すなわち、われわれの手中にある問題は、「天然資源」を単に保存する必要以上のものなのではないか。必要とされるのは、われわれ自身と地球との関係についてわれわれの理解の仕方を根本的に変えることである。本稿では、仏教がこの方面で洞察していることと、「ディープ・エコロジー」とを比較したい。両方の見方とも、これを道徳の問題から理解の問題へと変換させているが、それは両方とも、事物の本性を鋭く洞察しているからである。すなわち、事物はバラバラに存在しているのではなく、統一的な生態的システムのなかで互いに結びついているのである。

Recently the crucial issue of our ethical responsibility has broadened to encompass the whole ecosphere. Today the question is how to relate to all beings, not only animals and plants but also tropical rain forests and the ozone layer. Superpower tensions have ended just in time to realize the real problem facing us today : ecological disaster, or "ecocide", no longer something that threatens but something we find ourselves in the middle of. This is a challenge so great that it is difficult to know how to respond to it ; yet, amidst all the piece-meal attempts to deal with various kinds of pollution and environmental deterioration, the suspicion is growing that what is involved is much more than merely the need to preserve "our natural resources." Lynn White, Jr., one of the first to consider the philosophical implications of the ecological crisis, realized that the issue is fundamentally a spiritual one : "Since the roots of our trouble are so largely religious, the remedy must also be essentially religious, whether we call it that or not. We must rethink and refeel our destiny."¹ What is required is nothing less than a fundamental transformation in the

way we have understood the relation between ourselves and the earth.

In contrast to the main humanistic or “anthropocentric” tendency within the West, Asian philosophical and religious traditions have had much to say about this issue. This paper will discuss and compare the relevant insights of Buddhism and a more recent approach known as *deep ecology*. Both perspectives transpose the issue from morality to understanding : the problem is not evil but ignorance, and the solution is not primarily a matter of applying the will but reaching an insight into the nature of things. Yet it is not enough to discover the “correct” moral code or gain some objective scientific understanding. We need an insight which can liberate us from the dualistic ways of thinking whereby we “bind ourselves without a rope.”

Buddhism

I came to realize clearly that mind is no other than mountains and rivers and the great wide earth, the sun and the moon and the stars. (Dogen)²

From its beginnings Buddhism has emphasized ethics. The eightfold path is often grouped into the three pillars of sila (morality), samadhi (meditation), and prajna (wisdom or insight). Sila is regarded as providing the moral and karmic foundation necessary both for lay life and for successful meditation.

Five ethical precepts are commonly extracted from the eightfold path : to avoid killing, stealing, false speech, sensuality, and intoxicants. Notable from an ecological perspective is that the precept against killing protects not only humans but all living beings. From a Western viewpoint, what is most interesting about the precepts is that they are not commandments imposed upon us by the Buddha or some god, but undertakings that we choose to impose upon ourselves. “I undertake the course of training to perfect myself in the precept of not killing”, etc. Even while reciting them we know that we will violate them, but we vow to continue the attempt to embody them as the basic principles of our conduct in the world. The idea behind this perspective is the belief that when we break the precepts it is we ourselves who suffer the most.

Another, simpler version of the precepts originates from a verse in the Dhammapada : “Renounce all evil, practice all good, keep the mind pure : thus all the Buddhas have taught.” Mahayana Buddhism altered this to emphasize the attitude of the bodhisattva, who takes on the responsibility to help all sentient beings attain salvation : “Renounce all evil, practice all good, save the many beings.” The ten basic Mahayana precepts add five more to the Pali precepts : not to discuss the faults of others, not to praise oneself while abusing others, not to spare the dharma assets, not to indulge in anger, and not to defame the three treasures (Buddha, dharma, sangha). These add a greater psychological sensitivity to the ways the ego-self protects and perpetuates itself.

To these ten precepts the path of the bodhisattva adds six paramitas : generosity, morality, patience, exertion, meditation, and wisdom (prajna). Paramita, usually translated as “transcendental” (transcendental generosity, etc.) or “perfection of . . .” (perfection of generosity, etc.), literally means “to go beyond” and refers to a character trait developed to the highest possible degree. Generosity (dana) is first for good reason : it is the pre-eminent Buddhist virtue, emphasized more in Buddhism than in any other religion ; some teachers have said that it contains all the other virtues. Buddhism condemns the practice of performing good deeds with expectation of material reward or respect, because transcendental generosity denies the barrier between the one who gives and the one who receives. Accordingly, Mahayana emphasizes that dana-paramita is generosity without any awareness that it is oneself who is giving, that there is another who receives, or even that there is a gift which is given. As long as I am aware of my generosity, that generosity is not complete : something extra remains or “sticks”, which therefore does not lessen the sense-of-self but aggravates it.

The 8th century Buddhist poet and philosopher Santideva reminds us of the non-dualist perspective that grounds this approach to ethics : “Those who wish to bring themselves and others swiftly to salvation should perform the supreme act of converting others into oneself.”³ As this suggests, Buddhist morality cannot be comprehended apart from such a realization, which liberates us from the sufferings (duhkha) inherent to a sense-of-self. In order to understand Buddhist ethics, therefore, we must consider its foundation in the Buddhist understanding of the self.

As is well known, Buddhism denies the existence of the ego-self. However, the Buddhist critique of self-existence is more general than that. Expressed philosophically, the central insight of Buddhism is a critique of our tendency to reify things and perceive the world as a collection of self-existing (svabhava) objects in objectified space and time. That is the point of pratitya-samutpada “dependent-origination”, the most important Buddhist doctrine (the Buddha emphasized that anyone who really understands pratitya-samutpada understands his teaching, and vice-versa).

However, that type of logic and epistemological analysis did not appeal to Chinese Buddhists, who preferred a more metaphorical way to express the interconditionality of all phenomena : the analogy of Indra’s net described in the Avatamsaka Sutra and developed in the Hua-yen (Japanese, Kegon) school of Mahayana. Far above us, in the abode of the Indian god Indra, there is a net which stretches out infinitely in all directions. In each “eye” of the net is located a single glittering jewel, and since the net itself is infinite in all dimensions, the number of jewels is also infinite.

If we now arbitrarily select one of these jewels for inspection and look closely at it, we will discover that in its polished surface there are reflected all the other jewels in the net, infinite in number. Not only that, but each of the jewels re-

flected in this one jewel is also reflecting all the other jewels, so that there is an infinite reflecting process occurring. . . . [I]t symbolizes a cosmos in which there is an infinitely repeated interrelationship among all the members of the cosmos. This relationship is said to be one of simultaneous mutual identity and mutual inter-causality. (Francis Cook)⁴

Every "individual" is at the same time the effect of the whole and the cause of the whole, and the totality is a vast, infinite body of members each sustaining and defining all the others. "The cosmos is, in short, a self-creating, self-maintaining, and self-defining organism." One of the most important consequences of this (also important for deep ecology, as we shall see) is that such a world is non-teleological : "There is no theory of a beginning time, no concept of a creator, no question of the purpose of it all. The universe is taken as a given". In such a universe human beings cannot be considered the crown of creation, because it has no hierarchy : "There is no center, or, perhaps if there is one, it is everywhere."⁵

This "mutual identity and inter-causality" of everything means that right now you are reading more than my ideas about Buddhism : for in this page is nothing less than the entire universe. The Vietnamese Zen teacher (and poet) Thich Nhat Hanh makes this point well :

If you are a poet, you will see clearly that there is a cloud floating in this sheet of paper. Without a cloud, there will be no rain ; without rain, the trees cannot grow, and without trees we cannot make paper. The cloud is essential for the paper to exist. If the cloud is not here, the sheet of paper cannot be here either. . . .

If we look into this sheet of paper even more deeply, we can see the sunshine in it. If the sunshine is not there, nothing can grow. In fact, nothing can grow. Even we cannot grow without sunshine. And so, we know that the sunshine is also in this sheet of paper. The paper and the sunshine inter-are. And if we continue to look, we can see the logger who cut the tree and brought it to the mill to be transformed into paper. And we see the wheat. We know that the logger cannot exist without his daily bread, and therefore the wheat that became his bread is also in this sheet of paper. And the logger's father and mother are in it too. . .

You cannot point out one thing that is not here – time, space, the earth, the rain, the minerals in the soil, the sunshine, the cloud, the river, the heat. Everything co-exists with this sheet of paper. . . . As thin as this sheet of paper is, it contains everything in the universe in it.⁶

Instead of things, everywhere there are only traces and those traces are traces of traces.

We seem to have drifted far from ethics, but the Buddhist approach to morality follows directly from this nondualistic identity with the whole of Indra's Net. When my sense-of-self lets-go and evaporates (as can occur in meditative practices), I realize

my interdependence with all other phenomena in that all-encompassing net. It is more than being dependent on them : When I discover that I am you, the trace of your traces, the ethical problem of how to relate to you is transformed. Loss of self-preoccupation entails the ability to respond to others without an ulterior motive that needs to gain something, material or symbolic, from that encounter. Of course, the danger of abuse remains if my nondual experience is not deep enough to root out those dualistic tendencies that incline me to manipulate others. As long as there is sense-of-self, therefore, there will be need to inculcate morality, just as infants need training wheels on their bicycles. In Buddhism, however, ethical principles approximate the way of relating to others that nondual experience reveals ; as in Christianity, I should love my neighbor as myself – but in this case because he/she is myself. We may not have developed to the degree that we spontaneously experience ourselves as one with others, but we follow the precepts and endeavor to act just as if we did feel that way. In the Zen school of koan practice that I am familiar with, the last ten koan examine the ten Mahayana precepts from the enlightened point of view, to clarify what has by then become apparent : the precepts too are spiritual training wheels. There are no limitations on my freedom – except the dualistic delusions that incline me to abuse that freedom in the first place. Our greatest freedom comes from losing self-preoccupation and thereby assuming responsibility for all things : not just for our family or for our nation, but for the whole of Indra's Net.

For Buddhism such response-ability is neither the means to salvation nor the effect of liberation but natural to the expression of genuine enlightenment. It is what might be called the “non-moral morality” of the bodhisattva, who, having nothing to gain or lose himself – because he/she has no self – is devoted to the welfare of others. The bodhisattva knows that no one is saved until everyone is saved. Indra's Net implies that, insofar as I am caused by the whole universe, it exists for my benefit ; but insofar as I am the cause of the whole universe, I exist for it. This dilemma is resolved by realizing that there is no real distinction between the terms : when I am the universe, to help others is to help myself.

A friend once inquired if Gandhi's aims in settling in the village and serving the villagers as best he could were purely humanitarian. Gandhi replied . . . “I am here to serve no one else but myself, to find my own self-realization through the service of these village folk.”⁷

According to Buddhism, to become enlightened is to forget one's own suffering only to wake up in or rather one with a world of suffering. This experience is not sympathy or empathy but compassion, literally “suffering with.” What will the meaning of life become for such a person, freed from narcissistic self-preoccupation? What will that nondual freedom, which has nothing to gain or to lose, choose to do? The career of the bodhisattva is helping others : not because one “ought to”, but because one is the situation and through oneself that situation draws forth a response to meet

its needs.

What are the ecological implications of this approach? The first precept enjoins us not to kill any living being ; the bodhisattva vows to help all beings be happy and realize their Buddhature. This denies the importance of the distinction we usually make between ourselves and other living beings. Such an attitude developed quite early in Buddhism, as in the popular Jataka "birth stories" which purport to describe the earlier lives of the Buddha before he became the Buddha. Many Jataka passages celebrate the beauties of nature : forests, rivers and lakes, and most of all the nonhuman, wild creatures who are usually the protagonists of the stories. In many of the best-known stories the future Buddha sacrifices himself for "lower animals" : for example, offering his body to help a weak tigress feed her hungry cubs. In this fashion the Jatakas view the world nondualistically as a vast field of spiritual effort in which no life-form, no matter how insignificant it seems to be, is outside the path. All beings are revealed to be potential Buddhas and bodhisattvas. Each is able to feel compassion for the sufferings of others and can act selflessly to ease the pain of all beings. The Jatakas also remind us that everything is food for something else, part of an all-encompassing food chain which does not end with humans.

Nor is this compassion limited to animals. The Buddha is believed to have experienced his great enlightenment under a bodhi (pipal) tree, and to have spent his first week after that contemplating this sheltering tree. Many passages in the Pali scriptures contain expressions of the Buddha's gratitude for trees and other plants. In one sutra, the spirit of a tree appears to the Buddha in a dream and complains that it had been chopped down by a monk. The next morning the Buddha gathered the monks together and prohibited them from cutting down trees, for they too have sensate existence. Clearly, the Buddhist realization of nonself includes a deep appreciation of our unity with the natural world.

Deep Ecology

The Western version of mystical awareness, our version of Buddhism or Taoism, will be ecological awareness. (Fritjof Capra)⁸

What has become known as deep ecology developed out of a critique of reform environmentalism, which attempts to alleviate or mitigate some of the worst forms of pollution, wildlife destruction, and short-sighted development schemes. The shortcomings of this approach, which works within the framework of conventional political processes, soon became evident : such environmentalism tends to become technical and oriented only to short-term public policy issues like resource allocation. Environmentalism thus became limited to reforming only some of the worst land-use practices, without questioning more basic assumptions about the value of economic growth and development.

One of the earliest and best-known examples of a transformation to a deeper ecological approach was the naturalist Aldo Leopold, who in the 1920's and 1930's underwent a dramatic conversion from a "stewardship" resources-management mentality – the view that because of our superiority humans should be the "stewards" of nature – to what he termed an "ecological conscience." His new understanding was presented in *Sand County Almanac* (1949), a now-classic statement of ecological consciousness, which argued for "biocentric equality" because "we are only fellow-voyagers with other creatures in the odyssey of evolution." To adopt an ecological conscience "changes the role of Homo sapiens from conqueror of the land-community to plain member and citizen of it." Leopold claimed that "the biotic mechanism is so complex that its working may never be fully understood", which by stressing the essential mysteriousness of life processes undercuts the possibility of its successful domination and control by humans. From this, he formulated an egalitarian "land ethic": "A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise."⁹ These ideas were subversive of traditional environmentalism, but their implications went unnoticed until recently.

Leopold's ideas were not appreciated because they were too radical: like Buddhism, they challenge some of our most deeply-rooted assumptions about the natural world, what human beings are, and the relationship between them. According to the usual dualistic worldview (which can no longer be considered merely Western, since it has spread around the globe), the Earth is primarily if not exclusively a collection of natural resources waiting to be exploited. For those resources which are not infinite, our technology can provide substitutes. Human beings dominate nature because we are superior to the rest of nature. Nature is thus viewed from a human-centered or "anthropocentric" perspective. Historically, this set of values has not been concerned about the quality of the natural environment, such as the inherent worth of other species and the importance of maintaining biological diversity. Instead, the emphasis has been on individualism, with little awareness of the value of the human community, much less the value of the biotic "land community" that Leopold described. The overriding value has been linking science and technology to exploit some aspect of nature – energy, minerals, forests, etc. – to serve the growing economy.¹⁰

This worldview is still dominant – in its global reach, more than ever before – but it is not unchallenged. In addition to Asian traditions such as Buddhism and Taoism, there have also been strong minority strands within the West: literary traditions such as Romanticism and pastoralism; alternative Christian views of nature like that of St. Francis of Assisi; the lifestyles of "primal peoples" such as native American Indians; and today, more holistic scientific models such as quantum mechanics and, of course, ecology itself.

Warwick Fox, an Australian philosopher, succinctly expresses the central intuition of deep ecology : "It is the idea that we can make no firm ontological divide in the field of existence : That there is no bifurcation in reality between the human and the non-human realms." Arne Naess, a Norwegian philosopher, has developed this basic insight into two "ultimate norms". The first is self-realization, which necessarily goes beyond the self defined as an isolated ego striving for sense-gratification or for its own individual salvation. According to Naess, we must stop seeing ourselves as competing egos and learn to identify not only with other humans but with other species and even with inanimate objects in the nonhuman world. The second ultimate norm is biocentric equality :

all things in the biosphere have an equal right to live and blossom and to reach their own individual forms of unfolding and self-realization within the larger Self-realization. This basic intuition is that all organisms and entities in the ecosphere, as parts of the interrelated whole, are equal in intrinsic worth.¹¹

Let us examine these central concepts. Fox's idea that there is no bifurcation between the human and nonhuman realms follows from the essential (indeed, incontestable) ecological insight into the interrelatedness of everything. As John Muir put it, "When we try to pick out anything by itself, we find it hitched to everything else in the universe." That applies to us as much as to this sheet of paper that you are reading now. But there is still something lacking in this way of expressing it :

To the Western mind, interrelatedness implies a causal connectedness. Things are interrelated if a change in one affects the other. . . . But what is actually involved is a genuine intermingling of parts of the ecosystem. There are no discrete entities.¹²

Nagarjuna could not have put it better, for the Buddhist doctrine of *pratitya-samutpada* "interdependent origination" leads us to the same conclusion. Thus *Buddhism and ecology follow the same development*. We start with an understanding of the world as a collection of discrete beings, the most important being us (Buddhism begins with the individual ego-self, ecology the collective "wego-self" that is *homo sapiens*). Buddhist teachings and ecological science lead to the realization that beings are not discrete : all our experience and all life-forms are interrelated ; to isolate anything is to destroy it. Yet even this insight is incomplete, because if everything is interrelated then there are no discrete things to be related-together. We end up with . . . Indra's infinite and interpenetrating net, where each particular mirror is nothing other than a reflection of all the other mirrors which constitute the entire net : that is, each particular "thing" is what the whole universe is doing at this place and time.

From this principle Naess derives another implication : biocentric equality, the intuition that all organisms and entities in the ecosphere are equal in intrinsic worth. But if there are no discrete things to relate together, such terms as "organisms" and

“entities” become problematic. The all-encompassing food chain of life reminds us that we cannot discriminate one organism from another. Each is a “dissipative structure”, i.e., does not endure in and of itself, but only due to a continual flow of energy into the system.¹³ Our interdependence means we should speak rather of one vast organic ecosystem : the biosphere. And insofar as organic life is interrelated with supposedly nonorganic elements – oxygen, carbon, etc. – that biosphere cannot be separated from the inorganic sphere. Some inorganic elements – gold (a trace mineral in our bodies) and all the other elements with a higher atomic weight – were originally fused from lower elements in the superheated cores of supernova stars. . . . Clearly there is no end to this short of realizing the essential unity of the whole cosmos.

So much for organisms. But what about entities ? If there are no discrete beings, the static notion of entity must be replaced with something more dynamic. When we let-go of our usual entity-way of looking, which perceives the world as a collection of self-existing things, we end up with Buddhist insights about natural processes and events ; for the impermanence of everything is one of the three essential facts of life, according to Buddhism. To realize this is to see that a flower is not an entity, it is the sexual gesture of a plant. Then Naess’ point, his second ultimate norm, may be better expressed as : every event is equal in intrinsic value to every other event. This seems innocuous enough, but it has extraordinary “moral” implications.

Earlier we saw that the Hua-yen concept of Indra’s Net is non-teleological and non-hierarchical : “There is no theory of a beginning time, no concept of a creator, no question of the purpose of it all.” Human beings cannot be the crown of creation, because “there is no center, or, perhaps if there is one, it is everywhere.”¹⁴ Arne Naess, in arguing for deep ecology, has derived the same insight from Spinoza’s metaphysics : “There is no hierarchy. There is no purpose, no final causes such that one can say that the ‘lower’ exist for the sake of the ‘higher.’ There is an ontological democracy or equalitarianism . . .”¹⁵ Now that entity-language has been translated into event-language, how shall we understand this? There is a famous Zen story about a sermon by Sakyamuni Buddha, when he said nothing but just twirled a flower in his hand ; no one understood this except Mahakasyapa, but what did he understand? *Just “this”! The entire universe exists just for the sake of this particular “flower” to bloom – and for the sake of “me” to appreciate it.* Or, as deep ecologists might prefer to put it, the whole biosphere exists only for this oak tree to grow, for this river to flow, for this whale to spout.

Deep ecologists have elaborated on the meaning of “intrinsic worth” or “inherent value” : “The presence of inherent value in a natural object is independent of any awareness, interest, or appreciation of it by a conscious being.”¹⁶ This implies “letting things be” in order for them to flourish : not for our sake, and not even for their own sake, but for no sake at all – because questions of utility and justification no

longer apply. The teleological question “what for?” arises out of the anthropocentric attitude which perceives all beings as quantifiable and disposable raw material, and which values beings only insofar as they are good for something – that is, good for our own purposes.

Letting things be challenges that basic principle of our technological and consumerist society, but it also subverts our notion of ego-self. This brings us back to the first ultimate norm that Naess derives from the nonduality between the human and nonhuman realms : self-realization, which involves ceasing to understand ourselves as isolated, competing egos, and learning to identify with the whole of the biosphere. To admit that natural objects (or natural events) have an inherent value independent of any awareness or appreciation by other beings is to question our commonsense dualism between the conscious self and the objective world. If I am “in here” (behind the eyes and inside the ears, as it were) and the world is “out there”, the alienation between them makes value subjective : it can only be a function of my desires and my projects. Then to deny such an anthropocentric understanding of value, which deep ecology does, also leads us to deny the dualism between subject and object. We have already noticed how Buddhism denies that dualism. For example, Zen master Dogen realized that his mind is “nothing other than mountains and rivers and the great wide earth, the sun and the moon and the stars.” Then perhaps it is inevitable, although nonetheless a shock, that some deep ecologists have arrived at the same conclusion :

When humans investigate and see through their layers of anthropocentric self-cherishing, a most profound change in consciousness begins to take place.

Alienation subsides. The human is no longer an outsider, apart. Your humanness is then recognized as being merely the most recent stage of your existence . . . you start to get in touch with yourself as mammal, as vertebrate, as a species only recently emerged from the rain forest. As the fog of amnesia disperses, there is a transformation in your relationship to other species, and in your commitment to them. . . .

“I am protecting the rain forest” develops to “I am part of the rain forest protecting myself. I am that part of the rain forest recently emerged into thinking.”¹⁷

We are back within Indra’s Net : “I am that part of Indra’s Net recently emerged into thinking.” What began as a *scientific* claim, about the ecological inter-relatedness of species, has developed here into a *religious* claim : not just any religious claim, but the fundamental claim, or rather the fundamental realization, of Buddhism.

Yet it is not wolves or whales or trees but humans who make such a claim and endeavor to realize it. This raises a question about Fox’s “central intuition” that there is no real bifurcation between the human and nonhuman realms, for there does seem to be an important difference : we humans are the only dissipative structures who

can realize that we are not separate from Indra's Net, that moreover we are not parts of the Net but the whole of the Net, come to consciousness at this particular place and time. Or is it that we are the sole species which needs to pursue self-realization, because the sole species whose self-consciousness alienates it in the first place? Homo sapiens is the only animal that needs religion, because the only one deluded by an ego-self which needs to be reminded of its essential oneness with the world.

So we can understand why Fritjof Capra thinks that the Western version of Buddhism and Taoism will be ecological awareness : because deep ecology has also come to realize the importance of solving the basically religious issue of the alienation between ourselves and the world we find ourselves in. The individual ego-self and the species "wego-self" turn out to be different versions of the same problem, which can be resolved only by realizing that the duality between ourselves and the natural world is delusive. The environmental catastrophes which are occurring more and more often make it evident that such a transformation is necessary if we – not only humans, but the rich diversity that constitutes the biosphere – are to survive and thrive through the next century.¹⁸

Summary of David Loy's A MIND OF MOUNTAINS AND RIVERS

Superpower tensions have ended just in time to realize the real problem facing us today : ecological disaster, or "ecocide". Amidst all the piece-meal attempts to deal with various kinds of pollution and environmental deterioration, the suspicion is growing that what is involved is much more than merely the need to preserve "our natural resources." What is required is a fundamental transformation in the way we understand the relation between ourselves and the earth. This paper compares the relevant insights of Buddhism and deep ecology. Both perspectives transpose the issue from morality to understanding ; for both the solution involves reaching an insight into the nature of things : the realization that there are no discrete entities, only the intermingling processes of a unified ecosystem.

- 1 Quoted in Warwick Fox, *Toward a Transpersonal Ecology : Developing New Foundations for Environmentalism* (Boston : Shambhala, 1990), p.106.
- 2 As quoted in Philip Kapleau, ed., *The Three Pillars of Zen* (Tokyo : Weatherhill, 1965), p. 205. The original reference is from the Sokushin-zebutsu fascicle of Dogen's *Shobogenzo*. The same point is made in other fascicles such as *Shinjin-gakudo*, *Bussho*, *Sangai-yuishin*, etc.
- 3 *Bodhicaryavatara* VIII.120.
- 4 Francis H. Cook, *Hua-yen Buddhism : The Jewel Net of Indra* (University Park, Pennsylvania : The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1977), p.2.
- 5 *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- 6 Thich Nhat Hanh, *The Heart of Understanding* (Berkeley, CA : Parallax Press, 1988), pp.3-5.
- 7 Jag Parvesh Chander, *Teachings of Mahatma Gandhi* (Lahore : The India Book Works, 1945), p. 375.

- 8 Quoted in Warwick Fox, "The Intuition of Deep Ecology", *The Ecologist* (1984).
- 9 Aldo Leopold, *Sand County Almanac* (New York : Oxford University Press, 1968).
- 10 Bill Devall and George Sessions, *Deep Ecology : Living as if Nature Mattered* (Salt Lake City, Utah : Peregrine Smith Books, 1985), p. 44.
- 11 *Deep Ecology*, pp. 66-67.
- 12 Neil Everndon, "Beyond Ecology," *North American Review* 263 (1978), pp. 16-20.
- 13 A good nonorganic example is a vortex in water.
- 14 *Hua-yen Buddhism*, p. 2.
- 15 Arne Naess, *Ecology, Community, and Lifestyle, A Philosophical Approach* (Oslo, Norway : Oslo University Press, 1977).
- 16 Tom Regan, "The Nature and Possibility of an Environmental Ethic," *Environmental Ethics* 3 (1981), pp. 19-34.
- 17 John Seed, "Anthropocentrism," in *Deep Ecology*, p. 243.
- 18 An expanded version of this essay will be published in a forthcoming book edited by the Uehiro Foundation on Ethics and Education.