

**Purification Buddhist Movement, 1954 – 1970:  
The struggle to restore celibacy in the Jogye  
Order of Korean Buddhism**

Chanju Mun

Blue Pine

Honolulu, Hawaii

Copyright © 2011

**Jung Bup Sa Buddhist Temple of Hawaii**

1303 Rycroft Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814  
Blue Pine Books (213) 675-0336  
Fax: (808) 593-0478

Visit us at  
[www.bluepinebooks.com](http://www.bluepinebooks.com)

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Control Number: 2011920751  
ISBN: 9780977755363

I wish to dedicate this humble research book to my master Ven. Jung Woo and our Tongdo-sa Temple's monastics who have tremendously helped Korean Buddhists preserve celibate monasticism in modern Korean Buddhism.



## CONTENTS

<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	v
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	vii
<b>NOTES</b>	xiii
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b>	xiv
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1
1. Main themes:	1
Interconnecting sectarianism and ecumenism	
1.1. Chinese Buddhism	4
1.2. Korean Buddhism	6
1.3. Purification Buddhist Movement	10
2. A critical review of previous academic research	14
3. Methodology	19
<b>PT. 1 OVERVIEW OF KOREAN BUDDHISM:</b>	25
<b>INTERCONNECTING SECTARIANISM AND ECUMENISM</b>	
1. Pre-modern Korean Buddhism	25
1.1. Late Silla and early Goryeo Dynasties	25
1.2. The Goryeo Dynasty	29
1.3. The Joseon Dynasty	34
2. Modern Korean Buddhism	35
2.1. Founding patriarch(s)	37
2.2. The Dharma lineages	39
2.3. Critical reviews of the Dharma lineages	41
2.4. Soteriology	43
2.5. Dharma lineages and their authenticity	44
2.6. The Dharma lineages and their biological aspect	47
2.7. Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage	49
3. Purification Buddhist Movement	54
3.1. The movement's characteristics	58
3.2. The order's supreme patriarchs	63
3.3. The order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage	66
3.3.1. The Law of Taego-sa Temple (April 23, 1941)	67
3.3.2. The constitution of Korean Buddhism (March 7, 1946)	68
3.3.3. The order's constitution (June 20, 1954)	69
3.3.4. The order's constitution (September 27-28, 1954)	72

3.3.5. The order's constitution (August 12-13, 1955)	77
<b>PT. 2 THE MOVEMENT AND ORTHOPRAXY</b>	81
1. Vinaya lineages and texts	83
1.1. Vinaya lineages	83
1.2. Main vinaya texts	91
2. Outline of the <i>Brahma Net Sūtra</i>	93
2.1. The influence of the <i>Huayan Sūtra</i>	93
2.2. The doctrine of mind ground	97
2.3. The influence of Confucian filial piety	98
2.4. Comparison between monastic and Bodhisattva precepts	100
2.5. Characteristics of Bodhisattva precepts	102
3. Purification Buddhist Movement	105
Interconnecting orthopraxy and anti-orthopraxy	105
3.1. The movement's orthopraxy	106
3.1.1. Vegetarianism	106
3.1.2. No-drinking of intoxicants	110
3.1.3. No-eating of five pungent plants	114
3.1.4. Celibate monasticism	115
3.2. The movement's anti-orthopraxy	117
3.2.1. No-arbitrariness	118
3.2.2. Non-dispute (harmony)	122
3.2.3. Nonviolence	125
3.2.4. Separation of state and religion	127
<b>PT. 3 COLONIAL KOREAN BUDDHISM, 1910-1945:</b>	131
<b>THE MOVEMENT'S HISTORICAL BACKGROUND</b>	
1. The establishment of Imje Seon Sect	136
2. Han Yongun (1879-1944) and married monasticism	147
3. Anti-Japanese Korean Buddhism	157
3.1. The March 1 <sup>st</sup> Movement	157
3.2. Han Yongun	161
3.3. Various anti-Japanese activities	165
4. Pro-Japanese Korean Buddhism	167
5. The Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples	174
5.1. Korean Buddhist Temple properties	174
5.2. The Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples	177
5.3. The ordinance's aftereffects	180
5.4. Movements to abolish the ordinance	184
6. Arguments between married and celibate monasticism	187
6.1. Historical background	187
6.2. Baek Yongseong (1864-1940)	189
6.3. Bak Hanyeong (1870-1948)	194
6.4. Various different opinions	198

Purification Buddhist Movement	iii
7. The Center for Seon Studies	208
8. The foundation of Jogye Order	216
<b>PT. 4 POST-COLONIAL KOREAN BUDDHISM, 1945-1954:</b>	219
<b>THE MOVEMENT'S SPROUT</b>	
1. Institutional discriminations against Buddhism	219
2. Activities to de-Japanize Korean Buddhism	220
3. The movement's sprout	225
3.1. Haein Praxis Complex	225
3.2. Gobul Praxis Complex	227
3.3. The intensive retreat society at Bongam-sa Temple	232
3.4. The government's agricultural land reform	235
<b>PT. 5 PURIFICATION BUDDHIST MOVEMENT, 1954-1970:</b>	237
<b>DETAILED CHRONOLOGICAL EXPLANATIONS</b>	
1. The movement's early stage	239
1.1. May 20 – August 24, 1954	239
1.2. August 24 – September 28, 1954	245
1.3. September 28 – December 11, 1954	350
2. The movement's development	264
2.1. November 4, 1954 – May 15, 1955	265
2.2. May 15 – August 2, 1955	281
2.3. August 2 – 12, 1955	293
2.4. August 12, 1955 – April 19, 1960	296
3. The April 19 <sup>th</sup> , 1960 Movement and the movement	309
4. The May 16 <sup>th</sup> , 1961 Coup and the movement	316
5. The movement's discontinuation:	321
The establishment of the order's united administration	
6. The movement's positive effects	331
7. The movement's counter-effects	340
7.1. The celibate monastic side:	340
Conflicts between celibate monks	
7.2. The married monastic side:	350
Attempts to divide the Jogye Order	
8. The movement's completion:	367
The establishment of Taego Order	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	369
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	375
<b>INDEX</b>	395
<b>AUTHOR</b>	408









## RECOMMENDATION

Venerable Jung Woo Seunim  
Abbot of Tongdo-sa Buddhist Temple

I am honored to write a recommendation for this voluminous research book by Seongwon Seunim (Chanju Mun), my monastic disciple, who has conducted research in Buddhism in various religious and educational institutions in Korea and abroad and is currently teaching Buddhist philosophy at the prestigious University of Hawaii – Manoa. He academically and objectively analyzed how current Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, the biggest denomination of Korean Buddhism, was formed through the Purification Buddhist Movement, 1954 – 1970, which aimed at restoring celibate monasticism from Korean Buddhism Japanized during the Japanese occupation, 1910 – 1945.

The celibate monks of the order officially established in 1941 during its colonial period, originally composed of two groups of married and celibate monks, initiated the movement in 1954 and removed married monks in the order and married monks removed from the order established in 1970 a sectarian new order for them named Taego Order, the second biggest denomination of Korean Buddhism, making the established Jogye Order as a sectarian order for celibate monks. The celibate monastics successfully recovered celibate and vegetarian monasticism in the order upon the completion of the movement.

Professor Gim Yeongtae (b. 1933) published a research book on the movement, entitled *Taego jongsu: Hanguk bulgyo jeongtong jongdan ui yeoksa* (The History of the Taego Order of Korean Buddhism: The History of an Orthodox Order in Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Hanguk bulgyo chulpan-bu, 2006), the first academic book on the topic published in Korean, and extensively examined the movement from the sectarian and historical perspective of married monasticism affiliated with the Taego Order. However, Seongwon Seunim objectified the movement from the nonsectarian and philosophical perspective in this thick research book on the topic, the second book after the book by Gim Yeongtae.

I am currently serving as the abbot of Tongdo-sa Temple, considered as the vinaya center of Korean Buddhism throughout its history. The temple has preserved the vinaya tradition since its establishment by Vinaya Master Jajang (590-658) in 646. Seongwon Seunim embodied the foundation spirit of our temple and very clearly and philosophically defined the movement as the movement of revitalizing orthopraxis (precepts/vinaya) and opened a new view in the academic research on the topic. So, I strongly request him to incorporate his interest in orthopraxis, academically systemize and promote it in Tongdo-sa Temple and Korean Buddhism in his another research book as soon as possible.

I admire how well he comprehended the movement and how systematically he organized this voluminous book in articulating the movement's historical and theoretical background. He seemed like to incorporate academic knowledge and understanding that he obtained from studying and teaching at the academic and religious institutions of Tongdo-sa Temple, Dongguk University, Seoul National University, University of Wisconsin – Madison, University of Tokyo, Drepung Loselling Monastic University, University of the West, and University of Hawaii – Manoa in the several nations of South Korea, the United States, Japan and India.

I also hope that this book should be read among readers. If so, readers can easily visualize modern Korean Buddhism in general and the movement in particular. I enthusiastically recommend readers to read this book on behalf of Tongdo-sa Temple. Upon the publication of this book, I also want to share with readers my remembrance of our late master Nocheon Wolha (1915-2003), the spiritual leader of contemporary Tongdo-sa Temple on how actively he participated in the movement and how seriously he endeavored to preserve and/or revitalize the vinaya tradition in contemporary Tongdo-sa Temple and Korean Buddhism.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I can trace the origin of this book's main theme on ecumenism and sectarianism back to my doctoral dissertation entitled "The History of Doctrinal Classification in Chinese Buddhism: A Study of the *Panjiao* Systems" submitted to the University of Wisconsin – Madison in 2002 and published under the same title with the University Press of America in 2006. Professor Minoru Kiyota admitted me to the prestigious Buddhist Studies Program of the Department of Languages and Cultures of Asia (formerly Department of South Asian Studies) at the university in 1997 and guided me to conduct the topic of doctrinal classification and after his retirement, Professor Charles Hallisey graciously stepped up as advisor and led me to complete my dissertation in 2002. Without their deep concern and consideration, I could not have finished it. I really appreciate their worthy commentary and perspicacious insight.

I am also indebted to my dissertation committee members Professors Gudrun Gühnemann, John Dunne and Morten Schlütter of the Department of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Professors R. J. Cutter and Mark Csikszentmihalyi of the Department of East Asian Languages and Literature. While in Japan between April 2001 and March 2002 for one year, Professor Masahiro Shimoda of my home University of Tokyo introduced me his methodology for approaching Mahāyāna scriptures, specially the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*, and Professors Hiroshi Kanno of Soka University and Yoshihide Yoshizu of Komazawa University very clearly outlined the doctrinal classifications of Chinese Tiantai Buddhism and those of Chinese Huayan Buddhism respectively. I incorporated their teachings to my dissertation.

I extensively discussed the doctrinal classifications of Chinese Buddhism from the beginning through the doctrinal classification systems of Fazang (643-712) in the voluminous book of 496 pages. The systems were urgently needed for systemizing massive and comprehensive translations by Kumārajīva (334-412) into Chinese and can generally be considered ended by Fazang since no significant new translations came after his time. It was my intent to present a comprehensive picture of the doctrinal classification systems of Chinese Buddhism. I comprehensively introduced and discussed twenty six doctrinal classifiers and their doctrinal classifications from Kumārajīva to Fazang, covering almost all major doctrinal classifiers and their doctrinal classifications between Kumārajīva and Fazang in Chinese Buddhism.

I categorized these doctrinal classification systems into two groups: ecumenical systems and sectarian systems. However, based on their academic and/or sectarian background, modern scholars in doctrinal classifications have basically conducted research on their own sectarian doctrinal classification systems. However, I discussed the doctrinal classification systems in the interactive relationships between sectarian and ecumenical doctrinal

classification systems. I established the ecumenical lineage of doctrinal classifiers from Kumārajīva via Sengrui (352-436), Bodhiruci (d. 527), Huiyuan (523-592) and Jizang (549-623) to Wonhyo (617-686), heavily resorting to digitized Buddhist texts and by identifying direct and indirect citations from previous doctrinal classification systems to later systems. Wonhyo incorporated previous ecumenical doctrinal classifications and completed his own version of an ecumenical doctrinal classification scheme.

I hoped to expand and am still extending this topic in forthcoming sequential volume(s). I will discuss in a series of volumes the ways in which Huiyuan (673? -743?), Fazang's disciple, included traditional Chinese teachings, Confucianism and Taoism, in his doctrinal classifications. He theoretically syncretized Buddhism with the native Chinese religions. Succeeding his preceding Huayan masters, Huiyuan and his master Fazang, Zongmi (780-841) extended doctrinal classifications to include praxis (Chan) classifications. Zongmi hierarchically classified doctrinal traditions and Chan lineages and matched each of doctrinal traditions to each of practical Chan lineages. He attempted to synthesize doctrinal Buddhism and Chan Buddhism. He also syncretized Buddhism and native Chinese religions in his doctrinal classification schemes. I might also treat doctrinal classifications in the Pure Land Buddhism and in the Tantric Buddhism of East Asian and Indo-Tibetan Buddhist traditions in serial volumes.

In my second English research book of 516 pages entitled *Ha Dongsan and Colonial Korean Buddhism: Balancing Sectarianism and Ecumenism* (Honolulu: Blue Pine, 2009), I extended my academic theme of ecumenism and sectarianism originally introduced in my dissertation and investigated the theme in the Sino-Korean Buddhist context developed after the completion of Fazang's doctrinal classifications, including doctrinal Buddhism, Chan Buddhism, and Pure Land Buddhism. I discussed in the book Ha Dongsan (1890-1965), who served two times as the highest patriarch of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, the biggest and dominate order of Korean Buddhism, from November 3, 1954 to August 12, 1955 for the first time and from August 13, 1958 to April 11, 1962 for the second time. I comprehensively applied the theme and academically investigated Ha Dongsan and his Dharma lineage in the Sino-Korean Buddhist context in the book.

Even though Ha Dongsan officially and in the Dharma lineage inherited the sectarian lineage of Imje (Linji) Seon (Chan) Buddhism established after Hyujeong (1520-1604) by his disciples in the Joseon Dynasty (1392-1910), he actually and loyally followed after the ecumenists of the Sino-Korean Buddhist tradition such as Wonhyo, Chengguan (738-839), Zongmi, Yanshou (904-975), Uicheon (1055-1101), Jinul (1158-1210), Gihwa (1376-1433), Hyujeong, and Zhuhong (1535-1615). He also applied his ecumenical philosophy to ecumenize various Buddhist traditions available in his times, such as Seon Buddhism, doctrinal Buddhism, Pure Land Buddhism, Tantric Buddhism, and vinaya Buddhism.

He was a vinaya master, an eminent Seon master, and a key leader of Purification Buddhist Movement, 1954 – 1970, which aimed at revitalizing traditional Korean Seon Buddhism and recovering celibate monasticism of traditional Korean Buddhism from Korean Buddhism Japanized seriously during the Japanese occupation period, 1910 – 1945. He strongly disagreed with the radical subitist soteriology of sudden enlightenment and sudden practice that Imje Seon sectarians advocated and developed the moderate Seon soteriology of sudden enlightenment and gradual practice that ecumenists generally supported. He, furthermore, applied the moderate Seon soteriology, emphasized the importance of Mahāyāna Bodhisattva precepts, and popularized the precepts among Korean Buddhists. If we are the radical subitists of Imje Seon sectarianism who extremize the immanent aspect of precepts and enlightenment, we are naturally subject to be antinomians and easily to negate the necessity of enlightenment and of receiving and preserving precepts.

I also extended the two opposite terms of ecumenism and Imje Seon sectarianism in modern Korean Buddhism, comprehensively categorized major modern Korean Buddhist masters into three groups, and recently submitted a three-volume book manuscript written in Korean, entitled *Geunhyeondae Hanguk bulgyo* (Modern Korean Buddhism: Interconnecting Ecumenism and Imje Seon Sectarianism) to a prestigious Korean publisher for publication. If it is published, it might be the first and most comprehensive research book which discusses modern Korean Buddhism and covers the major eminent masters of modern Korean Buddhism from the philosophical, not historical, perspective. However, we can see some research books in which scholars historically, not philosophically discussed modern Korean Buddhism.

The Seon sectarians who accepted the Imje Seon Dharma lineage and considered Taego (1301-1382) as the founding patriarch of Korean Seon Buddhism in modern times were logically supposed to negate the authenticity of Korean Seon Buddhism prior to him. Some modern Korean Buddhists deconstructed and contextualized the Imje Seon sectarian Dharma lineage and established a new ecumenical Dharma lineage system covering from Doui (d. 821) who firstly introduced Seon Buddhism from China to the current times including major pre-modern Korean masters such as Jinul (1158-1210), one of the most representative ecumenists in Korean Buddhism.

Accordingly, I discussed in the book that modern Korean Buddhist masters philosophically and in the Dharma lineage reacted to the two contradictory concepts of ecumenism and Imje Seon sectarianism. So, even though I could not negate the fact that even the masters whom I classified to a same group differently reacted to the two concepts, I mainly categorized the masters of modern Korean Buddhism into three groups. The first group of masters accepted the Seon sectarian lineage and ecumenical philosophy; the second group the ecumenical lineage and philosophy; and the third group the Imje Seon sectarian lineage and philosophy. I concluded in the book that all of major

Korean Buddhist masters reacted to and were not free from the influence of the two seemingly contradictory concepts in modern times.

In my third and current English research book, I exclusively discussed the movement, introducing its historical and theoretical background and chronologically detailing it. Due to the movement's success, ecumenical Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, officially established in 1941 during the Japanese occupation and consisting of married and celibate monks, was institutionally partitioned into two modern orders: the Jogye Order of celibate monks and the Taego Order of married monks. When the celibate monks of the order initiated the movement in 1954 nine years after independence from Japan in 1945 and successfully removed married monks in the order, married monks removed from the order established a new sectarian order titled Taego Order for them and institutionally completed the movement in 1970, making the established order as another sectarian order only for celibate monks.

I extensively applied the categories of sectarianism and ecumenism and analyzed the movement in this book. Because married monks defined modern Korean Buddhist monasticism as the combined body of married and celibate monks, I considered their argument to be ecumenical. However, because celibate monks asserted Korean Buddhism should follow traditional celibate monasticism and allow only unmarried monks in the monastic order, I categorized their assertion as being sectarian. In this way, I defined this movement as the institutional paradigm of ecumenism and sectarianism. Even though we use the same term of Jogye Order before and after the movement, while the order was ecumenical before the movement, it became sectarian for celibate monks after the movement.

I had taught East Asian Buddhism at the University of the West in Los Angeles from Summer 2004 to Spring 2007 for three years. When I moved from the university to the University of Hawaii – Manoa in Fall 2007 since when I have taught Korean and Buddhist philosophy, my sincere colleague Professor Steve Odin has strongly encouraged me to continue the theme of doctrinal classification for my research. He also used to comment on that if I extend the theme, include the doctrinal classifications of Pure Land Buddhism and Tantric Buddhism of Indo-Tibetan and East Asian traditions in, and complete my volume(s) on doctrinal classifications, I can tremendously contribute to the Buddhist Studies in the East as well as in the West. He has continuously provided me with his wide and also deep knowledge in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism and East Asian Buddhism as well as in a variety of the topics of Western Philosophy and inspired me to broaden my view of philosophy and Buddhism.

My another sincere colleague Professor Roy W. Perrett also provided me with the ideas and knowledge on the doctrinal classifications of Indo-Tibetan Tantric Buddhism from his specialty in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism and suggested me to include the doctrinal classifications of Indo-Tibetan Buddhism in my serial volume(s) on the subject. He very analytically and philosophically



summarized Indo-Tibetan Buddhism and clarified and improved my understanding of doctrinal classifications in the Indo-Tibetan Buddhist tradition. Even though I still did not discuss the doctrinal classifications of Tantric Buddhism, East Asian and Indo-Tibetan, in this book, I should for now delay his request to and incorporate his comments on the topic in the later volume(s).

If I did not have their academic supports, I might have a difficulty to continue the topic and publish this humble research book. Even though I did not still finish a research project to explore doctrinal classifications in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism and East Asian Buddhism, they have helpfully and continuously missionized me to introduce the tough and wide-ranged topic to the scholars and students who are interested in Buddhist Studies. Other than Professors Steve Odin and Roy W. Perrett, I could not omit my heartfelt regards to my colleagues, staff, and students in my home Department of Philosophy and co-appointed Department of Religion at the University of Hawaii – Manoa.

I am obliged to express my sincere appreciation to my religious master, the Venerable Jung Woo, currently serving as the abbot of Tongdo-sa Temple, one of the biggest Korean Buddhist temples, who has been guiding me for more than two decades. He educated me not to limit my viewpoint in the narrower scope of Korean Buddhism but to understand Korean Buddhism from the broader context including not only East Asian Buddhism but also Indo-Tibetan Buddhism. So, he introduced me to Grand Master Hsing Yun (b. 1927), the founder of Fo Guang Shan Monastery, one of the biggest Buddhist organizations in Taiwan; Ven. Chimyō Takehara (b. 1939), the spiritual leader of Shōgyō-ji Temple in Fukuoka, affiliated to the Higashi Hongan-ji Faction of Pure Land Shin Buddhism in Japan; and the Ling Rinpoche (b. 1984), the reincarnate lama of the senior tutor of H. H. the current 14<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama (b. 1935), and let me deeply look into Chinese, Japanese, and Tibetan Buddhism respectively through their helps and guidance. I was also able to publish this humble work with his financial support.

I also want to express my sincere thanks to Ven. Daewon and his followers of Jung Bup Sa Buddhist Temple of Hawaii at which I am currently residing. They enthusiastically supported me to simultaneously do two different roles, religious and academic, without having contradictions. I was actually able to come to the United States to study English and Buddhism through the invitation by Ven. Daewon in 1995 since which he has immeasurably guided me to adjust to the new environment and has financially and spiritually helped me a lot. He also assigned me to publish serial books on Buddhism and peace under his spiritual guidance. I have published five serial books until to now since 2006 and am continuously planning to edit articles by eminent scholars on the subject and to include and publish them in consecutive volumes.

Finally, I should extend my thanks to Dr. Ronald S. Green, my close friend and co-editor of my established Blue Pine Books. As he has done, he also proofread this book in English, offered invaluable ideas and suggestions on it, created the index, and made the camera-ready preparation necessary for

publishing it. Ms. Ling-yu Chang, secretary of Blue Pine Books, also again provided much help with the innumerable miscellaneous items needed for publishing this book. In the management of Blue Pine Books and the publication of books with the publisher, including the handling of miscellaneous editorial and management stuffs for editing, formatting, printing, publishing, marketing, packing, shipping, and distributing our books, Dr. Green and Ms. Chang were always supportive of me and the company.

## NOTES

1. The Pinyin system is used for Chinese terms, the Korean Government Romanization System revised in 2000 for Korean ones, and the Hepburn system for Japanese ones.
2. Diacritics are used on most of Sanskrit and Pāli terms.
3. Foreign terms, those not included in the *Webster English Dictionary*, appear in italics.
4. If authors have Romanized their names in ways contrary to East Asian Standard Romanization Systems, I have adapted their spellings.
5. If names have not previously been Romanized, I have done so using East Asian Standard Romanization Systems.
6. This book is edited based on the 15<sup>th</sup> edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

## ABBREVIATIONS

- H     *Hanguk bulgyo jeonseo* (The Collected Works of Korean Buddhists),  
edited by Dongguk University
- S     *Sinmun euro bon hanguk bulgyo geunhyeondae-sa* (The History of  
Modern Korean Buddhism Seen through Newspaper Articles), edited  
by Seonu Doryang
- T     *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* (The Taishō Canon), edited by Takakusu  
Junjirō and Watanabe Kaigyoku
- X     *Zoku zōkyō (Xuzang jing)* (The Japanese Sequential Canon), edited by  
Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association

## INTRODUCTION

### **1. Main themes: Interconnecting sectarianism and ecumenism**

The main theme of this book is the application of what will be called ecumenism/sectarianism paradigms to the Korean Purification Buddhist Movement, 1954-1970. The Purification Buddhist Movement had a goal of eliminating married monasticism, introduced by the Japanese during their occupation period of 1910-1945, from Korean Buddhism and recovering the time-honored Korean celibate tradition in the post-colonial era. The current form of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, the largest and dominant denomination of Buddhism in Korea, historically originated from this movement. In this book the movement is examined in terms of its ecumenical and sectarian dynamics.

In this introduction, three different ecumenism/sectarianism paradigms are introduced. The first paradigm is drawn from an examination of doctrinal classification systems. The second paradigm is from Seon (the Korean version of Chinese Chan and Japanese Zen) and its view of doctrinal traditions. The third paradigm comes from the Purification Buddhist Movement. The first is a hermeneutic paradigm of ecumenism and sectarianism, the second is a soteriological paradigm and the third is an institutional paradigm, as explained below. In keeping with the theme of the book, emphasized in this chapter is on the third paradigm.

The author discusses the first and earliest ecumenism/sectarianism paradigm, that of doctrinal classification systems, at length in *The History of Doctrinal Classification in Chinese Buddhism: A Study of the Panjiao Systems*

(Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 2006). In short, when Chinese and non-Chinese Buddhists translated a massive number of Buddhist texts from Indian and Central Asian languages into Chinese, Chinese Buddhist scholars felt they needed to systematically classify the diverse writings and to resolve some of the seemingly contradictory ideas in them.

Some scholars classified Buddhist texts and doctrines in a hierarchical or vertical fashion, considering one more authoritative than another. Others sought ecumenical solutions and organized them horizontally, giving all equal status. Those arranging hierarchically can be defined as sectarians. Those considering them of equal value can be called ecumenists. Both groups proceeded hermeneutically, interpreting the meaning and value of texts. The former are hermeneutically sectarians, the latter hermeneutically ecumenists.

The first Chan Buddhists in China reacted in favor of or opposition to the previously existing doctrinal traditions. Again some conceived of vertical classifications that valued Chan practice over academic or doctrinal traditions. We can define these as Chan sectarians. Other Chinese Chan Buddhists horizontally arranged doctrinal and Chan traditions, valuing all equally. We can regard these as Chan/doctrinal ecumenists.

Extreme Chan sectarians advocated the radical Chan soteriology of sudden enlightenment and sudden practice. These individuals completely denied there was a necessity for doctrinal study or social ethics in the process of awakening. That is, they believed in the absolute superiority of Chan Buddhism to doctrinal traditions of Buddhism and applied this sectarian stance to soteriology, the theory of salvation from suffering. This group may be called antinomians in that they believed they were not subject to ethical laws and vows imposed by other traditions of Buddhism. Owing to this, they may be seen as Chan extremists. In contrast, ecumenists supported the moderate Chan soteriology of sudden enlightenment and gradual practice. They did not deny that doctrinal studies and social ethics were necessary in the process of awakening but harmonized these traditions both in theory and in practice.

The second of these paradigms is extensively applied to modern Korean Buddhism and the thought of the eminent monk Ha Dongsan (1890-1965) in the author's recent publication titled *Ha Dongsan and Colonial Korean Buddhism: Balancing Sectarianism and Ecumenism* (Honolulu: Blue Pine, 2009). In addition to soteriology, we can also discuss the paradigm in terms of Dharma lineage systems and theory. In short, it became important in Chan for practitioners to prove their teachings came from legitimate masters. Those masters also had to have had a teacher accepted as legitimate. This emphasis on lineage was modeled on the Confucian family system in China and was not found in earlier Indian Buddhism. Accordingly, Chan Buddhists established their own Dharma lineage systems and institutionalized their traditions. The Dharma lineage systems have been used to legitimize the authenticity of each tradition in Chan Buddhism.

We can apply the Seon/doctrine paradigm of ecumenism and sectarianism to categorize all modern Korean eminent masters into three groups. The first group constitutes the masters who advocated (Linji) Chan sectarianism in the Dharma lineage and ecumenism theoretically. The second group consists of the masters who follow Linji Chan sectarianism both in the Dharma lineage and in theory. The third group is composed of the masters who advocate ecumenism both in Dharma lineage and in theory. Modern Korean Buddhism can be characterized as an interconnection between Linji Chan sectarianism and ecumenism.

Korean Buddhism inherited celibate monasticism from its beginning and accepted married monasticism introduced from Japan during Japanese occupation, 1910-1945. After the independence from Japan in 1945, celibate Korean Buddhist monks initiated the Purification Buddhist Movement with the strong backing of President I Seungman (1875-1965) in 1954. The movement was completed in 1970 based upon the establishment of a new order named the Taego Order for married monks and its official approval from the government. In the development of the movement, celibate monks obtained control of the order and temples and completely removed married monks from temple management.

During the movement, married monks attempted to preserve the united Jogye Order consisting of married monks and celibate monks, and to retain their rights to manage temples. While celibate monks advocated institutional sectarianism for their political interests, married monks adopted institutional ecumenism for their own political concerns.

However, after celibate monks completely obtained the hegemony in the order and temples, they institutionally became ecumenists. They persuaded married monks to not divide the order into separate orders for married and unmarried monks. Married monks wanted to do so on the grounds that each side advocated different doctrines and precepts. After the movement's success, married monks institutionally became sectarians, were removed from one united order and established the new Taego Order for themselves in 1970.

The current book introduces the concept of orthopraxy (precepts, in distinction from orthodoxy) in analyzing the movement. It extensively investigates the *Brahma Net Sūtra*, which defines the orthopraxy of Korean Buddhists. The book also describes how and why theorists and activists justified and defended the movement. Based on orthopraxy stipulated in the scripture and other vinaya texts, they accomplished the goals of the movement and by sectarianism recovered the Korean Buddhist tradition of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism Japanized during the colonial period.

Even though Korean Buddhists have continuously used the name Jogye Order since its establishment under Japan's colonial rule in 1941, the order was ecumenical, including married and unmarried monks, prior to the movement but sectarian afterwards. Based on the success of the movement, the order removed

married monks. It currently consists solely of unmarried monks and is the sectarian order of celibates.

## 1.1. Chinese Buddhism

The history of Chinese Buddhist doctrinal classification systems can be viewed as the crossroads between ecumenical and sectarian perspectives. This is the thesis of my doctoral dissertation, revised and published as *The History of Doctrinal Classification in Chinese Buddhism: A Study of the Panjiao Systems* (Lanham, Maryland: University Book of America, 2006). This research developed through several steps that may reveal something important about our current project.

First, Korean Buddhists are proud of Wonhyo (617-686) who advocated ecumenical doctrinal classification systems. I was interested in him and his ecumenical doctrinal classification systems at educational institutions in Korea before studying Buddhism at the University of Wisconsin – Madison in the United States in 1997. When I studied Buddhism in the Department of Buddhist Studies at Dongguk University, the largest Buddhist mission university in Korea, between 1985 and 1989 and Asian philosophy in the master's program of the Department of Philosophy at Seoul National University between 1989 and 1992, I was naturally exposed to Wonhyo because he is widely presumed to be the most important figure in the history of Korean Buddhism.

Second, when I began to conduct research at the University of Wisconsin, I came to view Wonhyo and his thought more objectively in the broader context of East Asian Buddhism. We should not ignore the fact that Wonhyo received influence from Chinese Buddhism in forming his thought. In regard of this, it became apparent that the majority of Korean Buddhist scholars attempt to prove Wonhyo's greatness and uniqueness due to nationalist pride.

Third, I was eager to find methods to explore my assumption about Wonhyo and his thought. I utilized electronic texts for my academic methodology and discovered the great extent to which Wonhyo was influenced by previous Chinese Buddhist scholars such as Huiyuan (523-592) and Jizang (549-623) and how loyally he formed his ecumenical philosophy and doctrinal classifications. Wonhyo directly and indirectly extensively cited Huiyuan and Jizang in his works and inherited their ecumenical philosophy and doctrinal classifications. I also used electronic texts to identify how much Jizang loyally inherited Huiyuan's ecumenical philosophy and doctrinal classifications. So, I systematized an ecumenical lineage of doctrinal classification systems from Huiyuan to Wonhyo through Jizang in the East Asian Buddhist context.

Fourth, I extended the ecumenical lineage from Huiyuan through Jizang to Wonhyo in East Asian Buddhism and established a more complete ecumenical lineage by adding other previous ecumenical Chinese Buddhist scholars such as Kumārajīva (344-412), Sengrui (352-436) and Bodhiruci (d. 527). When I conducted research in Chinese Buddhism in the Department of Indian



Philosophy at the University of Tokyo, Japanese Buddhist scholars in Chinese Buddhism such as Kanno Hiroshi and Yoshizu Yoshihide informed me of the ecumenical Chinese Buddhists. We can interpret Kumārajīva's doctrinal classification schemes as being sectarian in some respects and ecumenical in others. While one of his disciples, Sengrui, inherited his master's ecumenical perspective and established doctrinal classification schemes accordingly, another disciple, Huiguan (d. 453), accepted the master's sectarian aspect in founding his sectarian doctrinal classification schemes.

Fifth, along with the ecumenical lineage of doctrinal classification schemes, I also organized the sectarian lineage of doctrinal classification schemes. I found that sectarian doctrinal classification systems developed chronologically dynasty to dynasty. During the Northern and Southern Dynasties (386-589), sectarian doctrinal classifiers emphasized the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* over other Buddhist texts in the Southern Dynasties and the *Di-lun* (*Daśabhūmika-sūtra-śāstra*), a commentary on the *Daśabhūmika Sūtra*, also known as a chapter in the *Huayan Sūtra*, over other Buddhist texts in the Northern Dynasties. The representative doctrinal classifications in the Sui (581-618) and Tang (618-907) Dynasties were Tiantai, Huayan and Yogācāra doctrinal classification systems, each of which highly emphasized their own sectarian scriptures, i.e., the *Lotus Sūtra*, the *Huayan Sūtra*, and the *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra* respectively.

As mentioned, when Chinese Buddhists encountered the huge number of translated Buddhist texts from Indian and Central Asian languages in Chinese, they strongly sought to understand, interpret and systematize them. Based on their own standards and from their own perspectives they established a variety of doctrinal classification systems. The necessity of these systems began with the massive translation of Buddhist texts and ended as no large translation projects occurred after Fazang (643-712).

Some Chinese Buddhist scholars selected particular Buddhist scriptures and classified other Buddhist texts below them from their sectarian perspectives. For example, Huayan scholars categorized all Buddhist texts from the perspective of Huayan Buddhism and hierarchically classified the others below the *Huayan Sūtra*. Tiantai scholars emphasized the *Lotus Sūtra* and sectarianistically arranged all Buddhist texts below that scripture.

Unlike the sectarian doctrinal classifiers, other Chinese Buddhist scholars did not stress a particular text but the universality of all texts. They felt each Buddhist texts functions differently for the variety of readers and audiences. Their classification of Buddhist texts was not based on value but function. According to their arguments, the Buddha needed to effectively deliver his teachings in different texts for the audience and readers endowed with different interests and capacities.

So, I characterized the history of doctrinal classification in Chinese Buddhism as the crossroads between ecumenism and sectarianism. When sectarian doctrinal classifiers classified Buddhist texts, they did not disregard their own positions but loyally imposed upon them their sectarian hermeneutical

and soteriological perspectives. However, ecumenical doctrinal classifiers arranged Buddhist texts according to their own ecumenical hermeneutical and soteriological outlooks. Each side mutually influenced the other side of doctrinal classification systems and gradually developed a variety of sophisticated doctrinal classification systems in Chinese Buddhism.

Doctrinal classifiers affiliated with the Huayan tradition were necessary to prove the superiority of the *Huayan Sūtra* and interpret various Buddhist texts from Huayan's sectarian perspective. They also expounded in their doctrinal classifications that Huayan philosophy and the *Huayan Sūtra* was soteriologically superior, that is, it contained the best teachings for awakening. Doctrinal classifiers affiliated with other traditions soteriologically and hermeneutically attempted to prove the superiority of their own sectarian scriptures and doctrines. Unlike the sectarian doctrinal classifiers, ecumenical doctrinal classifiers soteriologically and hermeneutically made efforts to prove the equality of Buddhist texts and doctrines.

If we understand pre-modern Huayan tradition in Sino-Korean Buddhism as a religious institution (sect), it should have its own exclusive ordination and administration system. However, Sino-Korean Buddhism has not had an institutional sect of Huayan Buddhism. Unlike Tibeto-Japanese Buddhism, Sino-Korean Buddhism has developed the institutionally ecumenical tradition under the government's strong intervention in and control of Buddhism. The concept of sect between Sino-Korean Buddhism and Tibeto-Japanese Buddhism is totally different. So, Sino-Korean Buddhists have understood the concept of sect (Chn, *zong*; Kor., *jong*) as meaning tradition, specialization and/or lineage, not as a religious institution.

Sino-Korean Buddhists basically systematized doctrinal classifications for Buddhist texts and doctrines, not for Buddhist practices. For this reason, when Chan Buddhism appeared, Chan practitioners felt they needed to reexamine the classifications systems. While doctrinal Buddhist traditions were mainly interested in doctrinal analysis, interpretation, classification and systematization, Chan Buddhist traditions were mostly concerned about enlightenment and how to obtain enlightenment effectively. While the main interest of doctrinal Buddhism is connected with textual and doctrinal hermeneutics, that of practical Chan Buddhism is connected with soteriology and Dharma transmission lineages.

## 1.2. Korean Buddhism

Prior to the beginning of Chan (Seon) Buddhism, in East Asia in general and in Korea in particular, the form of Sino-Korean Buddhism was doctrinal Buddhism. Buddhist scholars affiliated with doctrinal Buddhist traditions prior to Chan Buddhist traditions classified various Buddhist texts and doctrines either ecumenically or according to sectarianism. Ecumenicists and sectarians mutually influenced one another's doctrinal classification systems and

developed their own philosophy and doctrinal classification systems. We can define various doctrinal classification schemes as the crossroads between ecumenism and sectarianism.

Because Korean Buddhists accepted Chan Buddhism during the late Unified Silla and early Goryeo Dynasties, Korean Buddhists had the form of doctrinal Buddhism and followed Chinese or established their own doctrinal classification schemes prior to the introduction of Chan Buddhist traditions in Korea. After Korean Buddhists accepted Chan Buddhism, later imported Chan Buddhists needed to classify previously-existent doctrinal Buddhist traditions and their traditions. Some Chan sectarians classified Chan Buddhism over doctrinal Buddhism. Other Chan ecumenists equally arranged Chan Buddhism and doctrinal Buddhism in value.

Korean Buddhists introduced Buddhism from China and established the variety of doctrinal classification schemes interconnecting ecumenical and sectarian doctrinal classification schemes. Like in Chinese Buddhism, Korean Buddhism had three major sectarian doctrinal classification schemes representing three Buddhist traditions: Huayan, Yogācāra and Tiantai sectarian traditions. Korean Buddhists developed the three sectarian traditions, mutually exchanging their ideas with Chinese counterpart traditions. For example, Korean Huayan Buddhists influenced and was influenced by Chinese Huayan Buddhists.

Uisang (625-702) studied Huayan Buddhism under Zhiyan (602-668) in China and introduced and established Huayan tradition in Korea. He loyally followed his master Zhiyan's doctrinal classification schemes and established his Huayan sectarian doctrinal classification schemes. Woncheuk (613-696) went to and passed away in China. He studied Yogācāra Buddhism under Xuanzang (602-668) and loyally followed his master Xuanzang's doctrinal classification schemes and established his Yogācāra sectarian doctrinal classification systems. Che-gwan (d. 970), the author of *Cheontae sagyo-ui* (Introduction to Four Teachings in Tiantai Buddhism), the most authoritative introduction book to Tiantai Buddhism in East Asia, studied Tiantai Buddhism and took Tiantai Buddhism to his nation of Korea. He systematized Tiantai sectarian doctrinal classification schemes.

Other than the three major sectarian doctrinal classification schemes, Korean Buddhism also developed the ecumenical doctrinal classification schemes represented by Wonhyo and succeeded by Uicheon (1055-1101). Wonhyo loyally inherited previous ecumenical doctrinal classification systems from Huiyuan and Jizang, two major Chinese ecumenical doctrinal classifiers and established comprehensive ecumenical doctrinal classification schemes. Uicheon discovered and reevaluated Wonhyo and his ecumenical philosophy and tried to harmonize his current major sectarian traditions of Huayan, Chan and Yogācāra Buddhism.

We can use the terms sectarianism and ecumenism to define Korean Buddhism as a crossroads between them. We might not be able to apply the two terms to analyze Abrahamic religious traditions as we can in analyzing Sino-

Korean Buddhism. Even though Tibeto-Japanese Buddhism has more sectarian elements than Sino-Korean Buddhism, it cannot be comparable to the Abrahamic religions of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Buddhism is much more ecumenical and non-sectarian than the Abrahamic religions because Buddhism is not based on dichotomy, teleology, and dualism.

For this reason, although I use the terms sectarianism and ecumenism to characterize Sino-Korean Buddhism, my usages of the concepts in this book must be very different from their usages in the religions. While Abrahamic religions have used violence and wars to justify their own sectarian traditions, Buddhism has never adopted violence and wars to justify their own sectarian purposes. Even though Buddhists have used violence and wars, they have never justified them under the name of Buddhism throughout their long history since the foundation of Buddhism by Śākyamuni Buddha.

Wonhyo inherited ecumenism from previous ecumenists such as Huiyuan and Jizang, reacted against Xuanzang and his disciple Kuiji's (632-682) Yogācāra sectarianism and Zhiyan's Huayan sectarianism, and established his ecumenical philosophy. Uicheon loyally inherited ecumenism from Wonhyo, reacted against his current and earlier sectarian traditions of Yogācāra, Chan and Huayan Buddhism, and established his ecumenism between doctrinal and Chan traditions. Jinul (1158-1210) faithfully succeeded Zongmi's (780-841) ecumenism, reacted against his earlier and current Chan and Huayan sectarianism, and established his ecumenism between Chan and doctrinal traditions. Gihwa (1376-1433) reacted against Linji Chan sectarianism and advocated the harmonization between doctrinal and Chan Buddhism. He also reacted against Neo-Confucian absolutism and asserted the ecumenism between three religious traditions: Confucianism, Buddhism and Daoism.

Along with ecumenical tradition, Korean Buddhism had Huayan, Yogācāra and Chan sectarianism for the long time. However, Huayan and Yogācāra sectarianism disappeared after the Goryeo Dynasty (918-1392). Afterwards, Korean Buddhism developed based on the interconnection between ecumenism and Chan sectarianism. Even though Uisang and Gyunyeo (923-973) used Huayan philosophy to establish the superiority of their tradition, Korean Buddhists generally adopted Huayan philosophy to systematize their ecumenism. The major ecumenists such as Wonhyo of Silla Dynasty (traditionally dated, 57 BCE – 936 CE), Uicheon and Jinul of Goryeo Dynasty and Gihwa and Hyujeong (1520-1604) of Joseon Dynasty (1392-1910) adopted Huayan philosophy and established their ecumenical systems.

In essence Hyujeong was philosophically an ecumenist. He equally emphasized doctrinal Buddhism (theory) and Chan Buddhism (practice). However, he prioritized Chan Buddhism to doctrinal Buddhism when he emphasized the necessity of enlightenment. Because he soteriologically located practical Chan Buddhism over doctrinal Buddhism, we can also safely define him as a Chan sectarian. He had two aspects of ecumenism and Chan sectarianism in his philosophy and soteriology. Even though he soteriologically

was a Chan sectarian, because he did not completely negate doctrinal Buddhism, he was a moderate Chan sectarian. He simultaneously had the logically contradictory Chan sectarianism and ecumenism in his philosophy and soteriology.

After Hyujeong, even though his Dharma descendants established the Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage and advocated Chan sectarianism, Korean Buddhism also continued ecumenism between Chan and doctrinal Buddhism. The logical and actual tension between Linji Chan sectarianism and ecumenism is still easily seen in eminent masters of modern Korean Buddhism. So, the history of Korean Buddhism is a continuation of tensions between ecumenism and sectarianism. Even though the Chan masters after Hyujeong categorized themselves as Linji Chan sectarians and inheritors of Linji Chan Dharma lineages, they also received strong influence from Sino-Korean Buddhism's ecumenical tradition. Korean Buddhists have established their lineage and philosophy in the crossroads between ecumenism and Chan sectarianism.

The formation of Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage basically connotes the institutionalization of Linji Chan tradition in Korean Buddhism. Linji Chan Buddhists categorized Linji Chan Buddhism as an orthodox tradition and other Chan and doctrinal traditions as unorthodox traditions. They sectarianistically attempted to prove the superiority and orthodoxy of their own tradition to other traditions from various perspectives such as soteriology, Dharma transmission lineage, and hermeneutics between doctrinal and Chan traditions. They also attempted to locate their lineage as the primary and direct lineage of Linji Chan tradition and other lineages as the secondary and collateral lineages of the tradition.

When Korean Buddhists institutionalized Linji Chan tradition during the Joseon Dynasty after Hyujeong, the institutionalization accompanied inflexibility in their Dharma lineage, thought and practice. If some Buddhists established and/or adopted a Dharma transmission lineage, they were easily supposed to concretize their lineage and unite their group under the lineage system and to negate other Buddhists who do not accept their lineage. The Dharma lineage system has served as a potent ideological weapon to effectively establish and extend the power of the lineage followers. It has perpetuated closed mindedness when it comes to other Buddhist traditions and religions.

When they politically applied the Linji Chan lineage system, the lineage system institutionally (politically), soteriologically and philosophically caused them to develop dichotomous views to some degree. They tried to prove how great, authentic, orthodox and unique their affiliated Dharma lineage and sub-Dharma lineage, soteriology and philosophy were compared to other Dharma and sub-Dharma lineages. Even though Sino-Korean sectarian traditions have been much more ecumenical than Tibeto-Japanese Buddhist traditions and Abrahamic religions, they have held dichotomous and sectarian views much more so than the Sino-Korean ecumenical tradition.

Sino-Korean ecumenical tradition logically and naturally might provide more openness and plurality than other Buddhist and religious sectarian traditions such as Tibeto-Japanese Buddhism and Abrahamic religious traditions. Because the ecumenical tradition of Sino-Korean Buddhism can easily and naturally accept openness and plurality, it might be more compatible with modern democracy and might be able to more easily and naturally promote inter-denominational and inter-religious dialogues and harmonize conflicts between denominational and religious traditions than sectarian traditions.

Unlike ecumenism, sectarianism is supposed to have dualistic views, dividing good and evil, enemy and friend, subject and object, and describing other sects with dichotomous and opposing terms. Sectarrians might regard their organizations and thoughts as superior and criticize other organizations and thoughts. They might endeavor to prove how great and unique their organizations and thoughts are. Even though Korean Buddhism is much more ecumenical than other sectarian Buddhist and religious traditions and have not institutionally had sects before the Purification Buddhist Movement, we can see some sectarian individuals and groups in terms of hermeneutics and soteriology throughout the history of Korean Buddhism prior to the movement.

### **1.3. Purification Buddhist Movement**

When the group of celibate monks aimed at revitalizing Seon Buddhism by recovering the tradition of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism from Japanized Korean Buddhism and initiated the movement upon I Seungman's first presidential message in 1954, Song Manam (1876-1957), supreme patriarch of Jogye Order, preferred to purify Korean Buddhism gradually and realistically, not radically and idealistically. The key issue of the movement was the recovery of celibate monasticism in the order. Unlike Song Manam, activists and theorists of the movement, represented by I Cheongdam (1902-1971), radically and idealistically attempted to remove married monks and make the order only for celibate monks as soon as possible.

I Cheongdam, theoretically supported by lay scholars I Jaeyeol (1915-1981) and I Jong-ik (1912-1991), officially and politically changed the order's founding patriarch from Taego (1301-1382), a Linji Chan sectarian, to Jinul, an ecumenist between doctrinal and Chan Buddhism, in the movement's process and activists of the movement changed the order's head temple title from Taego-sa Temple named after Taego to Jogye-sa Temple named after Mt. Jogye on which Jinul was active in Suncheon, South Jeolla Province. Due to the change of the order's founding patriarch, even though Song Manam agreed with the movement's basic ideas, he vehemently criticized the movement's leaders, completely disconnected his relationship with celibate monks and finally sided with the group of married monks.

The movement's five major leaders, I Hyobong (1888-1966), Ha Dongsan, Jeong Geum-o (1896-1968), Yun Wolha (1915-2003) and even I Cheongdam

were not completely free from the influence of the Linji Chan Dharma lineage of Taego. Like Song Manam, I Hyobong and Ha Dongsan loyally followed Korean Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage and considered Taego as the lineage's founding patriarch but theoretically accepted ecumenism between doctrinal and Chan Buddhism. Song Manam seemed to accept the Korean Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage more seriously than and ecumenical thought less strongly than the two eminent masters. Even so, the three were not very different in Dharma lineage and philosophy.

However, while Ha Dongsan and I Hyobong actively participated in the movement, Song Manam did not. Jeong Geum-o strongly advocated Linji Chan sectarian philosophy and lineage more than the aforementioned three masters. I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha, the movement's other key figures, were more ecumenical than the three in the Dharma lineage and philosophy. However, while I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha, along with lay scholars I Jaeyeol and I Jong-ik, theorized that Jinul, an ecumenical philosopher, was their group's founding patriarch and advocated ecumenical philosophy, they could not completely exclude Korean Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage popularized among Korean monastics at the time.<sup>1</sup>

Even though the movement's activists definitely declared that they officially accepted Jinul as their group's founding patriarch, Jeong Geum-o strongly advocated Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage and philosophy. Jeong Geum-o was more sectarian in the Dharma lineage and philosophy than the three aforementioned modern eminent masters I Hyobong, Ha Dongsan and Song Manam. During the movement, Song Manam and the group of married monks advocated Taego as the order's founding patriarch. However, even though Jeong Geum-o was a strong Linji Chan sectarian and even a more Linji Chan sectarian than Song Manam, he did not follow Song Manam but accepted the movement. So, we cannot consistently and logically match their thought and Dharma lineage with the movement.

Song Manam was more moderate than the movement's leaders in the issue of purifying Japanized Buddhism. The movement's four major leaders were more moderate than I Cheongdam who radically implemented the movement. Even though Song Manam and the movement's five major leaders all politically interpreted the order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage with the movement's beginning, their political interpretation of the order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage did not affect their own thinking. They all conventionally accepted the Korean Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage of Taego established by the descendants of Hyujeong in the middle of the Joseon Dynasty and very generally accepted among Korean monks.

---

<sup>1</sup> See I Cheolgyo · Gim Gwangsik, comp., *Hanguk geun-hyeondae bulgyo jaryo jeonjip* (The Collection of Sour Materials of Modern and Contemporary Buddhism) (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1996), 68: 381.

As a matter of fact, they did not critically and academically review the order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage. Even I Cheongdam, who accepted the assertions of I Jaeyeol and I Jong-ik on the order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage and officially changed the patriarchs in the national conference for celibate monks on September 27 – 28, 1954, adopted the Dharma lineage of Taego as his Dharma lineage.<sup>2</sup> We can logically and easily assume that I Cheongdam officially changed them and the movement's other leaders followed the change for the movement's political reasons, not based on their own philosophical and Dharma lineage, at the movement's level.

Therefore, I assumed in this book that the interpretation of vinaya (monastic codes), not the order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage, was the central point in the movement. Both married and unmarried monks politically and very differently interpreted orthopraxy (precepts), including celibate monasticism, and developed their arguments. While unmarried monks conservatively and literally interpreted orthopraxy and advocated the movement, married monks freely and progressively interpreted precepts and opposed the movement. So, while married monks attempted to maintain the ecumenical order consisting of married and unmarried monks based on their interpretation of orthopraxy, unmarried monks tried to remove married monks from the ecumenical order and establish the sectarian order only for themselves depending on their interpretation.

While Ha Dongsan, I Hyobong, Jeong Geum-go and Yun Wolha were more moderate than I Cheongdam in the movement, the four masters were more radical than Song Manam in purifying Korean Buddhism. The five movement leaders used the issues regarding the order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage for their political slogan regardless of their own personal thinking on the issues. The most important issue in the movement was for married monks or celibate monks how to keep or take the order's hegemony from their different positions. While celibate monks attempted to take the order's hegemony from established married monks, married monks tried to keep the hegemony from the attack of counterparts. Celibate monks clearly revealed their own sectarian, political and ideological purposes in the movement.

The movement was a sectarian movement for celibate monks to take the order's hegemony from established married monks and to justify and beautify their political goals through presenting a new theory of the order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage. To objectively and neutrally analyze the movement and the split of the monastic order in modern Korean Buddhism, we might be able to refer to from Paul Williams' examination of the split of the monastic order in Indian Buddhism. Williams concludes that the division of the monastic order in Indian Buddhism essentially originated from the different

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.



interpretations of orthopraxy, not orthodoxy.<sup>3</sup> The Purification Buddhist Movement also was not a philosophical movement based on the interpretation of orthodoxy but a political movement concerned with the interpretation of orthopraxy.

The issue of married monasticism was the higher categorical one than those of the order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage in the movement. The movement basically aimed at revitalizing vinaya (monastic codes) and preserving precepts. The movement's key members conservatively and literally interpreted the vinaya and based on their interpretation, justified celibate monasticism and the movement. Married monks, opponents of the movement, liberally and progressively interpreted the vinaya and based on their interpretation, justified married monasticism and opposed the movement. The majority of scholars have academically discussed the movement from historical, rarely economical and sociological, contexts. However, it is difficult to find an article on the movement which discusses it from philosophical perspectives.

I recently discussed Ha Dongsan, a key leader of the movement, in my 516 page book entitled *Ha Dongsan and Colonial Korean Buddhism: Balancing Sectarianism and Ecumenism* (Honolulu: Blue Pine, 2009). Even though the work was not directly related to the topic of the movement, I discussed the movement when I dealt with his life. I also already outlined the movement in an English article from historical perspectives<sup>4</sup> and recently submitted a Korean article on the movement from a philosophical perspective to an academic journal specializing in modern Korean Buddhism for publication.<sup>5</sup> Based on the previous academic research on the movement by me and other scholars, I was able to write this book and philosophically examine the movement.

I Cheongdam also backed up my argument that the movement's key issue was orthopraxy, not orthodoxy.<sup>6</sup> The movement centered on the conservative interpretation of monkhood and then the removal of married monks based on the interpretation. As he argued that the movement centered on the purification of monasticism in modern Korean Buddhism,<sup>7</sup> the issues of the order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage were secondary, not primary, in the movement.

---

<sup>3</sup> Paul Williams, "3 The Nature and Origins of Mahāyāna Buddhism," in *Buddhist Thought: A Complete Introduction to the Indian Tradition* (London: Routledge, 2000), 96-111; and Paul Williams, "1 Introduction," in *Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (London: Routledge, 2009), 1-44.

<sup>4</sup> Chanju Mun, "Purification Buddhist Movement, 1954-62: The Recovery of Traditional Monasticism from Japanized Buddhism in South Korea," in *Hsi Lai Journal of Humanistic Buddhism* 8 (2007): 262-294.

<sup>5</sup> Chanju Mun, "Purification Buddhist Movement, 1954-1962: Interconnecting Ecumenism and Sectarianism," in forthcoming *Daegak sasang* (Maha Bodhi Thought) 14 (2010).

<sup>6</sup> I Cheongdam, "Na ui pyeollyeok 119, jongdan gwa gyeollyeol" (My Journey 119: Divorce from Jogye Order), in the September 3, 1969 issue of the national newspaper *Maeil gyeongje sinmun*.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

They were very arbitrary and free in interpreting the issues from their sectarian, political and ideological perspectives. While married monks creatively and progressively interpreted monkhood and defended their married monasticism, unmarried monks literally and conservatively interpreted monkhood and strongly criticized married monasticism.

The movement was a sectarian and political one for celibate monks and celibate monks successively accomplished the goals of the movement from their sectarian perspective. Celibate monks removed married monks from the united order between celibate monks and married monks and made it a sectarian order. Married monks separated themselves from the united Jogye Order and established their own order named Taego Order for their sectarian purpose. So, two groups did not theoretically and doctrinally discuss whether the issues of married monasticism and vegetarianism were helpful for modernizing the order and Korean Buddhism and how to constructively develop the order and Korean Buddhism. They spent their energy to strive for hegemony in the order, not to harmonize both sides and develop Korean Buddhism.

Referring to Williams' presupposition, I considered the split of the monastic order in modern Korean Buddhism as the first division of the united monastic order based on different interpretations of orthopraxy (vinaya) in the history of Korean Buddhism. Before the movement, Korean Buddhism which had institutionally preserved ecumenical tradition since the introduction of Buddhism to the Korean Peninsula began to have two sectarian and divided institutional orders, the Jogye Order of unmarried monks and Taego Order of married monks. The division of Korean Buddhism into two orders, Jogye Order and Taego Order, has historically and religiously significant meanings in the history of Korean Buddhism. In conclusion, I applied the institutional paradigm of ecumenism and sectarianism and comprehensively analyze the division of Korean Buddhism into two orders in this book.

## 2. A critical review of previous academic research

Min Dogwang published a book of 832 pages entitled *Hanguk bulgyo seungdan jeonghwa-sa* (The History of Purification Buddhist Movement in Korean Buddhist Monastic Order) (Gyeongju: Daehan bulgyo seungdan jeonghwa-sa pyeonchan wiwon-hoe (The Committee of Editing the History of Purification Buddhist Movement in Korean Buddhist Monastic Order), 1996). He chronologically and from the sectarian perspective of celibate monks included in the book source materials and daily reports on the movement from August 24, 1954 to August 16, 1955 for twelve months and 358 days. It was the first and most comprehensive source book on the movement during its first and most important period. I incorporated this source book in introducing the early stage of the movement.

Gim Gwangsik, a renowned specialist in modern and contemporary Korean Buddhism, along with I Cheolgyo (b. 1947), compiled source materials for the

movement in a book of 780 pages entitled *Hanguk geun hyeondae Bulgyo jaryo jeonjip*, vol. 68: *Bulgyo jeonghwa bunjaeng jaryo* (The Complete Collection of Source Materials of Modern and Contemporary Buddhism, vol. 68: Source Materials of Purification Buddhist Movement) (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1996), which smoothly paved historians and sociologists, including Chanju Mun, in modern and current Korean Buddhism to conduct research on the movement academically and extensively.

Seonu Doryang, a progressive Buddhist organization, published the *Sinmun euro bon hanguk bulgyo geunhyeondae-sa* (The History of Modern Korean Buddhism through the Newspaper Articles), 4 volumes (Seoul: Seonu Doryang Press, 1995 & 1999). It published two volumes in 1995 and other two volumes in 1999. Its first volume comprehensively included articles from the three major national newspapers, *Joseon ilbo*, *Dong-a ilbo*, and *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, on the movement, pp. 179-455. I heavily and extensively used this source book in introducing historical records of the movement in this current book.

The Association for the Modern and Contemporary History of Korean Buddhism affiliated with Seonu Doryang, a progressive and engaged Buddhist organization of Jogye Order, and the *Buddhist Newspaper*, the official newspaper of Jogye Order, co-hosted the conference on the movement on September 19, 2000 and published a book of 214 pages entitled *Gyodan jeonghwa undong gwa Jogye-jong ui oneul* (Purification Buddhist Movement and Current Jogye Order) (Seoul: Seonu Doryang chulpan-bu, 2001), including four articles and their respective comments presented at the conference. It was the first academic book on the subject published in Korea.

The Taego Order of Korean Buddhism commissioned an editorial committee for publishing its history and in cooperation with Gim Yeongtae (b. 1933), a renowned specialist in the history of Korean Buddhism, published a book of 517 pages entitled *Taego jongsu: Hanguk bulgyo jeongtong jongdan ui yeoksa* (The History of the Taego Order of Korean Buddhism: The History of an Orthodox Order in Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Hanguk bulgyo chulpan-bu, 2006) on January 20, 2006. He used a number of source materials which the Taego Order of Korean Buddhism collected and supported his arguments.

The controversial book negatively defined the movement as a government-sponsored institutional Buddhist movement and positively defended the Taego Order of Korean Buddhism that married monastics of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism separated themselves from the Jogye Order and newly and officially founded in 1970. It defined the current Taego Order as the legitimate order and the current Jogye Order as the illegitimate one in Korean Buddhism. It was a very sectarianistically comprehensive and consistent book for the Taego Order and justified the division of the Jogye Order and the new foundation of the Taego Order.

It, furthermore, considered the movement as a serious persecution from the Korean government and strongly asserted that the movement was not authentic

and not independent. It ignited a big issue on the movement in the Korean Buddhist community because it directly and vehemently questioned and criticized the identity of the current Jogye Order, the biggest order of Korean Buddhism, asserting that the order originated from the government's sponsorship and authorization.

In May 2006, Beomeo-sa Temple and Dongsan mundo-hoe (Association of Master Ha Dongsan's Dharma Descendants) decided to counterattack the order's official theoretical attacks against the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism and the Purification Buddhist Movement. They, in cooperation with Gim Gwangsik, interviewed with 33 persons on Ha Dongsan and the movement and published the live interviews in a 621 page book of one volume entitled *Dongsan daejongsa wa bulgyo jeonghwa undong* (Grand Master Ha Dongsan and Purification Buddhist Movement) (Busan: Yeonggwang doseo, 2007). Most of 33 interviewees are his disciples and close junior monks. The supporters and followers of Ha Dongsan and the movement defended the movement from their sectarian perspectives.

On May 8, 2007, Beomeo-sa Temple also hosted a conference on the theme of Ha Dongsan and the movement in its Lecture Hall. Chae Inhwan (b. 1931) delivered a keynote speech entitled "Dongsan daejongsa wa bulgyo jeonghwa undong eul dasi bomyeo" (Reexamination of Grand Master Ha Dongsan and Purification Buddhist Movement).<sup>8</sup> The temple hosted the conference to theoretically rebut the Taego Order's sectarian and negative arguments on the movement and strongly defended the movement from their own sectarian perspectives.

The Research Institute for the History of Korean Buddhist Orders (Director: Im Deoksan) and Gim Gwangsik continued the further interviews with 18 persons on Ha Dongsan and the movement and included those in the first part of *Beomeo-sa wa bulgyo jeonghwa undong* (Beomeo-sa Temple and Purification Buddhist Movement) (Busan: Yeonggwang doseo, 2008), pp. 43-521. 18 interviewees are closely related to Ha Dongsan and most of them are his disciples and close junior monks.

Buddhology Institute of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism edited nine articles on the movement from the order's sectarian perspective and published a book of 397 pages entitled *Bulgyo jeonghwa ui jaejomyeong* (Reexamination of Purification Buddhist Movement) (Seoul: Jogye-jong chulpan-sa, 2008). Jogye Order attempted to defend and justify the movement through the book from its sectarian perspective at its order's level. Nine scholars defensively analyzed the movement from the historical, economical, sociological, and political perspectives in each article.

---

<sup>8</sup> Beomeo-sa Temple, ed., *Haksul semina jaryo-jip: Dongsan daejongsa wa bulgyo jeonghwa undong* (Conference Source Materials: Grand Master Ha Dongsan and Purification Buddhist Movement) (Busan: Beomeo-sa Temple, 2007), 1-5.

Geum-o seon suhaeng yeongu-won (The Research Institute for Seon Master Jeong Geum-o's Seon Praxis) edited a book of two volumes entitled *Geum-o seunim gwa bulgyo jeonghwa undong* (Master Jeong Geum-o and Purification Buddhist Movement) (Seoul: Geum-o seon suhaeng yeongu-won, 2008). The book outlined Jeong Geum-o and the movement in the first volume and included 19 interviews on Jeong Geum-o and the movement along with the biography of Jeong Geum-o and an article on Jeong Geum-o and the movement by Song Wolju, a disciple of Jeong Geum-o in the second volume. Most of 19 interviewees are his disciples and close junior monks.

The book might be the most comprehensive one on Jeong Geum-o, one of the five major figures as Ha Dongsan, I Hyobong, Jeong Geum-o, I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha of the movement. Even though it is difficult that we say the book as an academic research one because it does not follow academic writing styles and does not provide proper notes and a bibliography, it helps us draw a general picture for the movement. However, it described Jeong Geum-o, one of the movement's major leaders, in particular and the movement in general, apologetically and defensively, not neutrally and objectively.

It actually originated from two reasons. First, it aimed at defending Jeong Geum-o and the Purification Buddhist Movement from the negative theoretical attacks of Taego Order, a newly established order for the married monastics of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism in 1970, and advertizing how sincerely Jeong Geum-o dedicated himself to the movement. It might be an academic reaction to the book by Gim Yeongtae. Even though the book extensively outlined the movement, it was not academic but general for common readers. It seemed like a book for propagandizing the movement's authenticity.

Academically speaking, the *Taego jongsae* by Gim Yeongtae was the most consistent and comprehensive research book on the topic from the Taego Order's sectarian perspective and the usage of source materials. Even though the defenders and supporters of the movement published their articles included in several books, we could find out any research book by one author who consistently and comprehensively analyzed the movement. Even so, Gim Gwangsik might be the most important scholar who academically challenged Gim Yeongtae in a number of articles, not in a book, on the movement from the Jogye Order's sectarian perspective.

Even though Gim Gwangsik did not publish an independent book on the movement, he published a number of articles and actually led the research on the movement. He especially included six articles on the movement in his book entitled *Geunhyeondae bulgyo ui jaejomyeong* (Reexamination of Modern and Contemporary Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 2000), pp. 379-587; four articles on the movement in his book entitled *Sae bulgyo undong ui jeon-gae: Seongchallo bon 20 segi uri bulgyo* (The Development of New Movements in Korean Buddhism in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century) (Anseong: Dopian-sa Temple Press, 2002), pp. 313-459; six articles on the movement's major leaders including I Cheongdam, in his book entitled *Hanguk hyeondae bulgyo-sa yeongu* (Research

on the History of Contemporary Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Bulgyo sidae-sa, 2006), pp. 299-504; and other articles in different sources.

As shown above, scholars generally published a number of articles on the movement from the historical, very rarely economic, perspectives and academically sympathized and defended the movement from the Jogye Order's sectarian perspective. Unlike the previous researches by scholars on the subject, I attempted to comprehensively analyze it from the philosophical perspective in this current book. So, based on my previous research,<sup>9</sup> I adopted two key concepts of ecumenism and sectarianism and defined the movement as being institutionally sectarian throughout this book.

From the neutral and objective perspective, I comprehensively reexamined and completely negated the movement's duration, 1954-1962, which the current Jogye Order officially accepted. The order officially asserted that the celibate monks initiated the movement with President I Seungman's 1<sup>st</sup> presidential message issued on May 20, 1954 and completed it upon the official establishment of the order's united administration on April 14, 1962. However, I philosophically adopted the two key concepts and defined the movement as a sectarian one for celibate monks. So, unlike the order's official argument, I contended in this book that celibate monks began the sectarian movement for themselves on May 20, 1954, did not continue its sectarian momentum upon the establishment of the order's ecumenical administration in 1962, but institutionally completed the movement based on the establishment of a new sectarian order for married monks named Taego Order on May 8, 1970, making the established Jogye Order as a sectarian order for celibate monks.

Even though the order emphasized the establishment of the order's united administration and concluded the establishment as the movement's official end, if we accept its argument, it is logically supposed to negate the movement's sectarian characteristics for celibate monks and accept its ecumenical ones for both celibate and married monks. If so, we can see the discontinuation and inconsistency of the sectarian movement for celibate monks in the establishment of the order's united administration. So, because the order's argument was logically and in principle contradictory to the sectarian movement, I did not consider the order's united administration as the movement's official end but the movement's discontinuation. So, I considered the movement as being continued from 1954 to 1970 and conducted research on the movement, 1954-1970, in this current book.

This book appears to be the first research on the movement either in Korea or elsewhere to neutrally analyze philosophically without a sectarian agenda. It might be the second research book on the topic written by a scholar after the

---

<sup>9</sup> I incorporated in this book my previous published under the titles of *The History of Doctrinal Classification in Chinese Buddhism: A Study of the Panjiao Systems* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 2006) and *Ha Dongsan and Colonial Korean Buddhism: Balancing Sectarianism and Ecumenism* (Honolulu: Blue Pine, 2009) and my article entitled "Purification Buddhist Movement, 1954-1962."

book by Gim Yeongtae. From a non-sectarian academic perspective, it challenges the Taego Order's sectarian positions on the movement which Gim Yeongtae crystallized in his book and reexamines the Jogye Order's sectarian positions on the movement. It attempts to deconstruct the sectarian arguments of both sides and to present new understandings of the movement as neutrally and objectively as possible.

### 3. Methodology

I academically discussed the Purification Buddhist Movement, 1954-1970 in this current book. Prior to this research, the majority of scholars in modern Korean Buddhism have discussed the topic from the historical, rarely economic and sociological, perspectives. However, I attempted to analyze the subject from a philosophical perspective. I applied the two key concepts of ecumenism and sectarianism which I devised and used in my previous research and philosophically analyzed the movement accordingly. The basic objective of the movement was to recover the tradition of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism from Korean Buddhism Japanized during the colonial period, 1910-1945. So, celibate monks initiated the movement in 1954, removed married monks and completely recovered traditional monasticism of Korean Buddhism in their Jogye Order in 1970.

While unmarried monks advocated the movement based on the stubborn, literal and conservative interpretation of orthopraxy (precepts and vinaya), not orthodoxy (doctrines and texts), married monks opposed the movement based on the free, arbitrary and progressive interpretation of orthopraxy. While unmarried monks tried to remove married monks from the Jogye Order and sectarianistically establish the order only for themselves, married monks attempted to ecumenically maintain the order composed of two groups of married and unmarried monks. While unmarried monks advocated the movement from their sectarian perspective, married monks opposed the movement from their ecumenical perspective. Both sides politically, not neutrally and objectively, interpreted orthopraxy and strongly defended their political positions. They interpreted and utilized precepts for their political interests.

I emphasize precepts in analyzing the movement and examine the precepts upon which Korean Buddhists have relied. So, I analyze in this book how and why celibate monks interpreted the precepts, advocated the movement and removed married monks from their sectarian perspectives. They strongly emphasized some major precepts of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism but intentionally ignored some major precepts of non-violence and the separation of state and religion for their political interests. For example, they accomplished the movement's objectives through relying on violence and the government's strong support. While they literally interpreted and strictly applied the precepts of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism, they freely interpreted and loosely

applied the precepts of nonviolence and the separation between state and religion in the movement. They inconsistently and contradictorily interpreted and utilized precepts for their political interests.

Unlike celibate monks, married monks did not literally and strictly interpret and apply precepts. They liberally and progressively interpreted and applied precepts and advocated their married monasticism and non-vegetarianism. They introduced the concept of modernization and defended their married monasticism and non-vegetarianism. They argued that Korean Buddhists absolutely need married monasticism and non-vegetarianism for modernizing their Buddhism. However, when they defended married monasticism and vegetarianism, they freely and progressively interpreted the precepts of celibate monasticism and non-vegetarianism. When they criticized the government-sponsored and violent movement, they literally interpreted and strictly applied the precepts of nonviolence and the separation between state and religion. Like unmarried monks, they also were inconsistent and contradictory in interpreting and applying precepts.

When I examine the above-mentioned main themes in this research book, I prioritize primary sources to secondary ones and minimized to use the secondary sources. When I discuss Buddhism prior to modern Korean Buddhism in this book, I mainly use source materials including the *Taishō Canon*, the *Zoku zōkyō* (Japanese Sequential Canon) and the *Hanguk bulgyo jeonseo* (The Collected Works of Korean Buddhists). I mainly utilize the *Taisho Canon* for Indo-Chinese Buddhism, the *Taishō Canon* and the *Zoku zōkyō* for Chinese Buddhism and the *Hanguk bulgyo jeonseo* for Korean Buddhism. When modern Korean Buddhist masters referred to pre-modern texts, I use the online texts of the abovementioned three main sources and easily identified their citations from original and pre-modern sources.

I use the *Hanguk geun-hyeondae bulgyo-sa yeonpyo* (A Chronological Table for Modern and Present Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Board of Education of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, 2000) edited by Buddhology Institute of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, the *Hanguk bulgyo chongnam* (The Comprehensive Collection of Source Materials of Contemporary Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Daehan bulgyo jinheung-won, 1993) edited by Hanguk bulgyo chongnam pyeonjip wiwon-hoe (The Committee for Editing the Comprehensive Collection of Source Materials of Contemporary Korean Buddhism) and the *Hanguk geunse bulgyo baengnyeong-sa* (The History of Modern Korean Buddhism for the Recent 100 Years), 4 vols, reprint (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1994) edited by Sambo Hakhoe as reference works for modern Korean Buddhism in general.

I use the following three source books for primary source materials in my discussion of the movement. First, when I examine the movement's earliest stage from August 24, 1954 to August 16, 1955, I use Min Dogwang's *Hanguk bulgyo seungdan jeonghwa-sa* (The History of Purification Buddhist Movement in Korean Buddhist Monastic Order). Second, I also utilize source materials



entitled *Bulgyo jeonghwa bunjaeng jaryo-jip* (Source Materials of Purification Buddhist Movement), compiled by I Cheolgyo and Gim Gwangsik. Third, I also use the *Sinmun euro bon hanguk bulgyo geunhyeondae-sa* (The History of Modern Korean Buddhism through the Newspaper Articles) in four volumes.

When I discuss the movement's orthopraxy in this book, I use the *Brahma Net Sūtra* (T.24.1848.997a3-1010a23) as the primary source material. I refer to its Korean translations and commentaries such as Gim Ilta's (1929-1999) *Beommang-gyeong bosal-gye* (Bodhisattva Precepts in the *Brahma Net Sūtra*), 5 volumes (Seoul: Hyorim, 1992), Sim Jaeyeol's (b. 1935) *Bosal gyebon Beommang-gyeong* (Bodhisattva Precepts of the *Brahma Net Sūtra*) (Seoul: Boseong munhwa-sa, 1979) and Yu Seogam's (1911-1992) *Beommang-gyeong: Yu Seogam yulsa seolbeop* (The *Brahma Net Sūtra* and Vinaya Master Yu Seogam's Sermons) (Seoul: Daehak chulpan-sa, 1988). I also referred to a research book entitled *Hanguk bulgyo gyeul jeongtong: Hanguk bulgyo gyebeop ui jajujeok jeonseung* (Korean Buddhism's Vinaya Tradition: Korean Buddhism's Independent Transmission of the Vinaya Teaching) (Seoul: Gasan bulgyo munhwa yeongu-won, 2005) by I Jigwan (b. 1932). When I need to refer to the scripture in this book, I heavily and frequently cite the English translation of *The Very Mahāyāna Buddhist Ethics: Introduction and Translation of the Fan-wan-ching* by Shigeru Osuka.

I discuss colonial Korean Buddhism by referring to the following two source materials. First, I heavily use I Cheolgyo · Gim Gwangsik's compiled *Hanguk geun hyeondae Bulgyo jaryo jeonjip* (The Collection of Source Materials of Modern and Contemporary Buddhism), 70 volumes (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1996). The collection included the majority of magazines, proceedings and other documents published during the colonial period from the first to the 67<sup>th</sup> volumes and some documents and magazines published during the post-colonial period from the 68<sup>th</sup> to the 69<sup>th</sup> volumes. Its last 70<sup>th</sup> volume was the annotated catalogue. Along with the above source materials, I also use Jogye Order's edited *Ilje sidae bulgyo jeongchaek gwa hyeonhwang: Joseon chongdok-bu gwanbo bulgyo gwallyeon jaryo-jip* (Japanese Government-General's Policy of Buddhism and the Status Quo: The Collection of Buddhist Source Materials Published in Japanese Government-General's Official Gazette), two volumes (Seoul: Jogye Order, 2001).

Modern scholars used to conduct research by using mainly two methodologies, philological (textual) and hermeneutical (interpretive) methodologies in Buddhist Studies. I also incorporate these two methodologies to examine the movement. First, I adopt the hermeneutical methodology, incorporate two key concepts of ecumenism and sectarianism and define the movement with the institutional paradigm of sectarianism and ecumenism. Second, even though I prioritize hermeneutical to philological methodology, I sincerely adopt textual methodology and textually attempt to prove my interpretations. I include both of these methodologies in this book.

I basically approach and analyze the movement from philosophical perspectives. Even so, I do exclude historical perspectives in dealing with the subject. Because I prioritize philosophical to historical methodology, I use philosophical methodology as the primary one and historical methodology as the second and supplementary one in this research. I attempt to objectively and neutrally interpret the movement and to verify my interpretations with the historical evidences and facts. I integrate and balance two different methods, i.e., interpretive and descriptive methods in investigating the movement.

Except for a few scholars, of course including Gim Yeongtae who systematically and comprehensively criticized the authenticity of the movement and published a book on the subject, even though the majority of scholars detailed the movement's side effects such as the adoption of violence and the serious reliance on the governmental authorities, they were basically sympathetic and supportive to the movement. I attempt to not simply follow the majority of scholars but to distance myself from the opponents of the movement. I hermeneutically de-sectarianize the movement and attempt to objectively and neutrally investigate it. I would not like to side with either of the groups but to carefully examine negative and positive aspects of both sides in this book.

## **PART I**

### **OVERVIEW OF KOREAN BUDDHISM: INTERCONNECTING SECTARIANISM AND ECUMENISM**

#### **1. Pre-modern Korean Buddhist**

##### **1.1. Late Silla and early Goryeo Dynasties<sup>1</sup>**

Korean Buddhism imported doctrinal Buddhism from Chinese Buddhism and developed doctrinal traditions in its earliest history. They accepted doctrinal traditions such as Mādhyamika, Yogācāra, Huayan Buddhism, and so on. While some scholars doctrinally and textually developed sectarianism, others advocated ecumenism. For example, while Woncheuk (613-696) and Uisang (625-702) represented the sectarian perspectives of Yogācāra and Huayan Buddhism respectively, Wonhyo (617-686) developed his own ecumenical views. We might be able to categorize early Korean Buddhism as the doctrinal and textual crossroads between ecumenism and sectarianism.

Upon the beginning of Chan Buddhism in Chinese Buddhism, Korean Buddhists began to introduce newly established Chan Buddhism and inter-relate

---

<sup>1</sup> I slightly revised and cited in this section my *Ha Dongsan and Colonial Buddhism: Balancing Sectarianism and Ecumenism* (Honolulu: Blue Pine, 2009), 348-353.

earlier introduced doctrinal Buddhism and later imported Chan Buddhism. While some Chan masters and scholars developed their own tradition's sectarianism, others advocated ecumenism between Chan and doctrinal traditions. We might be able to adopt the ecumenism/sectarianism paradigm and interconnect the two traditions of Chan and doctrinal Buddhism after the introduction of Chan Buddhism in Korean Buddhism.

So, in the late Silla and early Goryeo Dynasties, most of the Korean Chan Buddhist leaders, including Doui (d. 821),<sup>2</sup> the founder of the Seon lineage established on Mt. Gaji; Muyeom (800-888), the founder of the Seon lineage on Mt. Seongju; and Beomil (810-894), the founder of the Seon lineage on Mt. Sagul, among others, were Chan sectarians. Those who introduced Southern Chan Buddhism and respectively established their own Chan traditions were Chan sectarians.<sup>3</sup>

However, unlike the abovementioned Chan sectarians, Sunji was an ecumenist between Chan Buddhism and the doctrinal tradition of Huayan Buddhism. He went to Tang China in 858 and practiced Buddhism under Chan Master Yangshan Huiji (807-883), a disciple of Mazu Daoyi (709-788). He came back to Korea in 874 and he spread his ecumenical view between these two seemingly opposing traditions.<sup>4</sup>

In late Silla, the doctrinal traditions and the Seon traditions competed with each other.<sup>5</sup> Because King Taejo (r. 918-943), the founding ruler of the Goryeo Dynasty (918-1392), personally favored Seon Buddhism and politically sponsored it, Seon Buddhism increased its popularity in the dynasty. Seon Buddhism and Hwaeom (Huayan) Buddhism represented both sides and competed with each other.

Because the doctrinal traditions such as Huayan and Yogācāra Buddhism gained influence from King Hyeonjong (r. 1009-1031) on, they became antagonistic to the Seon traditions. Huayan and Yogācāra Buddhism became the two major traditions and Chan Buddhism demoted to the third major tradition. The two doctrinal traditions, Huayan and Yogācāra Buddhism, competed with each other, developed their sectarian positions and opposed each other.

Rediscovering and incorporating Wonhyo's ecumenism, Uicheon (1055-1101) tried to harmonize two doctrinal traditions, Huayan and Yogācāra Buddhism, and the doctrinal traditions and Seon tradition. And he imported Tiantai Buddhism from China and officially established Tiantai (Kor., Cheontae) Sect with the support of the court in Korea. He originally belonged to and was

---

<sup>2</sup> I Jeong, ed., *Hanguk bulgyo inmyeong sajeon* (Dictionary of Korean Buddhist Names) (Seoul: Bulgyo sidae-sa, 1997), 74-75.

<sup>3</sup> Ho-ryeon Jeon, "Interaction and Harmonization between Hwa-eom and Seon in Korea during the late Silla and Early Goryeo Period," in *International Journal of Buddhist Thought and Culture* 4 (February 2004): 61-90.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, 78-81.

<sup>5</sup> Jo Myeonggi, *Goryeo Daegak guksa wa cheontae sasang* (National Master Daegak Uicheon and his Cheontae Thought) (Seoul: Gyeongseo-won, 1982), 105-107.

trained in the Huayan tradition. He established the Tiantai Sect based on his own Huayan Sect. He tried to ecumenize the two established doctrinal traditions of Huayan and Yogācāra Buddhism and the established practical tradition of Seon Buddhism with his newly-established Tiantai Sect.

Before his establishment of the Cheontae Sect in Korea, there were five doctrinal traditions: Wonyung (Huayan) Sect, Beopsang (Yogācāra) Sect, Beopseong (Dharma Nature) Sect, Gyeyul (Vinaya) Sect and Yeolban (Nirvāṇa) Sect and nine Chan (Seon) traditions. Each Chan tradition was respectively established on each mountain of nine such as Mt. Gaji, Mt. Sagul, Mt. Saja, Mt. Seongju, Mt. Bongnim, Mt. Dongni, Mt. Huiyang, Mt. Sumi and Mt. Silsang.<sup>6</sup> After his establishment of the Cheontae Sect, the titles of the five doctrinal sects were changed to Hwaeom Sect, Jaeun Sect, Jungdo Sect, Namsan Sect and Siheung Sect.

Jo Myeonggi (1905-1988),<sup>7</sup> specialist in Korean Cheontae Buddhism, asserted that the title of the Wonyung Sect might be changed to the Hwaeom Sect based on its authoritative scripture, i.e., the *Huayan Sūtra*; the title of the Beopsang Sect to the Jaeun (Chn., Cien) Sect based on the name of Cien-si Temple on which Kuiji (632-682) established Chinese Yogācāra Buddhist Sect; the title of the Beopseong Sect to the Jungdo (Skt., Mādhyamika; Chn., Zhongdao) Sect based on its doctrine; the title of the Gyeyul (Vinaya) Sect to the Namsan (Southern Mountain) Sect based on the name of a mountain on which Daoxuan (596-667) established Chinese Vinaya Sect; and the title of the Yeolban Sect to the Siheung (Chn., Shixing) Sect based on the name of Mt. Shixing on which a monk founded Chinese Nirvāṇa Sect.<sup>8</sup>

Nine Seon traditions were established on nine mountains.<sup>9</sup> Doui of the Silla Dynasty first introduced the Southern tradition of Chinese Chan Buddhism from China. He learned and inherited Chan Buddhism from Xitang Zhizang (734-814), a disciple of Mazu Daoyi. He also studied Chan Buddhism under Baizhang Huaihai (720-814), another disciple of Mazu Daoyi. He studied Chan Buddhism in China between 784 and 821. Even though he tried to spread his Seon Buddhism in Silla, nobody accepted it. He established and practiced Seon Buddhism for forty years at Jinjeon-sa Temple on Mt. Seorak in Yangyang County, Gangwon Province.<sup>10</sup> He inherited his teaching to his disciple Yeomgeo (d. 844)<sup>11</sup> who was mostly active and propagated Seon Buddhism at Eokseong-sa Temple on Mt. Seorak. His grand disciple Bojo Chejing (804-880)<sup>12</sup> established Borim-sa Temple on Mt. Gaji in Jangheung County, South Jeolla

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, 138-141.

<sup>7</sup> I Jeong, ed. 270.

<sup>8</sup> Jo Myeonggi, 138.

<sup>9</sup> Ho-ryeon Jeon, 64-67.

<sup>10</sup> I Dongsul, ed., *Hanguk sachal bogam* (Dictionary of Korean Buddhist Temples) (Seoul: Uri chulpan-sa, 1997), 403.

<sup>11</sup> I Jeong, ed., 182.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, 304-305.

Province and founded a Seon lineage. Chejing received full ordination at Bowon-sa Temple on Mt. Garyanghyeop and learned Seon Buddhism under his master Yeomgeo at Eokseong-sa Temple. He visited various Chan masters between 837 and 840 in China and realized that the Seon teaching of Doui was the most valuable. After coming back to Korea from China, he established a Seon lineage at Borim-sa Temple.

Second, Hongcheok<sup>13</sup> also studied Chan Buddhism under Xitang Zhizang and inherited the Mazu Daoyi's Chan lineage from China. He extensively remodeled Silsang-sa Temple (on Mt. Jiri) in Namwon County, North Jeolla Province with the support of King Heungdeok (r. 826-836) and Crown Prince Seongwang and established a Seon lineage. He inherited his Chan lineage to his disciples Pyeon-un and Sucheol (817-893).<sup>14</sup>

Third, Hyecheol (791-861)<sup>15</sup> also studied Chan Buddhism under Xitang Zhizang in China. He learned Chan Buddhism between 814 and 839. He established his own lineage at Taeon-sa Temple on Mt. Dongni in Gokseong County, South Jeolla Province. His eminent disciples, including Doseon (827-898),<sup>16</sup> Yeo, Gyeongbo (868-948)<sup>17</sup> and Yunda, popularized the lineage.

Fourth, Hyeon-uk (787-868)<sup>18</sup> studied Chan Buddhism under Zhangjing Huaihui (756-815), a disciple of Mazu Daoyi. He learned Chan Buddhism between 824 and 837 in China. After he came back to Silla in 837, he had an intensive retreat at Silsang-sa Temple. Upon the request of King Gyeongmun (r. 861-875), he moved to and propagated Buddhism at Godal-sa Temple on Mt. Hyemok in Yeosu County, Gyeonggi Province.<sup>19</sup> He continuously received support from several kings such as King Minae (r. 838-839), King Sinmu (r. 839), King Munseong (r. 839-857), King Heonan (r. 857-861) and King Gyeongmun and popularized Seon Buddhism in Silla Korea. His disciple Simhui (854-923)<sup>20</sup> established Bongnim-sa Temple on Mt. Bongnim in Changwon County, South Gyeongsang Province in 901 at which he founded a Seon lineage.

Fifth, Doyun (798-868)<sup>21</sup> became a monk at the age of 18 in 815 and learned Seon and Hwaem Buddhism at Gwisin-sa Temple in Hwanghae Province. He learned Chan Buddhism between 825 and 847 in Tang China. He inherited the Chan teaching of Nanquan Puyuan (748-835), a disciple and dharma successor of Mazu Daoyi. After returning to Korea, he stayed on Mt. Geumgang (Diamond) and attracted many monks across the nation. He received

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, 359-360.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid, 157.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, 350-351.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, 71.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid, 17.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid, 335-336.

<sup>19</sup> I Dongsul, ed., 27.

<sup>20</sup> I Jeong, ed., 172.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid, 74.

respect from King Gyeongmun. Because he moved to Ssangbong-sa Temple on Mt. Jungjo in Hwasun County, South Jeolla Province,<sup>22</sup> he was also generally called Ssangbong Doyun. His disciple Jinghyo Jeoljung (826-900)<sup>23</sup> was active at Beopheung-sa Temple on Mt. Saja in Yeongwol County, Gangwon Province and established a Seon lineage.

Sixth, Muyeom became a monk at Osaekseok-sa Temple on Mt. Seorak at the age of 13 in 813 and learned Buddhism under Beopseong. He studied the *Huayan Sūtra* from Seokjing at Buseok-sa Temple on Mt. Bonghwang in Yeongju County, North Gyeongsang Province, considered as a representative Hwaom temple of Korean Buddhism.<sup>24</sup> He learned Hwaom and Seon Buddhism from various masters between 821 and 845 in China. He visited and inherited the Chan teaching of Magu Baoche,<sup>25</sup> a disciple of Mazu Daoyi. Prince Gim Yang, a son of King Munseong, requested him to preside over Ohap-sa Temple on Mt. Seongju in Boryeong County, South Chungcheong. As he taught Buddhism, many monks visited him. King Munseong officially changed the title of the temple to Seongju-sa Temple at which Muyeom established a Seon lineage. He became a national master for two kings, King Gyeongmun and King Heon-gang (r. 875-886).

Seventh, Beomil became a monk at the age of 15 in 824 and received full ordination at the age of 20 in 829. He entered China in 831 and studied Chan Buddhism under and inherited the lineage of Yanguan Zhaian (d. 842), a disciple of Mazu Daoyi, for six years. He also visited and learned Chan Buddhism from Yueshan Weiyan (c. 745-828), a disciple and dharma successor of Shitou Xiqian (700-790) and the master of Daowu Yuanzhi (c. 769-835) and Yunyan Tanshen (780-841). Upon having the severe Huichang persecution in 844, he hid himself and visited a memorial pagoda for the Sixth Patriarch Huineng (638-713) at Shangshan. In 847, he returned from China to Korea. In 850, upon the request of the governor of Myeongju County, he established Sagul-sa Temple (or Gusan-sa Temple) on Mt. Sagul in Myeongju County, Gangwon Province and founded a Seon lineage. His disciples including Nangwon Gaecheong (854-930)<sup>26</sup> and Nanggong Haengjeok (832-916)<sup>27</sup> inherited and popularized the Seon lineage.

Eighth, Jeom (866-932)<sup>28</sup> became a monk at Gayagap-sa Temple under Deongnyang at the age of 12 in 877 and received the full ordination from Vinaya Master Dogyeon in 886. In 896, he entered Tang China and since then, he studied Chan Buddhism for six years under Chan Master Yunju Daoying (d.

---

<sup>22</sup> I Dongsul, ed., 213.

<sup>23</sup> I Jeong, ed., 260.

<sup>24</sup> I Dongsul, ed., 182-183.

<sup>25</sup> See Ciyi, ed., *Foguang dacidian* (Foguang Dictionary of Buddhism), the 5<sup>th</sup> edition (Kao-hsiung: Taiwan: Foguang chupan-she, 1989), 4852.

<sup>26</sup> I Jeong, ed., 14.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid, 331-332.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, 238-239.

902), a disciple of Dongshan Liangjie (807-869). Except him, no Korean Seon master of nine Seon traditions inherited the Chan lineage of Caodong (Jpn., Sōtō) Sect from Tang China. Yunju Daoying continued the Chan lineage of Caodong Sect established by Dongshan Liangjie and his disciple Caoshan Benji (840-901). Zen Master Dōgen Kigen (1200-1253) was a later Dharma successor of this Chan lineage and Sōtō Zen in Japan continued its lineage even today. After learning Chan Buddhism under Yunju Daoying, he also visited various eminent Chan masters and in 911, he returned to his home nation Silla. He taught Seon Buddhism at Seungwang-sa Temple in Naju County, South Jeolla Province for four years. In 932, King Taejo, founder of the Goryeo Dynasty, established Gwangjo-sa Temple on Mt. Sumi in Haeju County, Hwanghae Province and appointed him to be its abbot. Since then, many Seon practitioners came to learn Seon Buddhism under him and formed a Seon lineage.

Ninth, Doheon (824-882)<sup>29</sup>, also known as Jiseon, established Bong-am-sa Temple on Mt. Huiyang in Mun-gyeong County, North Gyeongsang Province in 879<sup>30</sup> with the financial support of a layperson named Sim Chung, and founded a Seon lineage in Korea. King Heon-gang assigned the highest government official monk Hugong, also known as Jungong and the higher government official Bae Yulmun to decide the temple's boundary and named the temple to be Bong-am-sa Temple. He became a monk under Beomche at Buseok-sa Temple at the age of 9 in 832 and received the full ordination from Gyeong-ui at the age of 17 in 840. He studied Seon Buddhism under Hyeon who inherited the Seon lineage that Doyun established on Mt. Saja. He also stayed on Suseok-sa Temple on Mt. Gyeon. Even though King Gyeongmun respected and invited him to court, he did not respond to his invitation. He moved to and stayed at Allak-sa Temple on Mt. Hyeon and he later established Bong-am-sa Temple. He moved back to and lived at Allak-sa Temple. Even though King Heon-gang invited him to court and appointed him to be a royal master, he declined the king's offer. Yangbu (d. 917)<sup>31</sup> inherited his master Doheon's lineage and his disciple Geunyang (878-956) popularized the Seon lineage that Doheon established at Bong-am-sa Temple on Mt. Huiyang.

Geunyang was active in the late Silla and early Goryeo Dynasties and developed the Seon lineage that his grand master Doheon founded. He became a monk under Yeohae at Namhyeorwon Temple in Gongju County, South Chungcheong Province. He later studied Seon Buddhism under Yangbu, a disciple of Doheon, at Seohyeorwon Temple in Gongju County. Between 899 and 924, he studied Chan Buddhism under Yushan Daoyuan, a disciple of Shishuang Qingzhu, and other eminent Chan masters in Tang China. He became the abbot and taught Buddhism at Baegeom-sa Temple in Hapcheon County, South Gyeongsang Province and settled down at ruined Bong-am-sa Temple in Mun-gyeong County. He reestablished the temple and opened Seon centers in it.

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid, 280.

<sup>30</sup> I Dongsul, ed., 176-177.

<sup>31</sup> I Jeong, ed., 178.



He attracted Seon practitioners and propagated Seon Buddhism in Korea. He received respect and confidence from King Taejo, King Hyejong (r. 943-945), King Jeongjong (r. 945-949) and King Gwangjong (r. 949-975), the first four kings of Goryeo Dynasty (918-1392) and taught Buddhism to two kings such as King Taejo and King Gwangjong. King Gwangjong particularly invited him to Gaeseong, let them stay at Sana Seon Center in it and offered an honorific title entitled Jeunggong to him. Later he came back to and passed away at Bong-am-sa Temple. He along with disciples actually established and popularized the Seon lineage of Mt. Huiyang.

## 1.2. The Goryeo Dynasty<sup>32</sup>

Before the establishment of the Cheontae (Chn., Tiantai) Sect by Uicheon, Korean Buddhists used to categorize Korean Buddhism as five doctrinal sects and nine Seon lineages. After his establishment of the Cheontae Sect, Korean Buddhists categorized the nine Seon lineages to the Jogye Sect, a Seon sect and also defined the Cheontae Sect as a Seon sect.<sup>33</sup> Because the nine Seon lineages originated from Huineng, arguably the sixth patriarch of Chinese Chan Buddhism, Korean Buddhists named the Seon sect the Jogye (Chn., Caoxi) Sect adopting the name of Mt. Caoxi on which Huineng lived and taught Chan Buddhism. They also named the Cheontae Sect that Uicheon established in Korea, following the name of Mt. Tiantai on which Zhiyi (538-597), the founder of Tiantai Sect in Chinese Buddhism, stayed and taught Buddhism. Since then, Korean Buddhism formed the system of five doctrinal sects and two Seon sects and assigned the Jogye Sect and the Cheontae Sect to the category of two Seon sects.

Uicheon retired from Hongwon-sa Temple affiliated to Hwaom Sect to Haein-sa Temple on Mt. Gaya in Hapcheon County, South Gyeongsang Province and dedicated himself to writing books on Buddhism in 1094.<sup>34</sup> Upon the establishment of Gukcheong-sa Temple, the headquarters temple of the Cheontae Sect in Korea, he became its founding abbot in 1097. The government officially recognized the Cheontae Sect and arranged the first state examination for the sect in April 1099.

The state examination system for monks in the Goryeo Dynasty, established by King Gwangjong, allowed each government-authorized sect authority to take its examinations for its monks and let them take the government-operating examinations in the dynasty's capital Gaeseong. The government officials and eminent monks presided over state examinations per three years, modeling after state examinations for civil servants. Government dispatched its officials to the

---

<sup>32</sup> I slightly revised and cited in this section Mun, *Ha Dongsan*, 354-358, 390-392.

<sup>33</sup> Jo Myeonggi, 138-140.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid, 103-105.

government-operating examinations and supervised them along with eminent monks.

When monks passed state examinations, they would receive hierarchically-classified titles from the government, could wear the hierarchically-arranged robes and could have the qualifications for abbots and other higher positions in their own sects and the government's clerical ranks. The state examinations had two kinds, i.e., those for doctrinal sects and those for Seon sects. The monks who passed either of the two kinds of the examinations could promote themselves from the first and lowest level to the seventh and highest level in its respective kind. Because the Cheontae Sect was assigned to a Seon sect, its monks should take the examination for Seon sects and should follow the seven-leveled clerical system of the Seon sects.

Gukcheong-sa Temple, the headquarters temple of Korean Cheontae Sect, received strong support from his elder brother King Sukjong (r. 1096-1105). When he began to teach Cheontae doctrines at the temple, many monks changed their sectarian affiliations from their sects to the newly-established Cheontae Sect. Through six great parish headquarters temples and three administrative headquarters temples across the nation, the sect systematically managed its affiliated temples. The sect assigned three administrative headquarters temples, Gukcheong-sa Temple of Gaepung County, Gyeonggi Province<sup>35</sup> in the nation's central region, Seonbong-sa Temple of Chilgok County, North Gyeongsang Province<sup>36</sup> in its southern region and Sin-gwang-sa Temple of Byeokseong County, Hwanghae Province<sup>37</sup> in its northern region and let each of the three temples manage and control temples and monks in its respective area.

Prior to the official establishment of Cheontae Sect in the Goryeo Dynasty, Neungeung and other monks presented a memorial to the founding king Taejo in which they suggested him to sponsor the establishment of the Cheontae Sect in the Goryeo Kingdom based on the synthesis of the skillful means of three vehicles<sup>38</sup> to the ultimate truth of one vehicle and the doctrine of the threefold contemplation in a single mind.<sup>39</sup> They also argued in it that if they could

---

<sup>35</sup> I Dongsul, ed., 42-43.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid, 227.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid, 262.

<sup>38</sup> Three vehicles are the vehicle of *śrāvaka*, the vehicle of *pratyekabuddha*, and the vehicle of *bodhisattva*.

<sup>39</sup> See the entry of "Threefold Contemplation in a Single Mind" in the English Buddhist Dictionary Committee, ed., *Soka Gakkai Dictionary of Buddhism* (Tokyo: Soka Gakkai, 2002), 704-705. Tiantai Zhiyi formulated the threefold contemplation in a single mind in his *Great Concentration and Insight* and enabled people to understand the synthesis of the three truths of non-substantiality, provisional existence and the Middle Way. While the concept of synthesis of the three truths is the core of Tiantai teachings, the threefold contemplation in a single mind is the core of Tiantai practice. "T'ien-t'ai doctrine regards each phenomenon as a perfect unity of the three truths and sets forth the threefold contemplation in a single mind as the practice by which one attains insight into this perfect unity. This contemplation involves perceiving the three truths as

establish the sect, the kingdom could unite three fighting kingdoms of Silla, Later Baekje and Goryeo to one nation under the umbrella of his nation Goryeo based on the benefits originating from the sect's foundation.<sup>40</sup> However, we cannot textually prove now whether or not the king approved the sect's foundation.

Min Ji composed "Record of the Miraculous Effects of Śākyamuni Buddha's Relics Enshrined in the Main Hall of Gukcheong-sa Temple" ("Gukcheong-sa geumdang jubul seokga yeorae sari yeong-i gi") included in the 68<sup>th</sup> fascicle of *Selection of Korean Literary Writings (Dongmun seon)* compiled by Seo Geojeong (1420-1488) and others and first published in 1478. It constitutes one hundred thirty fascicles. Referring to the establishment of Guoqing-si (Kor., Gukcheong-sa) Temple, the headquarters temple of Chinese Tiantai Buddhism, on Mt. Tiantai,<sup>41</sup> he introduced the memorial by Neunggeung and other monks to King Taejo and related the foundation story of the Gukcheong-sa Temple to state protectionism.<sup>42</sup>

Uicheon learned Tiantai Buddhism from Cibian Congjian in Song China and vowed in front of the stūpa of Zhiyi on Mt. Tiantai that he would establish and dedicate himself to popularize the Cheontae Sect for his whole life if he moved back to his nation of Korea. He received a hand incense burner and a flywhisk from Cibian Congjian, transmitted the Tiantai Dharma lineage of Chinese Buddhism from him and established a new Dharma lineage of Korean Cheontae Buddhism by himself.

He thought that even though his previous scholars Wonhyo and Che-gwan (d. 917) of Cheontae Buddhism conducted sophisticated research and published excellent books on Tiantai Buddhism, they could not establish Korean Cheontae Sect. Of the two previous scholars, even though he highly evaluated Che-gwan, a representative Tiantai sectarian scholar of East Asian Buddhism, he did not

---

simultaneously and perfectly being integrated and interfused in each phenomenon. By doing so, one is said to rid oneself of the three categories of illusion and acquire at once the three kinds of wisdom – the wisdom of the two vehicles, the wisdom of bodhisattvas, and the Buddha wisdom. T'ien-t'ai also describes a single mind as comprising the three thousand realms within it. At the same time, one perceives that all phenomena consist of the three thousand realms." (pp. 704-705)

<sup>40</sup> Jo Myeonggi, 104-105.

<sup>41</sup> See the *Sui Tiantai Zhizhe dashi biezhuàn* (A Separate Biography of Master Tiantai Zhiyi of the Sui Dynasty), T.50.2050.191a20-198a1. We can see a passage directly related to the unification of three divided Chinese kingdoms in one united nation of Sui through the establishment of Guoqing-si Temple on Mt. Tiantai in it, T.50.2050.193a11-21.

<sup>42</sup> I cited the quote from I Jaechang, "Daegak guksa Uicheon ui Cheontae-jong gaerip" (Establishment of Korean Cheontae Sect by Uicheon), in Bulgyo munhwa yeongu-so (Korean Buddhist Culture Research Institute), ed., *Hanguk Cheontae sasang yeongu* (The Studies of Korean Tiantai Thoughts) (Seoul: Dongguk University Press, 1983), p. 188, footnote # 35.

follow after Che-gwan's Tiantai sectarianism but modeled after the ecumenical research of Wonhyo on the *Lotus Sūtra* and Tiantai Buddhism.

Five doctrinal sects and nine mountain Seon lineages originated from previous Silla Dynasty. He established his own Cheontae Sect in newly established Goryeo Dynasty. Even though he learned Buddhism from various Buddhist traditions, he classified Hwaeom and Cheontae Buddhism as the highest teachings. Of two highest teachings, he seemed to value Chinese Tiantai Buddhism over Hwaeom Buddhism and attempted to establish Korean Cheontae Sect and unite sectarian Korean Buddhism under Tiantai Buddhism.

Before he went to China, he wished to establish the Cheontae Sect. While in China between 1085 and 1086 for fourteen months, he focused on learning Hwaeom and Cheontae Buddhism. He studied Tiantai Buddhism from Cibian Congjian in Hangzhou. He also visited Mt. Tiantai and worshipped the memorial stūpa for Zhiyi, actual founder of Chinese Tiantai Sect, in front of which he made a solemn vow that he would dedicate himself to propagate Cheontae Buddhism after going back to Korea.<sup>43</sup>

Before him, doctrinal Buddhism and practical Seon Buddhism competed and criticized each other. He argued that by incorporating Hwaeom and Cheontae Buddhism, he could harmonize doctrine with meditation. He thought that because Cheontae Buddhism was more practical than doctrinal Hwaeom Buddhism, Cheontae Buddhism was much more suitable to harmonize practical Seon Buddhism than Hwaeom Buddhism.<sup>44</sup> He unified sectarian traditions under his Cheontae Buddhism, indirectly referring to the Cheontae Buddhism's main doctrine of subsuming three vehicles to one vehicle.

Uicheon harmonized two major doctrinal traditions of East Asian Buddhism, i.e., Huayan Buddhism and Tiantai Buddhism. He was trained under the influence of the Huayan Buddhist tradition since the beginning of his monkhood in Korea. Later he transmitted Tiantai Buddhism from China and officially established the Tiantai tradition in Korea. He harmonized his originally affiliated Huayan Buddhism with Tiantai Buddhism that he transmitted from China, established under his leadership and popularized in Korea. He also thought that we should equally learn the doctrinal traditions and practice Seon Buddhism.

Jinul (1158-1210) sincerely followed ecumenical philosophy after previous Korean Buddhists, Wonhyo and Uicheon. He also loyally carried on the ecumenical position of Chinese Buddhist Zongmi (780-841), harmonizing doctrinal teachings with Chan tenets.<sup>45</sup> He developed a Korean version of ecumenism with his own characteristics. Even though he was indebted to

---

<sup>43</sup> H.4.551c20-552a8.

<sup>44</sup> Jo Myeonggi, 106.

<sup>45</sup> Jae-ryong Shim extensively discussed Korean Buddhism's ecumenism between Chan tenets and doctrinal teachings first comprehensively systematized by Jinul in the "Tradition" part (pp. 1-158) of his *Korean Buddhism: Tradition and Transformation* (Seoul: Jimoondang Publishing Company, 1999).

Zongmi for his ecumenical views, a new version of Zongmi ecumenism between Chan and doctrinal traditions was necessary for the Korean context in which Jinul lived.

First, he negated the strict division between doctrinal teachings and Chan tenets inherited from previous Chan sectarian advocates and opposed Chan sectarianism. During late United Silla and early Goryeo Dynasties, new Chinese Chan Buddhism was imported from China to the Korean peninsula. Korean monks went to China, studied this new tradition mostly affiliated to Mazu Daoyi's Chan lineage and returned home to teach. They invested all their efforts to prove the superiority of the new Chan Buddhism, particularly Mazu Daoyi's radical Chan lineage, over the doctrinal teachings, especially the Huayan tradition firmly established in the Korean monasteries before the introduction of Chan Buddhism. He cited many passages from Chinese Huayan exegetes, Zongmi, his master Chengguan (738-840), and the lay Buddhist scholar Li Tongxuan (646-740) and used them as the theoretical foundation for his Chan Buddhism.

Jinul denied their Chan and Huayan sectarian arguments. He dedicated himself to an ecumenical approach involving both traditions. In this context, he is totally different from Zongmi's main purpose in the doctrinal and Chan ecumenism. While Zongmi synthesized several Chan sects and some doctrinal teachings active in his times, Jinul took an ecumenical approach to the radical Chinese Buddhism and doctrinal Huayan Buddhism available in his age. When Jinul commented on Zongmi's *Chan Chart*, he closely followed Zongmi's sectarian criticism of other doctrinal and Chan sects except his Heze Chan Sect and doctrinal Huayan Sect to which he belonged.<sup>46</sup> Even so, he was not much concerned with the Chan and doctrinal teachings that Zongmi considered so seriously because the teachings were not existent in his times.

Second, Jinul deemphasized the direct transmission from master to disciple that Chan and doctrinal masters, particularly Huayan masters, monopolized at the time. To the contrary, he emphasized the relationship between Chan practitioners and textual evidence. Jinul felt that while Chan practitioners should verify the authenticity of their enlightenment through textual evidence, doctrinal scholars should prove the accuracy of their textual interpretations through Chan practice. Moreover, unlike the majority of Chan practitioners, he did not himself have a regular and fixed master. Without having prejudice toward any text, he referred to texts at any time and place as needed. Even though he was originally a Chan Buddhist and passed the Chan examination run by the government, he completely dropped Chan Buddhism's strong sectarianism against the doctrinal Huayan tradition. Objecting to the strict distinction between doctrine and Chan, he harmonized both traditions.

---

<sup>46</sup> For the annotated English translation of Jinul's *Commentary on the Chan Chart*, see Robert E. Buswell, Jr., trans., *Tracing Back the Radiance: Chinul's Korean Way of Zen* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983), 150-203.

Third, Jinul was the first to discover the lay Chinese Buddhist scholar Li Tongxuan's *Commentary on the Huayan Sūtra* in Korean Buddhism and considered it as the ideal text to philosophically and soteriologically explain the marriage of doctrine and Chan.<sup>47</sup> While such Chinese Huayan exegetes as Chengguan, Fazang (643-712), and Zhiyan (602-668), considered the orthodox Chinese Huayan masters, stressed an intellectual and scholastic approach to Buddhism, Li Tongxuan used the *Huayan Sūtra* to support his soteriological and practical interests. While Li Tongxuan emphasized faith and considered it as being very important for enlightenment or obtaining Buddhahood from the perspective of practitioners, Fazang intellectually and metaphysically explained Huayan Buddhist philosophy from the perspective of enlightened persons.

Shim Jae-ryong, a renowned specialist on Jinul, succinctly explained the differences between the lay Huayan Buddhist scholar Li Tongxuan and orthodox Huayan monastic scholars thusly: "We must give credit to Li T'ung-hsüan for his discussion of the 'unmovable wisdom' which accompanies this faith. Fa-tsang and his predecessor Chih-yen never discussed 'unmovable wisdom' to be an essential nature of sentient beings, while Ch'eng-kuan mentioned 'unmovable wisdom' only in terms of the *śūnyatā* doctrine."<sup>48</sup> The orthodox patriarchs of the Hua-yen lineage emphasized Vairocana Buddha, the eternal *dharmakāya*, to be principal figure of the *Hua-yen Sūtra*, but Li T'ung-hsüan stressed 'unmovable wisdom' or 'wisdom of universal illumination' as the single underlying common ground of both ignorant sentient beings and enlightened Buddhas.<sup>49</sup>

### 1.3. The Joseon Dynasty

In late Goryeo, Gyeonghan (1298-1374), Taego (1301-1382) and Naong (1320-1376) went to Yuan China and learnt Linji Chan Buddhism in it. After coming back to their home nation of Korea, they disseminated the Kōan techniques of Linji Chan Buddhism. Even though the three masters were basically Chan sectarians, Gyeonghan and Naong were also interested in doctrinal Buddhism. Korean Buddhists became interested in other religious tradition of Neo-Confucianism recently introduced from China and later adopted as the state ideology in the Joseon Dynasty (1392-1910). Due to the increasing influence of Chinese philosophy as the ground of official education, from this time, Korean Buddhists used to consider three religious traditions of Confucianism, Buddhism, and Daoism.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Jae-ryong Shim, 50-97.

<sup>48</sup> Refer to T.35.1735.591b1-6, originally cited in Jae-ryong Shim, 65.

<sup>49</sup> Jae-ryong Shim, 65.

<sup>50</sup> Charles Muller, "Korean Buddhism: A Short Overview," first published in July 1996 and updated on August 14, 2003, <http://www.hm.tyg.jp/~acmuller/kor-bud/korbud-overview.html> (accessed January 3, 2008).

In late Goryeo and early Joseon Dynasties, the government accepted Neo-Confucianism and ideologically and very seriously persecuted Buddhism. Korean Buddhism needed to react against and/or for Neo-Confucianism newly imported from China. At the time, some Korean Buddhists newly imported new Kōan techniques of Linji Chan Buddhism from Chinese Buddhism and popularized them. Muhak (1327-1405) went to Beijing, capital of the Yuan Dynasty, and learned Linji Chan Buddhism and met Naong there. Even though he was a Chan sectarian, he was also interested in doctrinal Buddhism and other religious traditions of Confucianism and Daoism. He returned to his nation with Naong and became his disciple.

Gihwa (1376-1433), an ecumenist, was a disciple of Muhak. He learned the Kōan Chan techniques from his master Muhak and commented the *Diamond Sūtra*, *Yuanjue jing* (Complete Enlightenment Sūtra) and *Yongjia ji* (Record of Yongjia) and a number of articles and poems. Along with the Kōan techniques of Linji Chan Buddhism, he also accepted doctrinal Buddhism. He tried to harmonize both traditions. He also wrote the *Hyeonjeong-non* (Manifestation of the Proper Teaching) and attempted to defend Buddhism theoretically from severe criticisms of Neo-Confucians. He also theoretically syncretized three religious traditions of Confucianism, Buddhism and Daoism.

In the mid-Joseon period, politically very unstable, Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1536-1598) invaded the Korean Peninsula from 1592 to 1598. Hyujeong (1520-1604) led Korean monk soldiers and removed Japanese invaders from Korea. Because he was a sincere Linji Chan follower, he was a Linji Chan sectarian and disseminated the Kōan techniques of Linji Chan Buddhism. Even so, he did not exclude doctrinal Buddhism but soteriologically located Chan Buddhism over doctrinal Buddhism.<sup>51</sup> Because he did not completely exclude doctrinal traditions and exclusively practice Chan Buddhism, he was not a radical Linji Chan sectarian. Even though he doctrinally and theoretically ecumenized Chan and doctrinal Buddhism, he soteriologically prioritized Chan Buddhism to doctrinal Buddhism.

## 2. Modern Korean Buddhism

The majority of modern Korean Chan Buddhists argued that they succeeded the Linji Chan lineage and located themselves as the loyal successors to the lineage. However, even though they argue that they inherited the Linji Chan sectarian lineage, they actually and theoretically followed ecumenism between doctrinal and Chan Buddhism. They have contradictions between their lineage and philosophy. They reacted against the contradictions in different ways and attempted to solve out them in their own ways.

---

<sup>51</sup> King Yōng-t'ae, "Master Hyujōng: His Thought and Dharma Lineage," Lewis R. Lancaster and Chai-shin Yu, eds., *Buddhism in the Early Chosōn: Suppression and Transformation* (Fremont, California: Asian Humanities Press, 2002), 163-203.

For example, even though Song Gyeongheo (1849-1912) revitalized Linji Chan Buddhism and its sectarian lineage in the beginning of modern Korean Buddhism, he inherited ecumenical tradition of Korean Buddhism from Jinul and Hyujeong and theoretically ecumenized Chan and doctrinal Buddhism. Baek Yongseong (1864-1940) advocated the Linji Chan sectarian lineage and theoretically moderate Linji Chan sectarian Buddhism. Unlike two foremost masters of modern Korean Buddhism, Bak Hanyeong (1870-1948) and Bang Hanam (1876-1951) inherited ecumenism from Jinul and attempted to harmonize the two traditions based on Huayan philosophy.

As above, they seemed to have inconsistency and contradictions between thought and lineage. When we interpret Buddhist Dharma lineages from the perspective of Confucian biological and genealogical lineages, the contradictions of the Dharma lineages became maximized. Like Confucian biological and genealogical lineages, we cannot unilaterally define relations between masters and disciples in Buddhist Dharma lineages. The biological relation between parents and children is subject to be one-sided, not multi-lateral because children are able to be born only from their parents. However, relations between masters and disciples are not one-sided but multi-sided because disciples are subject to receive influences from a number of teachers and colleagues and form their thoughts.

We are not able to utilize the one-sided aspect of Buddhist Dharma lineages and analyze a master's actual and real thought. If we deconstruct the one-sided aspect of Dharma lineages, we might be able to comprehend his actual and real thought accurately and effectively. If we minimize the one-sided aspect and approach him from various social and historical contexts, we might understand him from broader and more accurate aspects. Even though we cannot ignore influence from a master to his disciple, we also cannot neglect influence from numerous figures including other masters and colleagues in the disciple's case.

For example, Taego went to China and inherited Shiwu Qinggong's (1272-1352) Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage. We cannot ignore that Taego tremendously received influence from him. But, if we dogmatize and absolutize the Dharma lineage, we are naturally supposed to neglect influence from other religious figures in his case. If we accept and institutionalize the Dharma lineage from Shiwu Qinggong to Taego in Korean Buddhism in general and Korean Seon Buddhism in particular, we are subject to negate the authenticity of Korean (Seon) Buddhism prior to Taego. If we adopt the biological and genealogical aspect of Chan Buddhism's Dharma lineages actually originated from Confucianism and interpret Taego's Dharma lineage, we are not able to contextualize him in Korean (Seon) Buddhism's context.

So, I characterized pre-modern Korean Buddhism as the crossroads between ecumenism and sectarianism. Early Korean Buddhism can be defined as the interconnecting process between doctrinal traditions. While some hierarchically classified the doctrines and texts of their own tradition over the doctrines and texts of other traditions, others ecumenically arrange all doctrines and texts.



After the introduction of Chan Buddhism to Korean Buddhism, Korean Buddhism can be characterized as the crossroads between doctrinal and/or Chan traditions. While some hierarchically arranged their traditions over other traditions, others ecumenically locate all traditions.

### **2.1. Founding patriarch(s)**

The current Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism was officially founded in 1941 under Japanese colonial period, 1910-1945. We can group various arguments on the founding patriarch of the Jogye Order in three. First, Gwon Sangno (1879-1965) and Bang Hanam considered Doui as its founding patriarch. Second, I Cheongdam (1902-1971), I Neunghwa (1869-1945), I Jong-ik (1912-1991) and I Jaeyeol (1915-1981) regarded Jinul as its founding patriarch. Third, Song Gyeongheo, Baek Yongseong, Song Mangong (1871-1946), Song Manam (1876-1957), Ha Dongsan (1890-1965), I Hyobong (1888-1966) and I Seongcheol (1912-1993) considered Taego as its founding patriarch. As seen above, the majority of eminent monks and theorists in modern Korean Buddhism accepted the third argument.

However, the current Jogye Order combined the three different arguments on its founding patriarch and officially adopts the combined version in its constitution. The Jogye Order's unified version of the founding patriarch agrees with the historical fact that Doui was the first Chan master who transmitted Chan Buddhism from Chinese Buddhism and officially accepts the first argument. The order defined its Dharma lineage succeeding from Doui to Taego, both of whom belonged to the same Dharma lineage established on Mt. Gaji and assigned Doui, Jinul and Taego to its founding patriarchs. Jinul officially belonged to the Dharma lineage established on Mt. Sagul and philosophically advocated ecumenism between Chan and doctrinal Buddhism. Doui learned sectarian Chan Buddhism under and inherited the Dharma lineage of Xitang Zhizang (734-814), a disciple of Mazu Daoyi. While Jinul was an ecumenist, Doui was a Chan sectarian and Taego a Linji Chan sectarian. The order syncretized ecumenism and Chan sectarianism in its order's constitution.

Bang Hanam considered Doui the order's founding patriarch and accepted the ecumenical Dharma lineage succeeding from Doui and Jinul and ecumenical philosophy. He was more ecumenical than the order's current constitution because he emphasized more Jinul and ecumenical philosophy in his arguments than in it. He regarded even Taego as an ecumenist, not a Linji Chan sectarian and contextualized him in the ecumenical history of Korean Buddhism. While Bang Hanam located Taego in the ecumenical context between Chan and doctrinal Buddhism, Baek Yongseong and I Seongcheol placed him as the founding patriarch of Korean Linji Chan sectarian lineage. We need to analyze Taego's works academically and clarify his actual thought and soteriology in the future research.

Because Taego inherited the sectarian lineage of Chinese Linji Chan Buddhism, theorists who considered Taego as the order's founding patriarch and argued that modern Korean Buddhists transmitted the Dharma lineage of Taego defined Taego as a Linji Chan sectarian. However, King Gongmin (1351-1374) appointed Taego as his personal master on April 24, 1356 and a few days later issued an edict and established Wonyung-bu (Department of Harmonization) at Gwangmyeong-sa Temple and let him manage temples belonged to two traditions of Chan and doctrinal Buddhism. He memorialized King Gongmin to unite nine Chan mountain lineages and revitalize Chan Buddhism as well as to support and make five doctrinal sects<sup>52</sup> to prosper.<sup>53</sup> Based on the historical fact, ecumenists located Taego in the ecumenist context of Korean Buddhism.

Saam Chaeyeong compiled *Haedong buljo wollyu* (The Origin of Buddhas and Patriarchs in Korean Buddhism) in 1764<sup>54</sup> and systematized the founding patriarch and the sectarian lineage of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism.<sup>55</sup> He determined as the founding patriarch of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism Taego who transmitted the Dharma of the 18<sup>th</sup> patriarch Shiwu Qinggong affiliated with the Dharma lineage of Yangqi Fanghui (992-1049) faction of Chinese Linji Chan Buddhism and the transmission lineage between masters and disciples in Korean Chan Buddhism.<sup>56</sup> Pyeongyang Eon-gi (1581-1644), a disciple of Hyujeong, actually systematized the founding patriarch and the sectarian Dharma lineage of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism. He wrote "Cheongheo-dang haengjang" (Biography of Hyujeong) and connected his master Hyujeong to Taego in the Dharma lineage and established Taego as the founding patriarch of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism.

Woljeo Doan (1638-1715), a Dharma descendant of Pyeongyang Eon-gi and a great-grand disciple of Hyujeong, published the *Buljo jongpa jido* (Diagrams of Sects and Factions, Buddhas and Patriarchs in Korean Chan Buddhism) in 1688 and loyally succeeded the assertions of Pyeongyang Eon-gi. Saam Chaeyeong nationwide assembled materials for three years from 1762 to 1764, published the book and comprehensively arranged the genealogy of major eminent monks in Korean Buddhism in 1764.

---

<sup>52</sup> Five doctrinal sects are (1) Nirvāṇa Sect, (2) Namsan Sect, (3) Hwaeom Sect, (4) Beopsang Sect, and (5) Beopseong Sect.

<sup>53</sup> Yu Chang, "Haengjang" (Biography), Daeryun bulgyo munhwa-won (Research Institute of Buddhist Culture for Bak Daeryun), ed., *Taego guksa* (National Master Taego) (Seoul: Bulgyo yeongsang, 1998), 1008-1011.

<sup>54</sup> H.10.100a1-134c12.

<sup>55</sup> Gim Yeongtae, "Joseon seonga ui beoptong-go: Seosan gatong ui gumyeong" (The Dharma Lineage of Seon Buddhism in the Joseon Dynasty: Investigation of Seosan Hyujeong's Dharma Lineage), *Bulgyo sahak-hoe* (Research Association for Buddhist History), ed., 295-342. He textually investigated the sectarian lineage of Linji Chan Buddhism and its founding patriarch Taego established by the Dharma descendents of Hyujeong in the article.

<sup>56</sup> H.10.101a19, 101c13-103c10.

The *Haedong buljo wollyu* settled Taego as the first patriarch of the sectarian lineage of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism, clearly defined Hyujeong as the 6<sup>th</sup> Dharma generation descendant of Taego, and defined that all monks of Korean Buddhism had inherited the lineage. However, when the book was published, even Jeong Yagyong (1762-1836), a famous scholar, indicated that the lineage from Taego to Hyujeong systematized in the text was a fabrication.

Byeokdam Haengin also claimed that the text included mainly the Dharma lineage of Hyujeong and ignored the Dharma lineage of Buhyu Seonsu (1543-1612) in and burnt the text.<sup>57</sup> Buyong Yeonggwon (1485-1571) had two major disciples, Hyujeong and Buhyu Seonsu and Korean Buddhism constituted the above-mentioned two lineages and the majority of Korean Buddhist monks claimed that they inherited the Dharma lineage of Hyujeong. The text concentrated on the Dharma lineage of Hyujeong and comprehensively systematized the Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage of Korean Buddhism.

Regardless of logical validity and historical evidence, Saam Chaeyeong's *Haedong buljo wollyu* tremendously impacted the later arguments on the founding patriarch and the Dharma lineage in Korean Buddhism. An Jinho (1880-1965) collected the materials on eminent monks not included in *Haedong buljo wollyu* and left a lot of posthumous manuscripts. Gyeong-un Hyeongjun referred to the unpublished writings, systematized the Dharma lineage of Korean Buddhism after Saam Chaeyeong's *Haedong buljo wollyu*, and published his version of *Haedong buljo wollyu* in four volumes in 1978.<sup>58</sup>

Like above, whichever practices they practice and whatever thought they have, modern Korean Buddhists are not free from the sectarian Dharma lineage of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism. Even though they recollect the Buddha's name, study doctrine, or chant spells, they officially inherit the Dharma lineage. Even though they have ecumenical philosophy, they officially succeed the lineage. In conclusion, they do not have consistent relations between their official Dharma lineage of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism and their actual philosophy.

## 2.2. The Dharma lineages

The majority of modern Korean Buddhists accepted the two seemingly contradictory concepts of Linji Chan sectarianism and ecumenism between doctrinal and Chan Buddhism. In late Joseon Dynasty, Song Gyeongheo adopted the traditionally accepted Dharma lineage of Linji Chan sectarianism established after Hyujeong by his Dharma descendants in mid-Joseon Dynasty and attempted to revitalize Chan Buddhism in its very degenerate period. The majority of modern Korean Buddhists received strong influence from him

---

<sup>57</sup> I Jeong, ed., 295.

<sup>58</sup> Gyeong-un Hyeongjun, *Haedong buljo wollyu* (The Origin of Buddhas and Patriarchs in Korean Buddhism), 4 vols (Seoul: Bulseo bogeup-sa, 1978).

directly and indirectly and revitalized Korean Chan Buddhism. Even so, he philosophically advocated ecumenism.

Modern Korean Buddhists reacted to the two concepts. Based on their reactions, we can generally categorize them into three groups. First, some Buddhists accepted Taego's sectarian lineage of Linji Chan Buddhism in the Dharma lineage and ecumenism theoretically. Second, some Buddhists accepted philosophically ecumenism but in the Dharma lineage the sectarian lineage of Linji Chan sectarianism. Third, other Buddhists accepted and united the philosophy and Dharma lineage of Linji Chan sectarianism. We can concretely use the key terms of ecumenism and Linji Chan sectarianism, analyze modern Korean Buddhists and group them into three as follows.

First, even though eminent masters Song Gyeongheo, Song Manam, I Hyobong, Ha Dongsan and I Unheo of modern Korean Buddhism inherited the Dharma lineage of Linji Chan sectarianism in the Dharma lineage, they theoretically succeeded ecumenism between doctrinal and Chan Buddhism. Song Gyeongheo adopted the Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage and recovered the Dharma lineage of Korean Buddhism discontinued at the time, but advocated ecumenical thought between doctrinal and Chan Buddhism, basically originated from Jinul and Hyujeong. Even though Song Manam theoretically was an ecumenist, he strongly criticized the movement's leaders who regarded Jinul as the founding patriarch of Korean Buddhism. I Hyobong and Ha Dongsan, leaders of the movement, in the Dharma lineage and philosophically were the loyal successor of Song Gyeongheo.

Second, eminent masters Bak Hanyeong, Bang Hanam, Gim Gyeongbong (1892-1982), Yun Goam (1899-1988), and Yun Wolha (1915-2003) of modern Korean Buddhism theoretically and in the Dharma lineage inherited ecumenism. They strongly advocated ecumenism between Chan and doctrinal Buddhism, not the sectarian lineage of Linji Chan Buddhism. While some masters actively criticized the sectarian lineage, others did not actively accept and/or negate the lineage. For example, Bang Hanam very actively refuted the founding patriarch Taego and Dharma lineage of Korean Linji Chan sectarianism, considered Doui as the founding patriarch of Korean Chan Buddhism and newly established the Dharma lineage of Doui – Jinul. Bak Hanyeong strongly criticized Linji Chan sectarianism and actively advocated ecumenism between Chan and doctrinal Buddhism. Unlike Bang Hanam and Bak Hanyeong, Yun Goam did not vocally criticize Linji Chan sectarianism but advocated ecumenical system of philosophy and praxis. Even though Yun Wolha did not negate the Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage, he did not actively advocate the lineage and the Linji Chan sectarian philosophy but ecumenical philosophy.

Third, Baek Yongseong, Song Mangong and I Seongcheol advocated Linji Chan sectarianism in the Dharma lineage and theoretically. They unified their philosophy and Dharma lineages with Linji Chan sectarianism. Baek Yongseong prioritized Chan Buddhism to doctrinal Buddhism and located the superiority of Linji Chan tradition over other Chan traditions. However, because he did not

completely exclude doctrinal Buddhism, he was not a radical Linji Chan sectarian. Unlike Baek Yongseong, because his grand disciple I Seongcheol was a radical Linji Chan sectarian, he exclusively emphasized Linji Chan Buddhism over doctrinal and other traditions and asserted that we could attain Buddhahood only through our exclusive practice of Kōan techniques of Linji Chan Buddhism. Even though Song Mangong did not vocally stress on Linji Chan Buddhism like I Seongcheol, he also extremely emphasized the importance of Linji Chan Buddhism over other Buddhist and Chan traditions.

### 2.3. Critical reviews of the Dharma lineages

I recently published a book of 516 pages entitled *Ha Dongsan and Colonial Korean Buddhism: Balancing Sectarianism and Ecumenism* (Honolulu, Hawaii: Blue Pine, 2019) and adopted the two keywords and analyzed Ha Dongsan's philosophy and Dharma lineages. Ha Dongsan argued that he inherited from his master Baek Yongseong Korean Buddhism's Linji Chan Dharma lineage, considering Taego as the lineage's founder. However, when I carefully reviewed Dongsan mundo-hoe (Association of Master Ha Dongsan's Dharma Descendants), ed., *Dongsan daejongsa munjip* (Collection of Grand Master Ha Dongsan's Works) (*Munjip* for abbreviation) (Busan: Beomeo-sa Temple, 1998), I realized that Ha Dongsan loyally inherited his ecumenism from representative Sino-Korean ecumenists Wonhyo, Chengguan, Zongmi, Yanshou (904-975), Jinul, Hyujeong, Zhuhong (1535-1615) and others. So, I assigned him to the first group.

The striking point which we should indicate in modern Korean Buddhism is that the Dharma lineage of each eminent master does not logically correspond to his philosophy. For instance, even though an eminent master officially proclaimed that he inherited the Dharma lineage of Korean Linji Chan sectarianism, he was not necessary to follow the philosophy of Linji Chan sectarianism. Even though an eminent master proclaimed that he was an ecumenist, he was not necessary to inherit ecumenism from his master. The Dharma lineage and philosophy between masters and disciples have not been consistent in modern Korean Buddhism. The relations of the Dharma lineage and philosophy between them can be consistent and also inconsistent.

The Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism has sincerely inherited the long history of Korean Buddhism and the majority of traditional Korean Buddhist temples and monasteries are affiliated with the order. The order is currently composed of several minor Dharma lineages and two major Dharma lineages, the Deoksung Dharma lineage of Sudeok-sa Temple on Mt. Deoksung in the County of Yesan, South Chungcheong Province and the Beomeo Dharma lineage of Beomeo-sa Temple on Mt. Geumjeong in the City of Busan. The Deoksung Dharma lineage mainly constitutes the Dharma descendants of Song Gyeongheo, a revitalizer of traditional Korean Seon Buddhism and his eminent disciple Song Mangong, a famous Korean Seon master, and the Beomeo

Dharma lineage mainly consists of the Dharma descendants of Baek Yongseong, a revitalizer of the traditional vinaya of Korean Buddhism and the traditional Korean Seon Buddhism and Ha Dongsan, a leader of the movement and an architect of current Korean Buddhism.

Song Gyeongheo, the founder of the Deoksung Dharma lineage in modern Korean Buddhism, was a Linji Chan sectarian in the Dharma lineage and philosophically an ecumenist. However, even though his two eminent disciples Song Mangong and Bang Hanam equally inherited the Dharma lineage of his master Song Gyeongheo, both of them had very different positions on philosophy and the Dharma lineage with each other. While Song Mangong was in the Dharma lineage and philosophically a Linji Chan sectarian, his junior Dharma brother Bang Hanam was in the Dharma lineage and philosophically an ecumenist. So, each of master Song Gyeongheo and his two eminent disciples philosophically and in the Dharma lineage had different perspectives respectively. Even though Song Gyeongheo, Song Mangong and Bang Hanam all belonged to the same Dharma lineage, all of them were different in their argument on the Dharma lineage and philosophy.

Baek Yongseong, an eminent junior to Song Gyeongheo and the founder of the Beomeo Dharma lineage in modern Korean Buddhism, in the Dharma lineage and philosophically was a Linji Chan sectarian. Even though his two eminent disciples Ha Dongsan and Yun Goam inherited the same Dharma lineage from their master Baek Yongseong, both of them had very different positions on philosophy and the Dharma lineage with each other. While Ha Dongsan in the Dharma lineage was a Linji Chan sectarian and philosophically an ecumenist, his junior Dharma brother Yun Goam did not clearly proclaim that he inherited the sectarian Dharma lineage of Linji Chan Buddhism but theoretically a strong advocate of ecumenism. I Seongcheol, a grand disciple of Baek Yongseong and a disciple of Ha Dongsan, served as the supreme patriarch of the order, was a Linji Chan sectarian in the Dharma lineage and philosophically unlike his master and his grand master. Even though Baek Yongseong, Ha Dongsan, Yun Goam and I Seongcheol belonged to the same Dharma lineage, all of them had different philosophy and different ideas on the Dharma lineage.

Regardless of the Dharma lineage and the tonsure lineage, Song Gyeongheo and Ha Dongsan are philosophically ecumenists and Linji Chan sectarians in the Dharma lineage; Baek Yongseong, Song Mangong and I Seongcheol are Linji Chan sectarians philosophically and in the Dharma lineage; and Bang Hanam and Yun Goam are philosophically and in the Dharma lineage ecumenists. Song Mangong and Bang Hanam declared that their master Song Gyeongheo recognized their enlightenment and they inherited the Dharma lineage from their master Song Gyeongheo. Ha Dongsan and Yun Goam also mentioned that their master Baek Yongseong recognized their enlightenment and they inherited the Dharma lineage from their master Baek Yongseong. However, I Seongcheol did

not mention that he inherited his Dharma lineage from his master Ha Dongsan or other masters even though he became a monk under his master.

Since the institutional and official establishment of the Jogye Order in 1941, Bang Hanam, Ha Dongsan, Yun Goam and I Seongcheol served as the order's supreme patriarchs and prior to the official establishment of the order, Song Mangong also served as a supreme patriarch of Korean Buddhism. The two lineages played the key roles in modern Korean Buddhism through the aforementioned eminent masters belonged to the lineage. I did not introduce a number of eminent monks affiliated with the two lineages in this section.

Even though Bak Hanyeong, Song Manam, I Hyobong and Yun Wolha did not belong to the abovementioned two major Dharma lineages in modern Korean Buddhism, they had different philosophy and different ideas on the Dharma lineage. While Bak Hanyeong was a serious critic to Linji Chan lineage and sectarianism and Yun Wolha was a moderate ecumenist, Song Manam and I Hyobong were Linji Chan sectarians in the Dharma lineage and philosophically ecumenists. I defined Yun Wolha as a moderate ecumenist because he theoretically advocated ecumenical philosophy and even though he did not negate the sectarian lineage of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism, he did not clearly make his own sectarian lineage of Linji Chan Buddhism unlike Linji Chan sectarians including Song Gyeongheo, Baek Yongseong, Song Mangong, Song Manam, I Hyobong and Ha Dongsan.

As investigated above, even though eminent monks of modern Korean Buddhism had relations between masters and disciples in their tonsure and/or Dharma lineages, they did not inherit their consistent ideas on philosophy and the Dharma lineage. So, I defined modern Korean Buddhism as the crossroads between ecumenism and Linji Chan sectarianism. We cannot analyze modern Korean Buddhism just with the concept of ecumenism but also with the perspective of Linji Chan sectarianism. If we approach modern Korean Buddhism from ecumenism, we can comprehend some aspect of modern Korean Buddhism but might exclude its other aspect. If we also approach modern Korean Buddhism from Linji Chan sectarianism, we can also understand some aspect of modern Korean Buddhism but might exclude its other aspect. To draw the comprehensive picture of modern Korean Buddhism, we should utilize the two key terms of ecumenism and Linji Chan sectarianism without excluding either of them.

## 2.4. Soteriology

We can easily find the paradigm of ecumenism between Chan and doctrinal Buddhism and Linji Chan sectarianism in the Dharma lineage and soteriology of Chan Buddhism. If we utilize the paradigm, we can clarify the soteriology and Dharma lineages of Chan masters of Sino-Korean Buddhism. While some Chan masters syncretized Chan and doctrinal Buddhism from their ecumenical perspective, others located Chan Buddhism over doctrinal Buddhism from their

sectarian views. While moderate Chan sectarians did not negate the necessity of doctrinal Buddhism but prioritize Chan Buddhism to doctrinal Buddhism, radical Chan sectarians negated the necessity of doctrinal Buddhism but exclusively emphasized Chan practice.

If we analyze modern Korean Buddhism from the perspective of soteriology, ecumenists equally emphasized Chan praxis and doctrinal research and argued that Chan praxis should supplement doctrinal research and vice versa. Even though moderate Chan sectarians strongly admitted the necessity of doctrinal research, they placed Chan practice over doctrinal research and considered doctrinal research as being prerequisite to enlightenment. Radical Chan sectarians excluded doctrinal research and strongly suggested Chan practitioners to exclusively practice Chan Buddhism.

While moderate Chan sectarians advocated the moderate Chan soteriology of sudden enlightenment and graduate practice, radical Chan sectarians asserted the radical Chan soteriology of sudden enlightenment and sudden practice. While moderate Chan sectarians emphasized sudden enlightenment, they argued that Chan practitioners could objectify and verify sudden enlightenment through altruistic activities, doctrinal research, and teachers. Radical Linji Chan sectarians argued that because sudden enlightenment meant complete accomplishment of practice, they did not need further verifications and objectifications for enlightenment. Therefore, even though moderate Chan sectarians and radical Chan sectarians all use the same term of sudden enlightenment, its scope is same and its connotation is totally different.

While Sino-Koreans adopted the paradigm of ecumenism and sectarianism and hermeneutically arranged and classified texts and doctrines, Chan Buddhists also applied the paradigm and defined their soteriology and Dharma lineages. Even though doctrinal classifiers and Chan Buddhists use the same terms of ecumenism and sectarianism, the connotation of the terms between them is different. While doctrinal classifiers use the concepts in terms of textual and doctrinal hermeneutics, Chan Buddhists approach them in terms of soteriology and Dharma lineages. So, we should understand the meaning of the two terms in different contexts.

## **2.5. Dharma lineages and their authenticity**

Chan Buddhism is subject to have the strong tradition of Dharma lineages. The Dharma descendants of Hyujeong systematized the Dharma lineage of Korean Linji Chan sectarianism in the middle of Joseon Dynasty and regarded Taego who inherited the Dharma lineage of Chinese Linji Chan Buddhism from Shiwu Qinggong as the founding patriarch of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism. When we consider Taego as the founding patriarch, they cannot locate Chan masters and eminent monks of Korean Buddhism before him in their Dharma lineage. Like the case of Taego, when we unilaterally interpret the genealogy of their Dharma lineage, we cannot reflect multilateral relations between masters



and disciples. If we deconstruct the unilateral and one-sided relation, we can contextualize Taego from multiple sides and understand him in Sino-Korean Buddhist context.

Doctrinal Buddhism does not strongly have and need the tradition of Dharma lineages unlike Chan Buddhism. Even though doctrinal Buddhism established Dharma lineages throughout East Asian Buddhism, it did not strongly need the tradition of Dharma lineage like Chan Buddhism. The followers of doctrinal Buddhism used texts and developed their theory and practice. They interpreted texts and doctrines progressively or conservatively and systematized their theory and practice based on their interpretations. They used exegetical interpretations and caused Buddhists to accomplish enlightenment. While some hierarchically evaluated texts and doctrines, others did equally evaluate them. While some were sectarians, others were ecumenists.

While Chan Buddhism basically depends on a master or a number of masters, doctrinal Buddhism mainly relies on a text or a number of texts. Even though we cannot negate the importance of master(s) in doctrinal traditions, text(s) are the primary source(s) and master(s) are the secondary source(s). The master(s) guide his disciples to understand proper meanings of text(s). Because we might be difficult to understand text(s) clearly and effectively without master(s), we need our master(s). Even so, the final criteria are text(s), not master(s) in doctrinal traditions.

Unlike doctrinal traditions, Chan traditions were not based on texts and admitted the mind-to-mind transmission from master to disciple and the secret transmission of Buddhism separate from that of Buddhist texts. Masters can decide authentic and unauthentic teachings in Chan Buddhism. Chan Buddhism emphasized the importance of masters much more than doctrinal Buddhism. Only enlightened masters are allowed to recognize newly-enlightened disciples, and write poems and transmit his Dharma lineage to them in Chan traditions. If some obtained enlightenment but did not receive recognition from an established Chan master, he was not able to be officialized and verified as an enlightened person in Chan Buddhism.

Enlightenment is subject to be subjective. The subjective enlightenment becomes objectified and institutionalized through recognition of a newly-enlightened Chan practitioner by an established Chan master and his transmission of Dharma lineage to the practitioner. Each Chan tradition established its own Dharma lineage transmitting enlightenment from master to disciple and justified its authenticity. When each Dharma lineage became codified and institutionalized, it was guided to have exclusiveness and self-righteousness in Chan Buddhism. The Dharma lineage system is easily supposed not to have democratic and open characteristics. We generally and traditionally categorize Chinese Chan traditions in five families and seven sects. Each family and sect of Chan Buddhism might have its Dharma lineage and justify its Chan tradition.

Because enlightenment is very subjective in Chan Buddhism, we are very difficult to objectify enlightenment. Chan Buddhism presented enlightenment as its goal but did not clearly expound its content. For example, when we read Chan analects, we can see a lot of motives for Chan practitioners to obtain enlightenment in them but not what they actually enlightened. Because Chan masters did not clearly and directly mention what they enlightened, we should speculate and interpret their enlightenment from the analects. The meaning of enlightenment can be differently and subjectively revealed based on the perspective of interpreters.

Unlike Chan Buddhism, early Buddhist texts generally and clearly introduce enlightenment as understanding of dependent origination, selfless-ness, and four noble truths and/or extinction of three poisons of greed, anger and delusion.<sup>59</sup> Because Chan analects mystified enlightenment, we cannot easily understand the meaning of enlightenment through the analects. Because Chan texts did not definitely explicate what Chan masters enlightened, we subjectively and arbitrarily understand and interpret the content of enlightenment in Chan Buddhism. When enlightenment became mythologized and mystified, we were not allowed to approach it objectively and openly.

Early Buddhism very universally and extensively interpreted the scope of enlightened persons. Early Buddhist texts described monks, kings, and masses obtained enlightenment. Abhidharma Buddhism limited the scope of enlightened persons to Buddha(s). Mahāyāna Buddhism, especially the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*, universalized the scope and argued that all sentient beings were allowed to attain enlightenment. Theoretically speaking, Chan Buddhism had never negated the assertions of the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*. However, practically speaking, Chan masters monopolized enlightenment for monastics, mostly monks, not nuns. Due to the influence of Chan Buddhism, modern Korean Buddhists generally tended to assign enlightenment for Chan monks<sup>60</sup> and mythicized enlightenment.<sup>61</sup>

We need to demythicize enlightenment, deconstruct the Dharma genealogies of enlightened monks and reinterpret enlightenment and the genealogies. Korean Chan Buddhism used to consider enlightenment as the ultimate goal of Buddhism and adopt Kōan Chan as a paramount method for enlightenment. If we approach enlightenment from the sectarian perspective of Kōan Chan Buddhism, we are logically and naturally subject to exclude other methods for obtaining enlightenment except Kōan Chan Buddhism. Kōan Chan absolutists dogmatized the slogan of no textual and intellectual reliance, the special transmission outside the orthodox teaching, the direct pointing to human mind, and the immediate realization through manifesting Buddha nature and were subject to negate doctrinal Buddhism.

---

<sup>59</sup> Gim Jongmyeong, “kkaedareum ui “sinhwa” jaegeomto” (Reexamination of the Myth of Enlightenment), in *Bulgyohak yeongu* (Journal of the Association of Research in Buddhist Studies) 12 (2005): 615.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid, 620-621.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid, 625-636.

Linji Chan absolutists adopted Kōan techniques and excluded doctrinal research and altruistic activities for society. They neglected altruistic social activities and doctrinal research for enlightenment and prioritized the latter to the former. Even though Kōan Chan sectarians proudly self-defined themselves as Mahayanists, they put stress on individual enlightenment and neglected social activities. They actually and loyally modeled after solitary realizers whom Mahāyānists strongly criticized. Due to overemphasis on individual enlightenment, they did not make efforts to model after Bodhisattvas who dedicated themselves to benefit suffering sentient beings in society.

Theoretically and logically speaking, while some Chan masters might ecumenically evaluate various Dharma lineages available to them, others might hierarchically evaluate them and attempt to prove the superiority of their lineage over other lineages. We can categorize the former group as ecumenists and the latter group as sectarians. We also subcategorize the latter group in two, moderate and radical sectarians. Even though moderate Chan sectarians did not completely exclude other lineages, they hierarchically arranged them and located their lineages over them. Unlike moderate Chan sectarians, radical Chan sectarians completely negated other traditions and lineages and absolutized their traditions and lineages. Radical Chan sectarians might not be compatible with modern democratic society.

## **2.6. Dharma lineages and their biological aspect**

We need to examine here how and why East Asian Buddhists developed Dharma lineages. Chinese Buddhism adopted the family genealogical record system from aboriginal Confucianism and established the Dharma lineage system of Buddhist monasticism. However, if we literally apply the system in Buddhist monasticism, we can find a lot of logical problems in it. Confucian genealogical records are very much effective for us to biologically trace back our family background because we are not born of other parents but only our parents. However, even though we cannot negate that we form our thought through our parents, we actually receive influence from a lot of masters, colleagues and even juniors and form our thought.

It is nonsense for us to assert that a disciple inherited his Dharma from only a master. He received influence philosophically from a number of figures, including his seniors, colleagues and even juniors. Even though he might receive influence from his teachers, he might also counterinfluence them. The relations between masters and disciples are not one-sided but mutual. If we argue that a disciple forms his thought only under a master, it is unreasonable. So, we should minimize the application of the Confucian biological genealogy system to the Dharma lineage system of Chan Buddhism.

If we interpret the Dharma lineage system of Chan Buddhism from the biological perspective, we are not able to objectify Korean Chan Buddhism. The system might simplify multiple relations of a master with other figures in terms

of his thought and misguide us to understand his thought. For example, based on preexistent Chan Buddhism, later Chan Buddhism developed. Likewise, Taego developed his thought on Chan Buddhism based on preexistent Chan Buddhism in Korea. Even so, if we adopt and maximize his Dharma lineage of Linji Chan sectarianism which he inherited from Chinese Linji Chan Buddhist Shiwu Qinggong and interpret it from the biological perspective, we should logically negate his connections with preexistent Chan Buddhism in Korea.

Just as the Confucian biological and genealogical systems created the concept of family which we could interpret as a community of politics, economy and biology, modern Korean Buddhists actively utilized the biological Dharma lineage systems from pre-modern Korean Chan Buddhism and established their own political and religious factions. Monks are united under their tonsure master who ordained themselves and/or their Dharma master who transmitted his lineage to themselves. The followers of a biological lineage affiliated themselves with a temple or monastery and protected their religious and political interests from the followers of other biological lineages. The biological lineage system is also supposed to have strong political and economical connotations in modern Korean Buddhism. However, as I investigated two major Dharma lineages and their followers in modern Korean Buddhism above, we cannot generalize the members of the biological lineages to have unified thought.

First of all, we are able to instantiate and analyze the Dharma lineage of Jinul who tremendously impacted the formation of modern Korean Buddhism from the theoretical perspective. He received influence from Huineng, Li Tongxuan, Zongmi, Dahui (1089-1163), and others and formed his thought. He did not receive any official recognition of his enlightenment from any masters. He did not attain enlightenment under the guidance of a particular Chan master but obtained enlightenment by himself. We cannot interpret his enlightenment and Dharma lineage from Chan sectarianism which emphasizes a Chan master's recognition of enlightenment and his providing of a transmission poem to his disciple. He authenticated and verified his enlightenment through textual evidences, not through a Chan master's recognition. He was not a Chan sectarian but an ecumenist who equally emphasized doctrinal and Chan Buddhism.

Jinul became a monk under Sin-gwang Jonghwi of the Seon lineage established by Beomil on Mt. Sagul. If we consider that he inherited the Dharma lineage of Sin-gwang Jonghwi and maximize his tonsure Dharma lineage, we cannot objectively and neutrally understand his thought. He might have philosophically received influence from his master. Even so, we cannot ignore that he also received influence from Huineng, Li Tongxuan, Zongmi, Dahui and other masters. We are necessary to approach Jinul in multiple contexts to properly understand his thought.

Second, we are able to instantiate and analyze the Dharma lineage of Ha Dongsan, a famous and renowned master of modern Korean Buddhism. He became a monk under his master Baek Yongseong, received his master's

recognition for his enlightenment, and inherited his master's Dharma lineage of Linji Chan sectarianism. Baek Yongseong was a tonsure master and also a Dharma master of Ha Dongsan. He also received from Baek Yongseong the vinaya lineage of Daeun (1780-1841), who revitalized vinaya degenerate in Korean Buddhism at Chilbul-am Hermitage on Mt. Jiri. He also received from Yeongmyeong Boje of Beomeo-sa Temple another vinaya lineage of Guxin (1535-1615), who revitalized degenerate vinaya in Chinese Buddhism at Fayuan-si Temple in Beijing. He transmitted the orthodox vinaya lineage of Chinese Buddhism from Vinaya Master Yeongmyeong Boje of Beomeo-sa Temple and also inherited the authentic vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism from his master Baek Yongseong.

Even though we cannot ignore the fact that Ha Dongsan inherited the Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage from his master Baek Yongseong, we also cannot neglect how much he was ecumenical in his thought. He strongly received influence of ecumenism between doctrinal and Chan Buddhism from previous major Sino-Korean ecumenists Zongmi, Yanshou, Jinul, Hyujeong, Zhuhong, and so on and formed his ecumenical philosophy. Even though he was a Linji Chan sectarian in the Dharma lineage, he was an ecumenist in his philosophy.

As examined above, it is necessary to understand and interpret Jinul, a pre-modern master and Ha Dongsan, a modern master from multiple angles and multi-layered contexts. If we examine both of them one-sidedly and from a mono-layered context, we might not be able to comprehend their thought comprehensively and properly. Even though Jinul philosophically and in the Dharma lineage received influence from his tonsure and Dharma master Singwang Jonghwi, we cannot ignore that he also received influence from other figures. Even though Ha Dongsan philosophically and in the Dharma lineage received influence from his master Baek Yongseong, he also received influence from a number of masters, pre-modern and modern.

Even though parents and children are definitely subject to have biological and genealogical continuations, they are not guaranteed to have continuations in their thought. The relations between masters and disciples are not biological but are based on social contracts in Chan Buddhism. Masters and disciples might but are not guaranteed to have continuations in their thought. We are necessary to comprehend the Dharma lineage of Chan Buddhism in the tensional relations between continuation and discontinuation. If we adopt the concept of continuation from masters and disciples, we are supposed to dogmatize the Dharma lineages. If we accept the concept of discontinuation from masters and disciples, we are subject to negate the necessity and validity of the lineages.

## 2.7. Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage

I Seongcheol published his book entitled *Hanguk bulgyo ui beommaek* (The Orthodox Dharma Lineage of Korean Buddhism) (Hapcheon: Janggyeong-gak,

1976) and strongly defended the Dharma lineage of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism and considered Taego as its founding patriarch who transmitted Chinese Linji Chan Buddhism from Shiwu Qinggong. Bak Haedang critically reviewed and pointed out the logical and academic problems in I Seongcheol's arguments clearly expounded in the abovementioned text.<sup>62</sup> I basically followed Bak Haedang's arguments and developed my ideas in this section.

Linji Chan sectarians of Korean Buddhism argued that Taego went to China, inherited the Dharma lineage of Chinese Linji Chan Buddhism from Shiwu Qinggong and became the first patriarch of the sectarian Dharma lineage of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism. If we absolutize the Dharma lineage and if we accept and interpret the lineage from the biological and genealogical perspective of Confucianism, we are logically subject to negate the authenticity of Chan Buddhism in Korea prior to Taego and we cannot historically and socially contextualize him from both sides of Chinese Buddhism and Korean Buddhism.

The Dharma lineage of Linji Chan sectarianism basically emphasized the mind-to-mind transmission and the special transmission outside the orthodox teaching from masters to disciples. Linji Chan sectarians argued that they could trace the lineage back to the Buddha himself and the lineage has been continued without interruption from masters to disciples. They strongly emphasized the unbroken tradition transmitting Dharma from masters to disciples through a master's recognition and his disciple's inheritance. So, I Seongcheol, a representative Linji Chan sectarian of modern Korean Buddhism, emphasized the unbroken Dharma transmission in Linji Chan Buddhism as follows:

A Chan master who enlightens the meaning of One Mind is able to attain Buddhahood. If we realize the teaching of One Mind, we can naturally attain complete enlightenment and can be like a Buddha. The Buddha transmitted the complete and final level of enlightenment, not the intermediate level of enlightenment, to Mahākāśyapa and Mahākāśyapa to Ānanda. 33 patriarchs and eminent masters of five families and seven sects who inherited the Dharma lineages of Chan Buddhism also attained complete enlightenment, not intermediate, enlightenment. The teaching of One Mind and the special transmission teaching outside the orthodox teaching mean the complete, not intermediate, teaching. Someone questions how later Chan patriarchs can obtain the same enlightenment as the enlightenment that Śākyamuni Buddha transmitted to Mahākāśyapa. If so, he is the person who does not know the

---

<sup>62</sup> Bak Haedang, "Seongcheol beommaeng-non e daehan bipan-jeok geomto" (Critical Examination of Seongcheol's Arguments on the Dharma Lineage), in Jo Seongtaek, ed., *Toeong Seongcheol ui kkaedareum gwa suhaeng: Seongcheol ui Seon sasang gwa bulgyosa-jeok wichwi* (I Seongcheol's Enlightenment and Practice: Seongcheol's Chan Thought and Position in Buddhist History) (Seoul: Yemun seowon, 2006), 157-183.

proper teaching transmitted without interruption from the Buddha to now through 33 patriarchs.<sup>63</sup>

We need to academically and critically examine I Seongcheol's assertions and the validity and historicity of Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage. Chan Buddhism traditionally and generally introduces 33 Chan patriarchs including 28 patriarchs of Indian Chan Buddhism and 6 patriarchs of Chinese Chan Buddhism. The 28<sup>th</sup> patriarch of Indian Chan Buddhism and the 1<sup>st</sup> patriarch of Chinese Chan Buddhism are the same patriarch named Bodhidharma. I Seongcheol, a Korean Linji Chan sectarian, argued that all patriarchs attained complete enlightenment same as the enlightenment that Śākyamuni Buddha himself attained and each earlier patriarch consecutively transmitted complete enlightenment to each later patriarch without interruption. Each earlier patriarch recognized and authenticated the enlightenment of each later patriarch by providing his Dharma successor with a poem which certified his Dharma heir's enlightenment.

If so, are the successive recognition and transmission between a previous patriarch and a later patriarch historical? Are they a-historical or trans-historical? Above all, Śākyamuni Buddha recognized the enlightenment of and bestowed to the first patriarch Mahākāśyapa of Indian Chan Buddhism a poem, "Dharma is originally Dharma-less Dharma / Dharma-less Dharma is also Dharma / I provide you with a Dharma-less teaching / How could already Dharma have been Dharma?" We cannot find the poem in any Indian Buddhist text but in a number of Chinese Chan Buddhist texts.<sup>64</sup> Second, Mahākāśyapa recognized the enlightenment of Ānanda and gave a poem to him, "Dharma is originally Dharma / There is neither Dharma nor no-Dharma / How can we see Dharma and no-Dharma in a Dharma?" We also cannot see the poem in any Indian Buddhist texts but in numberless Chinese Chan Buddhist texts.<sup>65</sup>

In conclusion, Chinese Chan Buddhists created the Dharma lineage of 28 patriarchs in Indian Buddhism and the Dharma lineage of 6 patriarchs in Chinese Chan Buddhism not based on historical facts and evidences. In order to authenticate the tradition of their mind-to-mind transmission and their no-reliance on texts, Chan Buddhists argued that they received recognition from previous masters and could trace their recognition back to Śākyamuni Buddha himself, the actual historical founder of Buddhism. To authorize the enlightenment of Śākyamuni Buddha, they extended the lineage to seven Buddhas of past lives. They argued that Śākyamuni Buddha of this current life

---

<sup>63</sup> I Seongcheol, Bangnyeon seonseo ganhaeng-hoe (White Lotus Society for the Publication of Chan Texts), trans., *Baegil beopmun* (Sermons of One Hundred Days), vol. 2 (Hapcheon: Janggyeong-gak, 1992), 229-230.

<sup>64</sup> T.48.2006.308b12-13, T.48.2016.937c25-26, T.51.2076.205c1-2, X.81.1571.403b21, X.85.1594.565b17-18, X.88.1666.557a4-6, and so on.

<sup>65</sup> T.48.2016.937c27-28, T.49.2036.496c27-28, T.51.2076.206b3-4, X.81.1571.406b7-8, X.85.1594.569b18-19, X.88.1666.557a8-10, and so on.

attained enlightenment and received recognition from a Buddha of his past life. So, Chinese Chan Buddhists added 7 past Buddhas to the lineage.

As shown above, the Dharma lineages of Chinese Chan Buddhism are not based upon historical facts and evidences at all. Chinese Chan Buddhists religiously and politically created them to establish the authenticity of their enlightenment and genealogical lineages. Each tradition of Chan Buddhism established each lineage. Huiju compiled and published the *Baolin zhuan* (Biographies of Jeweled Groves) in ten fascicles in 801 in which he comprehensively synthesized the Dharma lineages of various Chan traditions from the sectarian perspective of the Dharma lineage of Mazu Daoyi.<sup>66</sup> He completely systematized the Dharma lineage of 28 Indian Chan patriarchs and 6 Chinese Chan patriarchs Chan. Chan texts compiled and written after the *Baolin zhuan* loyally followed the lineage after the text.

Modern Korean Chan Buddhists generally followed the Korean Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage and considered Taego as the founding patriarch of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism. Sincerely following the lineage of Southern Chan Buddhism systematized in the *Baolin zhuan*, they connected the lineage of Taego to the lineage. However, we can also examine how historical, accurate and objective the Korean Linji Chan sectarian lineage is. The relation between a master and a disciple based on the former's recognition of the latter's enlightenment can be historical and also a-historical. If so, we cannot consistently identify the transmission relation between a master and a disciple as a historical fact and evidence. Chan Buddhists created the Dharma lineages for their individual and/or institutional interests, not always based upon historical facts.

As I Seongcheol argued in the above-cited passages, did each master historically and actually recognize and provide his poem to his disciple without exception in the Korean Linji Chan Dharma lineage? Can we prove the lineage was continued from Śākyamuni Buddha to I Seongcheol without interruption? If we accept I Seongcheol's argument, we are compelled to regard religious trans-historicity as actual historicity. We cannot prove the historic, religious and actual relations between masters and disciples in many cases of the lineage based on historical facts and textual evidences. So, his arguments are not logically consistent and coherent. He should continuously mention falsehood to truth. And to convert and prove falsehood to truth, he needed to fabricate facts.

In this context, Bak Haedang comprehensively analyzed and critically revealed contradictions in I Seongcheol's arguments on the Dharma lineage of Southern Chan Buddhism in general and Linji Chan Buddhism in particular.<sup>67</sup> Incorporating Bak Haedang's arguments, we are critically able to analyze I Seongcheol's assertions on the Dharma lineage in the following three aspects.

---

<sup>66</sup> Jeong Seongbon, *Seon ui yeoksa wa sasang* (The History and Thought of Chan Buddhism) (Seoul: Bulgyo sidae-sa, 1994), 339-349.

<sup>67</sup> Bak Haedang, 157-183.



First, if we critically examine logical coherence in I Seongcheol's assertions on the Dharma lineage, we cannot apply his principles of a master's recognition of his disciple's enlightenment and conferring a poem to his disciple without interruption to the Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage of Taego. The most important part in the lineage is from Taego to Hyujeong. The Dharma descendants of Hyujeong considered Taego as the lineage founder of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism and systematized and officialized the lineage. If we prove even one Chan master in the lineage who did not succeed the Dharma lineage from his master through his enlightenment and his master's recognition of it, we should logically negate the authenticity of the lineage. Even so, I Seongcheol did not prove anybody from Taego to Cheongheo Hyujeong who successively inherited the Dharma lineage according to his standards.

Second, if we critically analyze the historicity his arguments, the second problem becomes enlarged. Hyujeong clearly described his Dharma lineage that Byeoksong Jieom (1464-1534) was his grand master and Buyong Yeonggwan his master.<sup>68</sup> He clarified just Byeoksong Jieom, Buyong Yeonggwan and himself in his Dharma lineage.<sup>69</sup> He had never systematized the complete version of a Dharma lineage. He did not make the sectarian Dharma lineage of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism which considered Taego as the founding patriarch. However, the Dharma descendants of Hyujeong systematized the sectarian Dharma lineage, enlisting Taego as the first patriarch, Hwanam Honsu (1320-1392) as the second patriarch, Gugok Gagun as the third patriarch, Byeokgye Jeongsim as the fourth patriarch, Byeoksong Jieom as the fifth patriarch, Buyong Yeonggwan as the sixth patriarch and Hyujeong as the seventh patriarch.

However, Hwanam Honsu is not the disciple of Taego but the disciple of Naong.<sup>70</sup> Gugok Gagun is not the disciple of Hwanam Honsu but the disciple of Jolam Yeonon.<sup>71</sup> We cannot textually and historically prove any Dharma relation between Gugok Gagun and Byeokgye Jeongsim. Byeokseong Jieom received influence from Byeokgye Jeongsim but Byeoksong Jieom practiced without help from others and attained enlightenment. There is no textual and

---

<sup>68</sup> H.7.757b19-20.

<sup>69</sup> Gil Huiseong, *Jinul ui seon sasang* (Jinul's Thought on Seon) (Seoul: Sonamu, 2001), 237.

<sup>70</sup> Choe Yeonsik, "Seongcheol beommaeng-non e daehan bipan-jeok geomto leul ilgo" (Review of "Critical Examination of Seongcheol's Arguments on the Dharma Lineage" by Bak Haedang), Jo Seongtaek, ed., 157-183; Jang Wongyu, "Jogyee-jong ui seongnip gwa baljeon e daehan gochal" (Examination of Jogye Order's Foundation and Development), Bulgyo sahak-hoe, ed., *Hanguk Jogye-jong ui seongnip-sa* (Researches on the Formation History of the Jogye Order in Korea) (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1986), 211-214; and Gil Huiseong, 237.

<sup>71</sup> Bak Haedang, 161-166; Jang Wongyu, 214-217; Gil Huiseong, 237; and I Jaeyeol, "Ogyo yangjong gwa Jogye jongtong e gwanhan gochal: Jogye jongjo Bojo-pa ui Imje Seon yutong-go" (Examination of Five Doctrinal Sects and Two Chan Sects and the Jogye Lineage: Dissemination of Linji Chan Buddhism in the Dharma Lineage of Bojo, the Founding Patriarch of Jogye Order), Bulgyo sahak-hoe, ed., 263-276.

historical evidence that Byeoksong Jieom received recognition from Byeokgye Jeongsim. Even though Hyujeong defined Byeoksong Jieom as his grand master and Buyong Yeonggwon as his master, we cannot find any textual and historical evidence that Hyujeong received recognition of his enlightenment from Buyong Yeonggwon and Buyong Yeonggwon from Byeoksong Jieom. In conclusion, I Seongcheol's assertions cannot be supported with any historical and textual evidence.

Third, if we review the academic accuracy in I Seongcheol's assertions, even though the sectarian Dharma lineage of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism is inconsistent and ambiguous in successive Dharma transmission between masters and disciples, I Seongcheol attempted to textually and historically verify the lineage by referring to a lot of texts. The third problem is based on the second problem. He could not logically develop his assertions through academic accuracy. He did not criticize texts but unreasonably interpreted them to authenticate his assertions. As a result, he referred to Pyeongyang Eon-gi, Junggwon Haeon (b. 1567) and their followers and their texts and authorized his assertions to justify the lineage.

I Seongcheol loyally edited the *Haedong buljo wollyu* (Origin of Buddhas and Patriarchs in Korean Buddhism) which Saam Chaeyeong compiled in 1764 and systematized the sectarian lineage of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism. He compiled it to systematize its lineage and founding patriarch to justify the authenticity of his lineage, i.e., for his political and institutional needs. It became the authentic textbook for the followers of the lineage. However, I Seongcheol used the textbook to prove his sectarian arguments that the lineage is authentic and proper. He was just an ideologist who reiterated the same arguments included in without critically examining it. He did not examine the text and the lineage objectively and neutrally but he was an ideologist who just blindly believed in them.

I Seongcheol advocated the radical Chan subitism of sudden enlightenment and sudden practice and the sectarian lineage of Korean Linji Chan considering Taego as the lineage's founding patriarch. However, I think that his view of the lineage and soteriology cannot outline Korean Buddhism. His view of the lineage and soteriology can explain only a stream of Korean Buddhism represented by Korean Linji Chan Buddhism, not general Korean Buddhism. Along with the Linji Chan sectarian tradition, Korean Buddhism has inherited ecumenical traditions succeeding Wonhyo, Uicheon, Jinul, Gihwa and Hyujeong. Unlike him, we can contextualize modern Korean Buddhism as the crossroads between ecumenism and Linji Chan sectarianism.

### 3. Purification Buddhist Movement

There have been two major movements in the Buddhist history of South Korea since the liberation of that country from Japan on August 15, 1945. Chronologically, the first to appear was the "Purification Buddhist Movement"

(Jeonghwa Bulgyo Undong), the more recent being the Minjung Buddhist Movement in 1980's. Minjung Buddhist Movement is a Buddhist movement to liberate the struggling populace in the religious, political and social context. I think that we can also apply the key concepts of ecumenism and sectarianism to the movements. So, we can analyze and define the two movements as the crossroads between ecumenism and sectarianism from different angles. Social activists comprehensively initiated and developed Minjung Buddhist Movement in 1980's from the sectarian perspective of struggling masses, excluding established and institutionalized monks and classes.

The movement's leaders advocated Korean Buddhism's celibate monasticism and vegetarianism from married monasticism and non-vegetarianism Japanized during Japanese occupation period, 1910 – 1945. Celibate monks considered themselves as preserving orthopraxy and married monks as taking not orthopraxy (precepts) from their sectarian perspective. They strengthened their sectarianism based on the standard of orthopraxy. Married monks and unmarried monks, consisting of two groups in the Jogye Order at the time, fought against each other to get the order's hegemony based on the standard of orthopraxy. After unmarried monks obtained the order's hegemony, married monks separated themselves from the Jogye Order and newly established an order named Taego Order.

I academically utilized two key concepts of ecumenism and sectarianism, made three paradigms and comprehensively investigated Sino-Korean Buddhism previously. First, I hermeneutically used the concepts, analyzed a number of doctrinal classification systems in Sino-Korean Buddhism, and grouped the systems in two, ecumenical and sectarian.<sup>72</sup> Second, I also soteriologically and in the Dharma lineage applied the concepts, analyzed relations between doctrinal and Chan Buddhism in Korean Buddhism, modern and pre-modern, and concluded Sino-Korean Buddhism as the crossroads between ecumenism and Chan sectarianism.<sup>73</sup> Third, I could institutionally use the concepts, comprehensively analyze the movement and characterize it as the crossroads between ecumenism and sectarianism.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> See Chanju Mun, *The History of Doctrinal Classification in Chinese Buddhism: A Study of the Panjiao Systems* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2006), and "Wonhyo (617-686): A Critic of Sectarian Doctrinal Classifications," in *Hsi Lai Journal of Humanistic Buddhism* 6 (2005): 290-306.

<sup>73</sup> Refer to Chanju Mun, *Ha Dongsan and Colonial Korean Buddhism: Balancing Ecumenism and Sectarianism* (Honolulu, Hawaii: Blue Pine, 2009), "Yun Goam (1899-1988) and Peacemaking: Theory and Practice," in *Daegak sasang* (Maha Bodhi Thought) 12 (2009): 243-293, and "Bak Hanyeong (1870-1948) and Anti-Chan Sectarianism," in forthcoming *Bojo sasang* (Journal of Bojo Thought Research Institution) 35 (2011).

<sup>74</sup> See Chanju Mun, "Purification Buddhist Movement, 1954-1962: Interconnecting Ecumenism and Sectarianism," in forthcoming *Daegak sasang* (Maha Bodhi Thought) 14 (2010).

The movement's activists espoused to revitalize Chan Buddhism but did not take Linji Chan sectarian theory and its sectarian Dharma lineage. They theoretically advocated ecumenism between doctrinal and Chan Buddhism. Even so, unmarried monks successively accomplished the movement based on their political and institutional sectarianism and kicked out married monks in the order while married monks negated the authenticity of the movement and advocated ecumenism between married and unmarried monks coexistent in the order since the Japanese colonial period. Institutionally speaking, married monks advocated ecumenism and unmarried monks sectarianism. While married monks tried to maintain the ecumenical order between married monks and unmarried monks, unmarried monks attempted to make the sectarian order only for themselves.

Even though celibate monks initiated the movement and began to enthrone the highest patriarch only for themselves in 1954, they began the list of the highest patriarchs from 1962 after the order's united administration. The numbering of the highest patriarchs has many logical problems. First, even though the Jogye Order was officially established in 1941, present Jogye Order officially counts the highest patriarchs from 1962. So, the Jogye Order negates the history from 1941 to 1962. If the order dislikes including its history, 1941-1945, under Japanese occupation, it should include its history at least after 1945. If the order dislikes its history which included married monks in it, it should count the supreme patriarchs from the movement's beginning in 1954. The order's calculation of the supreme patriarchs does not logically reflect the sectarian perspective of unmarried monks.

Even though the movement's leaders individually declared that they loyally succeeded the sectarian Dharma lineage of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism, they officially and institutionally installed Jinul, a representative and famous ecumenist in Korean Buddhism, as the founding patriarch of Korean Buddhism. They had logical contradictions between their personally adopted Dharma lineage of Korean Linji Chan sectarianism and their officially adopted Jinul as the founding patriarch and his ecumenical philosophy. Even though Jinul was not related to the sectarian lineage which they adopted Taego as its founding patriarch, they institutionally officialized Jinul as the founding patriarch of Korean Buddhism during the movement's process.

The majority of movement leaders theoretically had ecumenical philosophy, not sectarian philosophy of Linji Chan Buddhism. We usually list I Cheongdam, I Hyobong, Ha Dongsan, Jeong Geum-o (1896-1968) and Yun Wolha as the five major leaders of the movement. Except Jeong Geum-o who accepted Linji Chan sectarianism philosophically and the sectarian lineage of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism, four of them theoretically and philosophically were ecumenists, not Linji Chan sectarians. So, the actual thought and personal Dharma lineage of the movement leaders does not consistently reflect the official adoption of thought and Dharma lineage in the movement because the majority of them personally did not adopt Jinul's Dharma lineage but his ecumenical philosophy.

If we instantiate Ha Dongsan, a key leader of the movement, we can easily see the inconsistency between his personal lineage and the official lineage of the movement. Even though he inherited ecumenical philosophy from Jinul, his master Baek Yongseong and his disciple I Seongcheol did not follow ecumenical philosophy but Linji Chan sectarianism. So, we cannot consistently apply sectarianism and ecumenism in the same Dharma and/or tonsure lineage of modern Korean Buddhism. Even though Ha Dongsan inherited Korean Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage from his master Baek Yongseong, he followed ecumenism and moderate Chan soteriology of sudden enlightenment and gradual practice after Shenhui (670-762), Chengguan, Zongmi, Yanshou, Jinul, Hyujeong, Zhuhong, and so on.

Ha Dongsan theoretically and doctrinally received strong influence from Sino-Korean ecumenists such as Wonhyo, Li Tongxuan, Shenhui, Zongmi, Uicheon, Jinul, Yanshou, Hyujeong, Zhuhong, and so on and formed his ecumenical philosophy. He loyally followed after moderate Chan soteriology that ecumenists generally adopted and strongly negated radical Chan soteriology of sudden enlightenment and sudden practice which Linji Chan sectarians adopted. He did not hierarchically classify various Buddhist traditions such as vinaya, Chan, Huayan, Pure Land, and Esoteric Buddhism but ecumenically considered various Buddhist doctrinal and practical traditions. While his master Baek Yongseong was a Linji Chan sectarian,<sup>75</sup> Ha Dongsan was an ecumenist.

Even though Yun Goam, a junior Dharma brother of Ha Dongsan and an eminent disciple of Baek Yongseong, who served as the supreme patriarch of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, theoretically advocated ecumenism, he did not actively claim that he inherited the sectarian lineage of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism and also that he succeeded the ecumenical lineage of Korean Buddhism. He did not define his lineage as being ecumenical or sectarian.<sup>76</sup> I Seongcheol, an eminent disciple of Ha Dongsan and an eminent grand disciple of Baek Yongseong, who also served as the highest patriarch of the Jogye Order, inherited Linji Chan sectarianism in philosophy and the Dharma lineage.<sup>77</sup>

Even though Baek Yongseong and his grand disciple I Seongcheol advocated Linji Chan sectarianism in the Dharma lineage and philosophically, both were quite different in dealing with the sectarianism. Because Baek Yongseong prioritized Chan Buddhism over other traditions but did not completely exclude other traditions, he was a moderate Chan sectarian. Unlike Baek Yongseong, because I Seongcheol excluded other traditions except Chan Buddhism, he was a radical sectarian. So, Baek Yongseong, his two major disciples Ha Dongsan and Yun Goam, and his grand disciple I Seongcheol all

<sup>75</sup> Dongsan, ed., Dongbong, trans., *Yongseong keun seunim eorok: Pyeongsangsim i do ra ireuji malla* (Chan Master Baek Yongseong's Analects) (Seoul: Bulgwang chupan-bu, 1993), 455-464.

<sup>76</sup> Chanju Mun, "Yun Goam (1899-1988) and Peacemaking," 243-293.

<sup>77</sup> I Seongcheol, *Hanguk bulgyo ui beommaek* (The Orthodox Dharma Lineage of Korean Buddhism) (Hapcheon: Janggyeong-gak, 1976).

are different in their Dharma lineage and philosophy. As described above, modern Korean masters of the same tonsure and/or Dharma lineage do not guarantee to have same philosophy and same view of the Dharma lineage.

Ha Dongsan loyally inherited his master Baek Yongseong and the spirit of Seonhak-won (Center for Seon Studies) established in 1920 and became the movement's key leader. He was officially a Linji Chan sectarian in the Dharma lineage but actually and philosophically an ecumenist. He did not accept Taego, a sectarian of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism but installed Jinul, a major ecumenist in Korean Buddhism, as the founding patriarch of Korean Buddhism during the movement's process. However, his disciple I Seongcheol was a radical Linji Chan sectarian, advocated the radical Linji Chan sectarian soteriology, and vehemently criticized the movement's key leaders who changed the founding patriarch of Korean Chan Buddhism from Taego to Jinul.<sup>78</sup>

Even though they individually declared that they inherited the Korean Linji Chan Dharma lineage, they officially and institutionally installed Jinul, an ecumenist, as the founding patriarch of Korean Buddhism. They had contradictions between their individual stance and their official position regarding the Dharma lineage. Ha Dongsan also had the contradictions between his personal stance and the movement's official position regarding the Dharma lineage. He also had contradictions between his ecumenical philosophy and his personally accepted Korean Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage.

As seen above, we can adopt two key concepts of ecumenism and sectarianism and analyze the movement and its leaders in many aspects such as the Dharma lineage, the founding patriarch, soteriology, institution, and so on. I concretely used the order's constitutions and investigate in this section how and why the order revised it several times after its establishment in 1941. Modern Korean Buddhists, different from official statements on the Dharma lineage and the founding patriarch(s) dictated in the order's first and successively revised constitution(s), presented their own versions of the topics. As we can see in the following sections, unmarried monks used the topics of the Dharma lineage and the founding patriarch to take the order's hegemony from married monks and married monks utilized the same topics to maintain the order's hegemony based on the political necessity.

### 3.1. The movement's characteristics

The movement began its sectarianism for celibate monks in 1954, discontinued it in 1962,<sup>79</sup> and completed it in 1970. This movement focused on cleansing the influence of Japanese Buddhism on that of Korea and purification

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

<sup>79</sup> Mun, *Ha Dongsan*, 12-17; and Chanju Mun, "Purification Buddhist Movement, 1954-62: The Recovery of Traditional Monasticism from Japanized Buddhism in South Korea," in *Hsi Lai Journal of Humanistic Buddhism* 8 (2007): 278-294.

of the monastic order. The movement was initiated by executive orders of the first South Korean president, I Seungman (1875-1965), to expel married Buddhist priests from traditional monasteries. Essentially, the Korean monastic orders had kept the precept of non-marriage until the Japanization of them by the Japanese government. This occurred during the colonial period from 1910 to 1945. During that time, the Japanese Governor-General in Korea forcibly caused Korean Buddhist monks to marry in order to facilitate control over Korean Buddhism.

The unmarried monks obtained the leadership in the order after the national monastic conference on August 12 – 13, 1955. The married monks, who lost the leadership, strongly reacted against the unmarried monks' leadership. The administrative confrontations between two groups continued until the establishment of the order's united administration, an ecumenical, not sectarian, result, between them in April 1962, upon which the sectarian movement for celibate monks was discontinued. The married monastic group broke away from the order's united administration because of the discriminated measures from the unmarried monastic group in September 1962. So, because celibate monks continuously and gradually developed their sectarianism in the movement, they stopped their sectarian momentum in the movement upon the establishment of the order's united administration.

The Supreme Court finished the long and tedious legal procedures between the married and the unmarried monastic groups and authorized the Purification Buddhism Movement over married Japanized Buddhism in 1969. The married monks established the independent new order entitled Taego Order and the government approved the registration of the new order based on the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties in 1970. We can presume that because the established Jogye Order became a sectarian order for celibate monks upon the official establishment of the sectarian Taego Order for married monks, the movement was institutional completed in 1970.

The movement had two major missions.<sup>80</sup> First, it was to recover the celibate monastic tradition of Korean Buddhism from the marriage priesthood of Japanese Buddhism. The married monks privatized temple properties to support their families financially. To get and keep their higher positions in Buddhism, they were loyal to their appointers, Japanese officials. It was naturally subject to have nationalist sentiments. It easily identified the celibate monasticism as the traditional identity of Korean Buddhism. It ignored the positive aspects of Japanese Buddhism's influences on Korean Buddhism in modern times. Japanese Buddhists tremendously helped Korean Buddhism to adopt various advance models of academic research, social activities and mission works from their Buddhism and to modernize itself. It did not properly evaluate the

---

<sup>80</sup> The Board of Education of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, ed., *Jogye jongsŏ: Geun-hyeondae pyeon* (The History of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism: Modern and Present Periods) (Seoul: Jogye-jong chulpan-sa, 2001), 191-192.

influences of Japanese Buddhism on Korean Buddhism under the Japanese occupation period.

Second, it was to revitalize the Seon practice tradition of Korean Buddhism. Seon practitioners lost their temples for practicing Seon Buddhism because married abbots and higher order administrators controlled almost all Korean temples at the time. The movement loyally succeeded the celibate monasticism and Korean Seon tradition of the Center for Seon Studies (Seonhak-won), established in 1920. The Seon practitioners actively participated in the movement in this context. It basically had the Seon sectarianism even though Korean Buddhism has preserved the ecumenical tradition for a long time. Seon practitioners affiliated with the Center for Seon Studies in Seoul and the Seon centers across the nation participated in the movement. Because Korean Seon practitioners prioritized the Imje Seon lineage, we can safely categorize them as the Imje Seon sectarians.

The characteristics of the movement<sup>81</sup> can be summarized as follows. First, the movement heavily relied on the state. The movement was supported by the two rulers, Presidents I Seungman and Bak Jeonghui (1917-1979). President I Seungman issued six times his messages between May 20, 1954 and August 5, 1955 and President Bak Jeonghui issued several official statements in support of the movement.

Second, Koreans and Korean Buddhists supported the movement from their strong nationalistic sentiments against Japanese imperialism and their negative experiences under the Japanese occupation, 1910 – 1945. They defined married monasticism and non-vegetarianism as Japanized Buddhism and regarded Japanized Korean Buddhism as an object that Korean Buddhists should eliminate.

Third, the movement did not neutrally and objectively evaluate the influences of Japanese Buddhism on Korean Buddhism under Japanese occupation period. Even though Korean Buddhists tremendously received positive influences from Japanese Buddhism and improved and modernized their own Buddhism, they emotionally maximized the negative aspects of and intentionally minimized the positive aspects of Japanized Korean Buddhism. The participants to the movement intentionally ignored how Korean Buddhism had modernized itself through influences from Japanese Buddhism.

Fourth, the movement violated the separation policy between religion and state, which is described in the constitution. President I Seungman initiated the movement by issuing his first message on May 20, 1954. Prior to the message, Korean Buddhists tried to purify Korean Buddhism but obtained nearly none of their goals. After the first message by President I Seungman, the government administrative units became actively involved in the religious affairs.

---

<sup>81</sup> See Dongguk daehakgyo seongnim-hoe (Monastic Alumni Association of Dongguk University), ed., *Hanguk bulgyo hyeondae-sa* (The History of Modern Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Sigong-sa, 1997), 33.



Fifth, both groups, married monks and celibate monks, defined monkhood in different ways based on their interests. The celibate monks conservatively defined monkhood based on monastic codes that the traditional Buddhist orders had kept. The married monks suggested that monkhood could be a combination of celibate monks, who might concentrate on cultivation and enlightenment without being distracted to the secular lives, and married monks, who might focus on propagating Buddhism among those living mundane lives.

Sixth, the movement's process was heavily dependent on the court and the state's intervention. Two groups took their cases to court and to the state to back up their own behaviors. The court and the state generally favored the celibate monastic side against the married monastics. Korean Buddhism wasted its properties and money in legal fees. Through the process, Korean Buddhism became a pro-government religion and automatically voiced support for the government. It ignored the social justices under the undemocratic regimes. The government manipulated the conflict between two Buddhist groups for their purposes.

Seventh, the behaviors of both sides were non-Buddhist. They used violence, and some disemboweled themselves and intruded into the court, and broke the harmony of the Buddhist community. They even employed gangsters to attack the opposition and to take the temples. Even though the goals of Purification Buddhism could be justified, the methods that they adopted could not be authorized under the name of Buddhism. Buddhism strictly prohibited Buddhists from using violence.

Eighth, the movement was basically sectarian. It was subject to Seon sectarianism because Seon practitioners participated in the movement and naturally supported Seon sectarianism. Except for a few leaders of the movement, common Seon practitioners were not trained and not well educated in Buddhist doctrine but concentrated on Seon praxis. The participants to the movement basically were Seon sectarians and positioned the Seon praxis over the doctrinal study.

Even so, because married monks had used the order's headquarters Taegosa Temple named after Taego, an Imje Seon sectarian, unmarried monks sectarianistically and politically changed their order's founding patriarch from Taego to Jinul, an ecumenist between Huayan doctrine and Seon praxis. Even though their change of the founding patriarch Taego and their Seon sectarianism are contradictory, they changed their order's founder from their practical and political perspective, not from their theoretical and doctrinal one.

Ninth, the movement was contradictory between Seon sectarianism and the change of the order's founder from the Imje Seon sectarian Taego to the ecumenist Jinul. Although Korean Seon practitioners are traditionally subject to have Seon sectarianism to a certain degree, Korean Buddhists have generally preserved their strong tradition of ecumenism for a long time. While the participants in the movement were Seon sectarians from the practical perspectives, they were ecumenists from the doctrinal and theoretical ones.

Tenth, even though the defenders and sympathizers of the movement maximized its autonomous aspect, the movement was a government-sponsored and institutionalized one to some degree. So, the critics and opponents of the movement defined it as a government-initiated institutional one. Its participants did not make an objection to the undemocratic politics of two dictators I Seungman and Bak Jeonghui, loyal patrons and supporters of their movement, but they rather beautified and justified the dictatorships. They approached even the sublime social issues from their partisan perspectives.

Eleventh, the movement was basically a partisan (sectarian) movement for celibate monks, not including married monks. It tried to negate the identity of married monasticism in the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism established under the Japanese occupation period, 1910-1945, after obtaining independence from Japan in 1945. After married monks separated themselves from the Jogye Order and officially established the Taego Order of Korean Buddhism for themselves in 1970, fundamental conflicts between married monks and unmarried monks in a same order became completely settled down.

Twelfth, the movement was a power struggle and conflict in the religious order. While married monks tried to protect their political and institutional hegemony established under the Japanese rule, unmarried monks tried to take it from married monks. The political interests between two groups clashed against each other. So, we can define the movement as a political movement in a religious order.

Because the movement's aim was to recover this aspect of monastic order from the Japanese influence, the movement was basically for reformation of Korean Buddhism inside the religious arena. In contrast, the Minjung Buddhist Movement is fundamentally an attempt to construct a type of Pure Land in the society by introducing such universal issues as human rights, justice, peace, labor, democracy, reunification, and so on.

I discussed Minjung Buddhist Movement in terms of its history, development and meaning within the larger context of Korean Buddhism and society in an article.<sup>82</sup> It indicates when and how the two movements came into conflict with each other. While Minjung Buddhist Movement was a socially engaged one, Purification Buddhist Movement was a religious one. While Minjung Buddhist Movement was active to work for social justice, Purification Buddhist Movement was indifferent to the social issues.

Because the Purification Buddhist Movement was successful based on the government's backing, it was automatically institutionalized even under the undemocratic and dictatorial government's control. So, participants sometimes beautified and justified the undemocratic dictators. While Purification Buddhist Movement was the government-sponsored one, Minjung Buddhist Movement was independent of the undemocratic government. While participants of the

---

<sup>82</sup> See Chanju Mun, "Historical Introduction to Minjung Buddhism (Korean Liberation Buddhism) in 1980's," in *Kankoku bukkyōgaku semina* – (Journal of Korean Buddhist Seminar) 9 (2003): 239-270.

Purification Buddhist Movement could not raise a social issue of democratization in the undemocratic society, activists of the Minjung Buddhist Movement were very active to democratize the cruel dictatorships in Korean society.

### 3.2. The order's supreme patriarchs

President I Seungman issued his first presidential message on May 20, 1954, based on which celibate monks extensively initiated the movement. Since then, one supreme patriarch represented the group of celibate monks and another the group of married monks in the same order. The present Jogye Order officially defined I Hyobong as its first supreme patriarch beginning his term from 1962 in which the order's united administration was established.<sup>83</sup> Because it did not include the supreme patriarchs of the celibate monastic group continued during the movement from 1954 to 1962, it was automatically subject to negate the authenticity of the patriarchs.

The celibate monastic group installed Ha Dongsan as its first supreme patriarch on November 3, 1954 and its second supreme patriarch on August 2, 1955 from their sectarian perspective for celibate monks in the Jogye Order. It installed Seol Seogu (1875-1958) as the third supreme patriarch on August 12, 1955, I Hyobong as the fourth supreme patriarch in April 1958 and Ha Dongsan as the fifth supreme patriarch on August 13, 1958. Ha Dongsan served as the fifth supreme patriarch from August 13, 1958 to April 11, 1962. Upon the establishment of the order's united administration, I Hyobong became the order's supreme patriarch. The supreme patriarchs of both sides in the same order, Ha Dongsan and Guk Mukdam (1896-1981) finished their terms on April 11, 1962.

The present Jogye Order calculates its supreme patriarchs from the establishment of the order's united administration in 1962, officializing I Hyobong as its first supreme patriarch. If we accept the official numbering of its supreme patriarchs, we should its long history from its official establishment in 1941 under Japanese occupation period, 1910-1945. The current Jogye Order did not include even the supreme patriarchs of the order's celibate monastic during the movement from 1954 to 1962 in its official list of supreme patriarchs, of course excluding Bang Hanam as a supreme patriarch served for four years from 1941 to 1945 during the colonial period and several supreme patriarchs for seventeen years from 1945 to 1962 during the post-colonial period.

Im Hyeobong, a specialist in modern Korean Buddhism, criticized the Jogye Order which officialized the list of its supreme patriarchs and suggested the

---

<sup>83</sup> Hanguk bulgyo chongnam pyeonjip wiwon-hoe (The Committee for Editing the Comprehensive Collection of Source Materials of Contemporary Korean Buddhism), ed., *Hanguk bulgyo chongnam* (The Comprehensive Collection of Source Materials of Contemporary Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Daehan bulgyo jinheung-won, 1993), 206.

order to include at least the supreme patriarchs served after Korea's liberation.<sup>84</sup> If it does not include the supreme patriarchs in its list, it is supposed to negate its history from August 15, 1945 to April 11, 1962 and admit its history began from April 11, 1962. Even though the order dislikes including its supreme patriarch from 1941 to 1945 during the colonial period, Im Hyeobong argued that the order should include its supreme patriarchs in its official list at least from 1945.

Thirty one abbots of parish head temples convened the meeting in the Japanese Government-General Building on November 28, 1940 and drafted the "Law of the Taego-sa Temple, Headquarters Temple of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism" (Joseon bulgyo Jogye-jong chongbonsan Taegosa-beop). They changed the order's name from the awkward title "Two Sects of Seon and Doctrine of Korean Buddhism" to "Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism." They submitted the law to the Japanese Government-General for approval on December 9, 1940. The Government-General revised the enforcement ordinances of the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples (Sachal-ryeong) on April 23, 1941 and approved the Law of Taego-sa Temple based on the revised enforcement ordinance. So, Korean Buddhism was officially able to adopt the title of Jogye Order.

The official title of Taego-sa became the "Taego-sa Temple, Headquarters of Korean Buddhism." Based on the Law of Taego-sa Temple which the Japanese Government-General approved, Korean Buddhists officially established the Jogye Order and assigned all of Korean Buddhist temples to the order. The order centralized and administered all of Korean Buddhist temples under its supervision. Prior to the order's official establishment in 1941, Korean Buddhism consisted of 31 parishes. Because the headquarters temple of each parish had its own autonomous power to appoint the abbots of and manage its branch temples, Korean Buddhism did not have a central administrative body to administer all Korean Buddhist organizations and temples. Japanese Government-General controlled and managed all of Korean Buddhist temples through each parish headquarters.

The Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism convened the first meeting of the order's central assembly on June 5, 1941 and installed Bang Hanam as its first supreme patriarch. Japanese Government-General approved him as the order's first supreme patriarch on August 4, 1941. Since Bang Hanam became the first supreme patriarch of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, he served as the supreme patriarch until Korea's independence on August 15, 1945. Two days later, on August 17, 1945, I Jong-uk (1884-1969), the order's Secretary-General, and his cabinet members resigned from the positions. Korean Buddhists considered that they had served for imperial Japan.

On August 18, 1945, progressive Korean Buddhists organized the Preparatory Committee for Reforming Korean Buddhism. Two days later, on

---

<sup>84</sup> See the preface in Im Hyeobong, *Jongjeong yeoljeon 1: Geu nuga keun kkum eul kkaeyeot na?* (The 1<sup>st</sup> Series of the Biographies of Modern Korean Buddhism's Supreme Patriarchs: Who Awakened the Dreams?) (Seoul: Garam gihoek, 1999).

August 20, Gim Beomnin (1899-1964), Choe Beomsul (1904-1979), Yu Yeop, and so forth visited the Taego-sa Temple, Headquarters Temple of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, took over the order's management rights and organized the Preparatory Committee for a National Conference for Monks. They hosted the national conference for monks on September 22 – 23, 1945 and abolished the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples, its enforcement ordinance, the Law of Taego-sa Temple, the system of 31 parishes, and so on. They aimed at removing the influence of Japanese Buddhism in Korean Buddhism and establishing new Korean Buddhism in the conference. They newly made Korean Buddhism's constitution, reorganized its Central Secretariat Office and its provincial secretariat offices, and assigned each provincial secretariat office to each province of 13 provinces.

They installed Bak Hanyeong as the 1<sup>st</sup> supreme patriarch of Korean Buddhism after Korea's liberation in the national conference for monks. Even though Bak Hanyeong was considered as the supreme patriarch, he did not serve as the position but stayed at Naejang-sa Temple in Jeong-eup, North Jeolla Province. After he passed away on April 8, 1948 (lunar February 29), the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism installed Bang Hanam as the second supreme patriarch on June 30, 1948. He served as the supreme patriarch until he passed away on March 21, 1951 (lunar February 14). The order installed Song Manam as its third supreme patriarch on June 20, 1951.

President I Seungman issued the first presidential message on May 20, 1954. Based on the message, celibate monks officialized the movement. On June 20, 1954, the order's executives hosted the meeting and revised its constitution depending on I Daeui's (1901-1978) suggestions and supreme patriarch Song Manam's directives. It promulgated and implemented the constitution on July 6, 1954.<sup>85</sup> The order's executives defined its monasticism as constituting married and unmarried monks. Song Manam became the order's fourth supreme patriarch based on the newly promulgated constitution.<sup>86</sup> They stipulated that the Jogye Order inherits ecumenical tradition between doctrinal and Chan Buddhism in its constitution and defines Doui as the order's founding patriarch.

Celibate monks hosted the first national conference for themselves on September 27 – 28, 1954 and revised and declared the order's constitution. They did not accept Doui affiliated with the Chan lineage of Mt. Gaji as the founding patriarch but Jinul affiliated with the Chan lineage of Mt. Sagul as the founding patriarch. The order's official constitution promulgated on July 6, 1954 accepted the Dharma lineage of Doui and Taego, both of whom were affiliated with the Chan lineage of Mt. Gaji. The sectarian constitution for unmarried monks declared at the first national conference adopted the Dharma lineage of Beomil

---

<sup>85</sup> I Cheolgyo · Gim Gwangsik, comp., *Hanguk geun hyeondae Bulgyo jaryo jeonjip* (The Complete Collection of Source Materials of Modern and Contemporary Buddhism) (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1996), 68: 127-145. They compiled the source materials related with Purification Buddhist Movement in its 68<sup>th</sup> volume.

<sup>86</sup> Im Hyeobong, 1: 78.

and Jinul, both of whom were affiliated with the Chan lineage of Mt. Sagul. Doui and Beomil were the founders of each lineage respectively.

Vehemently criticizing celibate monks who made their own version of the order's constitution and changed the founding patriarch from Taego to Jinul, Song Manam, the order's then supreme patriarch, resigned the position in January 1955 and sided with the married monastic group. Even so, married monks did not accept his resignation but still considered him as the order's official supreme patriarch. Because celibate monks installed Ha Dongsan as their supreme patriarch on November 3, 1954, the Jogye Order simultaneously had two supreme patriarchs, one for married monks and another for unmarried monks, in the same order. Both sides agreed to initiate the order's united administration and installed I Hyobong as its supreme patriarch on April 11, 1962. The order had two supreme patriarchs between 1954 and 1962.

Married monks asserted that Song Manam served the order's supreme patriarch by his death on January 10, 1957. After his death, married monks installed Guk Mukdam as its 5<sup>th</sup> supreme patriarch on March 17, 1957 and succeed the 4<sup>th</sup> supreme patriarch Song Manam. Guk Mukdam served until the official beginning of the order's united administration on April 11, 1962. Even though the present Taego Order did not include the supreme patriarch in the colonial period, it consistently and pretty reasonably calculates its supreme patriarchs from the liberation of Korea on from Japan on August 15, 1945 to the present.

However, the present Jogye Order fixed I Hyobong as the 1<sup>st</sup> supreme patriarch who began his term from April 11, 1962 on which the order's united administration was officially established. However, if we accept the list of supreme patriarchs in the order, we are subject to negate the order's historical authenticity from April 23, 1941 on which the order was officially established to April 11, 1962. I think that the order needs to carefully and academically examine and set up the list of its supreme patriarchs by properly, reasonably and factually reviewing the movement and the history of modern Korean Buddhism. If we accept its calculation, the Jogye Order is logically and completely subject to negate even the movement's authenticity and the order's historicity. Even though celibate monks in fact and historically formed the current order based on the success of the sectarian movement, the order did not properly reflect the movement's authenticity and the order's historicity in the calculation.

### **3.3. The order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage<sup>87</sup>**

Korean Buddhists officially established the Jogye Order in 1941 under the Japanese colonial rule and included married and unmarried monks in the order. I

---

<sup>87</sup> I slightly revised and cited my Korean article "Purification Buddhist Movement, 1954-1962" in this section.

reviewed the order's first and revised constitutions and examined how the order established and changed their founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage. The movement's activists and theorists consisting of the group of celibate monks politically revised the order's constitutions and changed the order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage for their group. Referring to the order's constitutions, I carefully and academically investigated in this section how and why the order has revised the order's constitutions and has changed the order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage.

### 3.3.1. The Law of Taego-sa Temple (April 23, 1941)

Korean Buddhists received the approval of the "Law of Taego-sa Temple, Headquarters Temple of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism" from the Japanese Government-General on April 23, 1941 and implemented the law on May 1.<sup>88</sup> Based on the law, the order was officially established and Taego-sa Temple became the order's headquarters. Even though the order was officially founded based on the support of Japanese Government-General, it was the first national organization in the history of modern Korean Buddhism which managed and controlled all of Korean Buddhist temples across the nation. The order represented Korean Buddhism and Japanese Government-General could effectively manage Korean Buddhism.

Prior to the foundation of Jogye Order in 1941, Japanese Government-General established the Association of 31 Buddhist Parishes and managed Korean Buddhism based on the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples on June 3 and its enforcement ordinance on September 1, 1911 in which the official name of Korean Buddhism was named the Two Sects of Seon and Doctrine of Korean Buddhism. Korean Buddhists officially initiated the Jogye Order in 1941 and officialized Taego as the order's founding patriarch. The Japanese Government-General and the Jogye Order nationally controlled and managed all temples and monks in Japanese colonial period.

If we review the 'First Chapter General Rules' of the "Law of Taego-sa Temple," we can see the official view of the Jogye Order.<sup>89</sup> The first chapter, the first article of the law prescribes, "the headquarters and branch temples shall be called as the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism," so that it unified Korean Buddhism as the Jogye Order. Its first chapter, the second article stipulates, "This order aims at learning the fundamental teaching of Chan Buddhism such as the manifesting of Buddha nature, the realizing of Buddhahood and saving sentient beings." Its first chapter, the third article describes, "This order enshrines Śākyamuni Buddha as the main Buddha in temples. However, the temple which already enshrined other Buddha image is able to maintain the pre-

---

<sup>88</sup> I Cheolgyo · Gim Gwangsik, comp., 67: 197-198. They compiled various meeting minutes of Buddhist organizations during modern times in its 66<sup>th</sup> and 67<sup>th</sup> volumes.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid, 67: 199.

enshrined image.” Its first chapter, the fourth article mentions, “This order considers National Master Taego as its founding patriarch.” And its first chapter, the fifth article prescribes that “anyone who does not inherit the Dharma lineage of Taego, the order’s founder, cannot succeed to the temple’s leader.”

The Law of Taego-sa Temple officially adopted Gim Yeongsu’s (1884-1967) theory, considered Taego as the order’s founding patriarch and accepted the sectarian Dharma lineage of Korean Linji Chan Buddhism. However, the theory of regarding Taego as the order’s founding patriarch is logically supposed to negate the authenticity of Korean Buddhism and/or Korean Chan Buddhism prior to Taego. To solve the logical problems, the order’s revised constitutions after its first official Law of Taego-sa Temple did not literally and dogmatically interpret Gim Yeongsu’s theory. For example, even though the constitution of the Taego Order established in 1970 accepted Korean Linji Chan sectarian lineage and definitely considered Taego as its founding patriarch, it also contextualized Taego in the long history of Korean Buddhism.

### **3.3.2. The constitution of Korean Buddhism (March 7, 1946)**

Korea became independent from Japan on August 15, 1945. Two days later, on August 17, the executives of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism resigned from their positions. Progressive Buddhist leaders organized the Preparatory Committee for Reforming Korean Buddhism on August 18 and took over the order’s business and began to work at Taego-sa Temple, headquarters of Korean Buddhism, on August 20. The Society for Reforming Korean Buddhism hosted the national conference for monks on September 22 – 23, 1945, abolished the Law of Taego-sa Temple and the system of parish and branch temples, and changed the order’s title from “Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism” to “Korean Buddhism.”

Korean Buddhism hosted the first central cabinet meeting and passed its constitution on March 7, 1946 and officially promulgated it on May 28. It constituted 26 chapters and 106 articles in total.<sup>90</sup> It loyally handed over the ecumenical tradition of Korean Buddhism and did not officially accept Korean Linji Chan sectarianism’s founding patriarch and Dharma lineage prescribed in the Law of Taego-sa Temple. Korean Buddhism highly respected two major ecumenists Wonhyo and Jinul of Korean Buddhism and did not fix any scripture as the order’s official and authoritative text. Even though it officially accepted the Dharma lineage originated from Taego, it located Taego as an ecumenist, not as a sectarian. It considered Taego as succeeding to the ecumenical lineage of Korean Buddhism. It did not hand over Korean Linji Chan sectarian lineage clearly described in the Law of Taego-sa Temple, the order’s first constitution.

---

<sup>90</sup> Ibid, 65: 431-455.



Korean Buddhism clearly defined its founding patriarch and Dharma lineage from the first chapter the first article to the fourth chapter the fourth article of its constitution from the ecumenical perspective. Korean Buddhism indicated all of Korean Buddhism after the first introduction to Korea from China in 372, the second reign year of King Sosurim (r. 371-384) of the Goguryeo Dynasty (BCE 37- CE 668) and extremely emphasized Wonhyo and Jinul in its constitution. It did not fix its authoritative text for the order but ecumenically accepted all Buddhist texts. While the order's first constitution defined Taego as a Korean Linji Chan sectarian and his Dharma lineage as the lineage of Linji Chan sectarianism, Korean Buddhism considered Taego as an ecumenist and defined his Dharma lineage as the lineage of Korean ecumenism. We can see the strong spirit of ecumenism in its constitution.

If we concretely examine its constitution,<sup>91</sup> its first chapter the first article prescribes, "Since the second reign year of King Sosurim of the Goguryeo Dynasty Buddhism was imported to Korea, Buddhism had historically and regionally become Koreanized. We can call the Buddhism as Korean Buddhism." The second chapter the second article describes, "Korean Buddhism aims at experiencing the Buddha's fundamental teachings for realizing ourselves and making others realize, cultivating Wonhyo's great compassionate vow of Great Vehicle and Jinul's joint practice between meditation and wisdom, and finally pointing to Buddha nature and realizing Buddhahood. Korean Buddhism does not fix any official and authoritative text." The third chapter the third article mentions, "Korean Buddhism enshrines Śākyamuni Buddha as the main Buddha in temples. However, the temple which already enshrined other Buddha image is able to maintain the pre-enshrined image." The fourth chapter the fourth article states, "According to the succession of a Dharma lamp in Korean Buddhism, five teachings and nine Chan lineages had sectarian confrontations in the Silla and Goryeo Dynasties but Korean Buddhism since then inherited Chan Masters Hyujeong and Buhyu Seonsu who handed over the lineage of ecumenists such as Chan Masters Byeokgye Jeongsim and Taego who transcended sectarianism and maintained ecumenical spirit. Korean Buddhism needs to follow after the model of ecumenical Dharma lineage."

### 3.3.3. The order's constitution (June 20, 1954)

President I Seungman issued the first presidential message on May 20, 1954 and initiated the movement. The executives of Korean Buddhism consisting of married monks reacted to the message and revised the order's constitution on June 20, 1954. They changed the order's official title from "Korean Buddhism" to "Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism" in the constitution. They did not follow ecumenist founders and ecumenical Dharma lineage prescribed in Korean

---

<sup>91</sup> Ibid, 65: 434-435. They compiled the miscellaneous source materials of modern Korean Buddhism in the 63<sup>rd</sup>, 64<sup>th</sup>, and 65<sup>th</sup> volumes.

Buddhism's constitution but considered Doui as its founding patriarch and adopted the Dharma lineage of Korean Linji Chan sectarianism in their newly revised constitution. The order's first constitution officialized Taego as its founding patriarch and accepted the Dharma lineage of Korean Linji Chan sectarianism originated from Taego in 1941. The order's second constitution officialized Korean major ecumenists as its founding patriarchs and adopted the ecumenical Dharma lineage locating Taego as an ecumenist in 1946. The order's third constitution adopted Doui as its founding patriarch and accepted the Dharma lineage of Linji Chan sectarianism originated from Taego in 1954.

If we carefully review the order's constitution drafted on June 20, 1954, its official adoption of Doui as its founding patriarch was based on the combination of pre-existent three different theories of its founding patriarch. First, Gwon Sangno theorized Doui as the order's founding patriarch; second, Gim Yeongsu considered Taego as its founding patriarch; and, third, I Jong-ik and I Jaeyeol adopted Taego as its founding patriarch. The order combined three views of its founding patriarch in its constitution. Because Doui of the Silla Dynasty (traditionally dated 57 BCE – 936 CE) firstly introduced Chan Buddhism from China, they considered Doui as the order's founding patriarch. However, they also included Jinul and Taego as the order's co-founders. They defined the order as the union between Chan sectarianism and ecumenism between doctrinal and Chan Buddhism.<sup>92</sup>

According to the first article in the order's constitution, "The order was entitled the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism. It originated from the Chan lineage of Mt. Gaji that National Master Doui of the Silla Dynasty established and National Master Bojo of the Goryeo Dynasty revitalized it. National Master Taego subsumed all Buddhist traditions and authorized them as the Jogye Order. Thereafter, Korean Buddhism inherited the ecumenical lineage."<sup>93</sup> National Master Doui of the Silla Dynasty, the founder of the Chan lineage established on Mt. Gaji, was a Chan sectarian; even though National Master Jinul of the Goryeo Dynasty officially inherited the Chan lineage established on Mt. Sagul by Beomil, he theoretically was an ecumenist between Chan and doctrinal Buddhism; and National Master Taego domestically inherited the Chan lineage of Mt. Gaji and internationally handed over the Dharma lineage of Linji Chan sectarianism from China. The first article in the order's constitution clearly defined Jogye Order as the combined version between Chan sectarianism and ecumenism between doctrinal and Chan Buddhism.

The constitution's second article discussed the order's ecumenism between Chan and doctrinal Buddhism and its third article described that the order did not limit but ecumenically discussed various Buddhist traditions such as Pure Land, Tantric, doctrinal Buddhism, and other traditions. According to its second article, "This order aims at experiencing Śākyamuni Buddha's fundamental

---

<sup>92</sup> Ibid, 68: 132.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid, 68: 133.

teachings for realizing ourselves and making others realize themselves, cultivating Wonhyo's great compassionate vow of Great Vehicle and Jinul's joint practice between meditation and wisdom, and finally pointing to Buddha nature, realizing Buddhahood and saving suffering sentient beings in Chan Buddhism.<sup>94</sup>

The abovementioned article clearly manifested ecumenical tradition of the Jogye Order. Wonhyo ecumenized various doctrinal traditions and Jinul harmonized doctrinal and Chan traditions. Wonhyo and Jinul were the representative ecumenists in Korean Buddhism. The constitution accepted the open style of the Dharma lineage not directly continued from masters to disciples but did not follow the closed version of its Dharma lineage directly inherited from masters to disciples. According to the constitution's third chapter, "This order's official text is the *Diamond Sūtra*. However, this order does not sectarianistically limit other Buddhist traditions such as doctrinal, Pure Land, Tantric and other Buddhism except Chan Buddhism."<sup>95</sup> If we examine the aforementioned sentence, the Jogye Order officially adopted ecumenism.

The sixth article of the constitution clarified the Dharma lineage of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism. It says, "The order considered as its founding patriarch National Master Doui who inherited the Dharma lineage of Xitang Zhizang, a grand-great disciple of Huineng, the sixth patriarch of Chan Buddhism, in the fifth reign year (813) of King Heondeok of the Silla Dynasty. It defined National Master Taego of the Goryeo Dynasty as its revitalizing patriarch. It also defined the Dharma lineage of Hyujeong and Buhyu Seonsu, disciples of Buyong Yeonggwon."<sup>96</sup> Monks of current Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism inherit two Dharma lineages.

The sixth article defined National Master Doui, the founder of the Chan Dharma lineage of Mt. Gaji, as the order's founding patriarch and considered as the order's inheritor National Taego who succeeded to the Korean Chan Dharma lineage of Mt. Gaji and the Chinese Linji Chan lineage. But it did not even mention in the Dharma lineage of Jogye Order Jinul who inherited the Chan Dharma lineage established on Mt. Sagul and philosophically advocated ecumenism. The constitution's manifestoes, first article, second article, and third article described ecumenism and its sixth article prescribes the sectarian Dharma lineage of Chan Buddhism. In this context, its constitution contained the logically contradictory Chan sectarian lineage and ecumenism between Chan and doctrinal traditions.

---

<sup>94</sup> Ibid.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid.

### 3.3.4. The order's constitution (September 27 -28, 1954)

I Jaeyeol and I Jong-ik, ex-monks, considered Jinul as the order's founding patriarch. They were close to the group of celibate monks and actively participated in the movement. Celibate monks hosted the first national conference for themselves on September 27 – 28, 1954 and made the order's constitution for their sectarian purposes regardless of its official constitution. They excluded married monks from the definition of monkhood in their constitution and advocated their movement. With the theoretical and academic support from I Jaeyeol and I Jong-ik, they clearly stipulated Jinul as the order's founding patriarch in the constitution.<sup>97</sup>

The movement's theorists did not accept Doui, Jinul and Taego as ecumenical founding patriarchs and the Chan sectarian Dharma lineage of Mt. Gaji continued from Doui to Taego as their Dharma lineage prescribed in the Jogye Order's June 20, 1954 constitution but officialized the Dharma lineage of Mt. Sagul continued from Beomil to Jinul in their constitution's first article the first clause. The clause says, "This order inherited the direct lineage of Huineng, the sixth patriarch of Chan Buddhism; Master Beomil established the Chan lineage on Mt. Sagul; National Master Jinul inherited Master Beomil's Chan lineage, harmonized doctrinal and Chan traditions, and created the independent lineage of Chan Buddhism; a number of Master Jinul's disciples including National Master Jingak Hyesim (1178-1234), a Dharma heir to Master Jinul, made their master's teaching prosper; and based on King Gangjong's (r. 1212-1214) edict, they officially declared the Jogye Order. The order successively inherited the lineage from masters to disciples and was the united order of Korean Buddhism which harmonized two Chan sects and five doctrinal sects."<sup>98</sup>

The constitution's fifth article clarified the founding patriarchs and the Chan Dharma lineage of Mt. Sagul continued from Beomil to Jinul as follows: "This order originated from Master Beomil who inherited the Chinese Chan Dharma lineage from Yanguan Zhaian (d. 842), a great-grand disciple of Huineng, the sixth patriarch, returned to his home nation of Silla in 847, the ninth reign year of King Munseong, established a Chan lineage on Mt. Sagul. National Master Jinul, founder of Songgwang-sa Temple on Mt. Jogye, succeeded to the Dharma lineage of Sin-gwang Jonghwi belonged to the Chan lineage of Mt. Sagul, considered the *Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch* as his master, and established the Jogye Order. National Master Jingak took over the Dharma lineage from his master Jinul and handed it over National Masters

---

<sup>97</sup> Gim Gwangsik, "Doui guksa ui jongjo-ron simal" (Discussions on the National Master Doui as the Jogye Order's Founding Patriarch), in *Manhae chukjeon jaryo-jip* (Source Materials in Commemoration of Manhae Han Yongun in 2009) (Inje: Baekdam-sa Temple Manhae Village, 2009), 3: 168-179.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid, 3: 173, footnote # 43.

Cheongjin (d. 1252), Jinmyeong (1191-1271), Won-o (1215-1286) and Jagak and Chan Masters Jolam, Gugok, Byeokgye, Byeoksong (1464-1534) and Buyong. Buyong handed it over to two major disciples Cheongheo and Buhyu. The aforementioned national masters synthesized two Chan sects and five doctrinal sects and handed the united lineage of Jogye Order over until now.<sup>99</sup>

They defined Jinul affiliated with the Chan lineage of Mt. Sagul as the founding patriarch of Jogye Order and Beomil as the founder of the order because he founded the lineage. They also argued that 16 national masters of Songgwang-sa Temple in the Goryeo Dynasty and later eminent Chan masters Jolam, Gugok, Byeokgye, Byeoksong and Buyong in the Joseon Dynasty inherited the Dharma lineage of National Master Jinul. The majority of Korean Buddhist monks succeeded to two major Dharma lineages of Hyujeong and Buhyu Seonsu under Chan Master Buyong. They politically adopted the Dharma lineage of Mt. Sagul continued from Beomil to Jinul and negated the established Dharma lineage of Mt. Gaji continued from Doui to Taego.

Song Manam who served as the order's supreme patriarch at the time declared a public statement and vehemently criticized their change of the order's founding patriarch from Taego to Jinul on October 15, 1954.<sup>100</sup> Even though he basically agreed with the movement's goal, he seriously criticized the change of the order's founding patriarch by the movement's key leaders. He criticized unmarried monks who officialized their founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage of Mt. Sagul continued from Beomil to Jinul in the newly adopted constitution and asserted that the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism should succeed to the Korean Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage of Taego. After his criticism, it was generally told in public that married monks considered Taego to be the order's founding patriarch and that unmarried monks regarded Jinul as the order's founding patriarch.<sup>101</sup>

We need to examine whether the order's constitution that the order's executives revised on June 20, 1954 really prescribed Taego as the order's founding patriarch and officialized the Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage of Taego. Song Manam and his followers of married monks actually misunderstood the order's founding patriarch and Dharma lineage in the June 20, 1954 constitution. Unlike his arguments, the constitution adopted Doui, Jinul and Taego as the order's founding patriarchs and officialized the Chan Dharma

<sup>99</sup> Ibid, 3: 173.

<sup>100</sup> Gim Sangyeong, "'Jeonghwa undong' sidae ui jongjo galdeung munje wa geu yeoksa-jeok uiui" (The Conflict of the Order's Founding Patriarch during Purification Buddhist Movement and its Historical Significances), Buddhology Institute of the Board of Education of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, ed., *Bulgyo jeonghwa undong ui jaejomyeong* (Reexamination of Purification Buddhist Movement) (Seoul: Jogye Order's Publishing, 2008), 175.

<sup>101</sup> See the November 28, 1954 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.190-191; the December 20, 1954 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.197-198; and the January 26, 1955 issue of *Donga ilbo*, S.1.1.200-201.

lineage of Mt. Gaji continued from Dou to Taego. He did not properly reflect the constitution but developed the order's founding patriarch and Dharma lineage from his personal view.

Song Manam already considered the Korean Linji Chan sectarian lineage of Taego as Korean Buddhism's authentic Dharma lineage in the general principles of Gobul Praxis Complex established on lunar December 8, 1947, a religious holy day for celebrating the Buddha's enlightenment, at his resident Baegyang-sa Temple.<sup>102</sup> He reacted against the order's founding patriarch Jinul and its Dharma lineage which celibate monks advocated in their revised constitution, considered Taego as their founding patriarch and more strongly advocated the Korean Linji Chan sectarian lineage of Taego. He argued that celibate monks were disloyal to the founding patriarch and characterized unmarried monks as being immoral. He defined that celibate monks exchanged their father and changed their founding patriarch.

The group of celibate monks accepted I Jaeyeol and I Jong-ik's assertions, considered Jinul as the order's founding patriarch, declared the public statement regarding the change of their founding patriarch and the exchange of their father and logically refuted Song Manam's adoption of Taego as the order's founding patriarch and of the Korean Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage of Taego.<sup>103</sup> The group of celibate monks who advocated the movement strongly and logically argued against Song Manam and his followers of married monks who did not properly reflect their constitution. His understanding of the order's founding patriarch and the Dharma lineage was contradictory to the founding patriarch and the Dharma lineage prescribed in the order's constitution.

The group of married monks declared the long public statement under the group of the Dharmic Descendants of Taego of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism in December 1954.<sup>104</sup> They assigned "the exchange of their father and the change of their founding patriarch" to the first item of nine items in the statement, seriously criticized the unmarried monastic group's adoption of the founding patriarch Jinul and the Dharma Lineage of Jinul, considered Taego as the order's founding patriarch and strongly advocated the Korean Linji Chan sectarian lineage of Taego.<sup>105</sup> The married monastic group of the Jogye Order established the Taego Order of Korean Buddhism for themselves and registered

---

<sup>102</sup> Gim Gwangsik, "Gobul chongnim gwa bulgyo jeonghwa" (Gobul Praxis Complex and the Purification of Buddhism), in *Hanguk hyeondae bulgyo-sa yeongu* (Researches in the History of Modern Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Bulgyo sidae-sa, 2006), 88-95.

<sup>103</sup> I Cheolgyo · Gim Gwangsik, comp., 68: 646-652.

<sup>104</sup> Jongdan-sa ganhaeng wiwon-hoe (The Publication Committee for the History of the Taego Order of Korean Buddhism), ed., *Taego jongsae: Hanguk bulgyo jeongtong jongdan ui yeoksa* (The History of the Taego Order of Korean Buddhism: The History of an Orthodox Order in Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Hanguk bulgyo chulpan-bu, 2006), 281-286.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid, 282.

it to the government's Department of Education in 1970. The present Taego Order basically considered Taego as its founding patriarch and the Dharma lineage of Taego as Song Manam and the group of married monks who advocated during the movement.

Hanguk bulgyo chongnam pyeonjip wiwon-hoe (The Editorial Committee for the Comprehensive Collection of Source Materials of Contemporary Korean Buddhism), ed., *Hanguk bulgyo chongnam* (The Comprehensive Collection of Source Materials of Contemporary Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Daehan bulgyo jinheung-won, 1993), introduced "Hanguk bulgyo Taego-jong" (Taego Order of Korean Buddhism) (pp. 221-223). According to its introduction, the Taego Order's founding patriarch is National Master Taego, the order aims at respecting the fundamental spirit of Śākyamuni Buddha which makes us and others enlightened, enhancing the philosophy of its founding patriarch, propagating Buddhism, and saving sentient beings.<sup>106</sup> The order "enshrines Śākyamuni Buddha as the main Buddha image in its temples. However, if its temple enshrines other Buddha image other than Śākyamuni Buddha, the temple can follow its custom."<sup>107</sup> The order's official text is the *Diamond Sūtra* but the order does not limit the chanting and research of any other sūtras.<sup>108</sup> And "National Master Taego of late Goryeo Dynasty united five doctrinal sects and nine mountain lineages of Chan Buddhism and established two traditions of doctrine and Chan Buddhism."<sup>109</sup> As shown above, the Taego Order accepted National Master Taego as its founding patriarch, but unlike the arguments which Song Manam and his followers of married monks presented during the Purification Buddhist Movement, the order located him in the context of Korean Buddhism's ecumenical Dharma lineage, not of Korean Linji Chan sectarian lineage.

Song Manam considered the movement one for the minority of celibate monks to take the order's hegemony by relying on political power.<sup>110</sup> He also defined the movement as being undemocratic, dependent on the government, unrealistic, and desirous of power. He argued that celibate monks could not justify their change of the order's founding patriarch and the Dharma lineage by revising the order's constitution. He analyzed the movement from the perspective of a moderate reformist. He contended that we could and should reform Korean Buddhism Japanized during Japanese occupation and adopting married monasticism and non-vegetarianism from the realistic and moderate perspective. He considered the movement's key activists as radical reformists and claimed that their movement was unrealistic.<sup>111</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup> Hanguk bulgyo chongnam pyeonjip wiwon-hoe, ed., 221.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid, 235-236.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid, 236-237.

Song Manam could not accept the radical opinions of unmarried monks who abandoned the order's founding patriarch and official Dharma lineage, established Jinul as its founding patriarch and accepted the Dharma lineage of Jinul as its official lineage. He considered the movement's key figures as those who could even change their fathers and founding patriarchs to justify their political purposes. He vehemently criticized the movement's key figures and disconnected the relation with them. He claimed to gradually and realistically purify Japanized Buddhism and attempted to gradually solve it in the Gobul Praxis Complex established on January 18, 1948 (lunar December 8, 1947). He also did not exclude the majority of married monks in the order in purifying Japanized Buddhism. Because he was a moderate and a realist, he concretely attempted to solve married monasticism in the Gobul Praxis Complex. The radical minority of unmarried monks considered the established majority of married monks as an object to eliminate.

Song Manam did not agree to accept married monks based on Buddhist teachings. Even so, he contended that the minority of celibate monks could not radically remove the majority of married monks. He wanted to make the movement to be moderate unlike radical activists of the movement. He realistically divided monkhood into two groups, married and unmarried monks and assigned different roles to different groups in the 5<sup>th</sup><sup>112</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup><sup>113</sup> articles in the Rules of Baegyang Praxis Complex, a headquarters of Gobul Praxis Complex. He adamantly had the moderate stance in purifying Buddhism even before and after the movement. He also firmly considered Taego as the order's founding patriarch and strongly advocated the Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage.

Due to conflicts between Song Manam and celibate monks on the issue of the order's founding patriarch and the Dharma lineage, Song Manam disconnected his relation with the celibate monastic group and sided with the married monastic group. The celibate monastic group of the Jogye Order hosted the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of their group's Central Assembly at the Center for Seon Studies, enshrined Ha Dongsan as the supreme patriarch for themselves, and fired Song Manam from the supreme patriarch position on November 3, 1954. Even so, Ha Dongsan was the spiritual, not official, leader of unmarried monks in the order. Since then, there were two supreme patriarchs, Song Manam for married monks and Ha Dongsan for unmarried monks.

The Society of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, the Lay Association of Korean Buddhism, and the Female Association of Korean Seon Buddhism jointly issued a public statement on November 22, 1954 and supported unmarried monks who considered Jinul as the order's founding patriarch.<sup>114</sup> Based on I Jaeyeol and I Jong-ik's arguments, they actively refuted Gim Yeongsu who theorized Taego as the order's founding patriarch and Gwon

---

<sup>112</sup> Ibid.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid, 189.

<sup>114</sup> I Cheolgyo · Gim Gwangsik, comp., 68: 646-652.



Sangno who considered Doui as the order's founding patriarch. They also criticized the arguments of Song Manam and his followers of married monks on the order's founding patriarch because they simultaneously asserted Taego as the order's founding patriarch at the individual level and also accepted the order's constitution which prescribed Doui as the founding patriarch at the order's level.

### 3.3.5. The order's constitution (August 12-13, 1955)

The group of celibate monks received the government's support and hosted the national conference for monks on August 12 – 13, 1955 and institutionally took the order's hegemony. They newly elected members of the order's Central Assembly, revised the order's constitution, elected executives of the order's cabinet, appointed new abbots and changed abbots from the married monastic side to the celibate monastic side. They did not accept the theory of considering Jinul as the order's founding patriarch prescribed in the constitution that they revised on September 27 – 28, 1954 but returned to the theory of the order's founding patriarch stipulated in the order's June 20, 1954 constitution which married monks revised. Married monks accepted Doui as the order's founding patriarch in the constitution.<sup>115</sup>

Ironically speaking, celibate monks accepted Doui as the order's founding patriarch stipulated in the order's constitution which married monks drafted on June 20, 1954 and negated Jinul as the order's patriarch prescribed in their sectarian constitution which celibate monks passed on September 27 – 28, 1954. The order's later revised constitutions loyally transmitted the constitution passed on August 12 -13, 1955 and adopted Doui as the order's founding patriarch. For example, the order drafted its constitution on March 22 and promulgated it on March 25, 1962 and accepted Doui as its founding patriarch. The order's current constitution drafted and promulgated on October 12, 1999 also basically transmitted the version of its founding patriarch adopted in the constitution (June 20, 1954). It also accepted Doui, Jinul and Taego as its founding patriarchs and the ecumenical Dharma lineage continued from Doui through Jinul to Taego.<sup>116</sup>

The group of unmarried monks changed the order's founding patriarchs from Doui, Jinul and Taego to Beomil and Jinul of the Chan lineage of Mt. Sagul and its Dharma lineage continued from Doui and Taego of the Chan lineage of Mt. Gaji to Beomil and Jinul of the Chan lineage of Mt. Sagul during the movement in their drafted constitution. They politically changed the order's

---

<sup>115</sup> Gim Sangyeong, 177-178.

<sup>116</sup> The Secretariat Head Office of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, ed., *Jongdan beomnyeong-jip* (The Collection of the Regulations and Rules of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism), revised edition (1995, Seoul: Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, 2001), 17-19.

founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage. The Chan tradition of Taego transmitted Chinese Linji Chan sectarianism, considering their Linji Chan lineage as being authentic and other Chan lineages as being unauthentic. Linji Chan tradition advocated radical Chan sectarianism in the Dharma lineage, exclusively practiced Kōan Chan techniques and strongly followed radical Chan soteriology of sudden enlightenment and sudden practice.

Unlike Linji Chan sectarians, Jinul was an ecumenist between doctrinal and Chan Buddhism and did not locate Chan Buddhism over doctrinal Buddhism. Even though the movement's activists aimed at revitalizing Korean Chan Buddhism, they ironically did not accept Taego as their group's founding patriarch and his Linji Chan sectarianism but adopted Jinul as its founding patriarch and his ecumenism between doctrinal and Chan Buddhism. So, unmarried monks of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism politically and ideologically established Jinul as its founding patriarch and clearly did differentiate their group's founding patriarch and Dharma lineage from Korean Linji Chan sectarian Dharma lineage and its founding patriarch Taego.

The movement's leaders hosted the national conference for celibate monks on September 27 – 28, 1954, extensively implemented the movement and officialized Jinul as their group's founding patriarch and his Dharma lineage. However, they also hosted the national conference for celibate monks on August 12 – 13, 1955 and certainly held the order's hegemony and actually abandoned their founding patriarch and Dharma lineage. They ironically returned to the order's constitution revised and adopted by married monks on June 20, 1954 in which married monks officialized the order's founding patriarchs, Doui, Jinul and Taego and the Dharma lineage continued from Doui through Jinul to Taego. They held the ecumenical stance on the order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage. The sectarian view of the order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage of Beomil and Jinul, both of whom were affiliated with the Chan lineage of Mt. Sagul, began from the beginning of the movement and ended with the end of the movement. The celibate monks of the Jogye Order officially accepted the founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage for less than one year from their own sectarian, political and ideological interests.

The movement's key leaders made their founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage official when they began the movement, abandoned their founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage upon the movement's success, and returned to the order's founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage which married monks drafted and implemented. In conclusion, they arbitrarily discussed and used the founding patriarchs and Dharma lineage for their sectarian, political and ideological purposes. While the order's executives, married monks, officially made Doui the order's founding patriarch prior to the movement, unmarried monks began to adopt Jinul as their founding patriarch upon the beginning of the movement, celibate monks abandoned their founding patriarch and began to accept Doui as the order's patriarch again upon the movement's success, married monks established their order named Taego Order and officially

established Taego as their founding patriarch. In conclusion, married monks and celibate monks did not consistently assert their founding patriarchs but freely, arbitrarily and without principle developed arguments on the patriarchs based on their fluctuating political situations.



## **PART II**

### **THE MOVEMENT AND ORTHOPRAXY**

The majority of modern scholars conducted research on the movement, 1954-1970, from historical, not philosophical, perspectives. The movement aimed at removing married monks from the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, an ecumenical order, constituting married monks and unmarried monks, and making a sectarian order just for unmarried monks. The activists and theorists of the movement conservatively and literally interpreted precepts and defended celibate monasticism described in the monastic precepts and vegetarianism introduced not in the monastic precept but in Mahāyāna Bodhisattva precepts. They restored celibate monasticism and vegetarianism in Korean Buddhism Japanized during the colonial period, 1910-1945. They promoted the importance of orthopraxy in the movement's process.

While celibate monks did not authorize the movement from a theoretical or doctrinal background but on an ethical or moral basis, married monks progressively and freely interpreted the precepts and justified their married monasticism and non-vegetarianism. While married monks freely and creatively defined monkhood and attempted to preserve their established hegemony in the united Jogye Order institutionally founded in 1941, unmarried monks conservatively and literally defined monkhood and tried to take the order's hegemony from married monks. So, the movement was sectarian, political and ideological based on the conservative interpretation of precepts by celibate monks. The movement was justified based on orthopraxy, not on orthodoxy. The

theorists of the movement were not interested in authentic doctrines (orthodoxy) but proper behavior (orthopraxy).

Even though celibate monks literally and conservatively interpreted the precepts of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism, they intentionally ignored the precepts of non-arbitrariness, non-dispute, non-violence and the separation between religion and state in the movement for their political and sectarian interests. While they utilized the precepts of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism as the orthopraxis weapons to remove married monks in the order, they easily utilized and/or justified violence, disputes and the government authorities to successfully accomplish the movement for their political and sectarian purposes. They emphasized the key precepts of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism and ignored other key precepts of non-arbitrariness, non-dispute, nonviolence and the separation between religion and state.

Unlike celibate monks, while married monks freely and progressively interpreted the precepts of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism and defended their married monasticism and non-vegetarianism, they literally and conservatively understood the precepts of non-arbitrariness, non-dispute, nonviolence and the separation between state and religion and defined the movement as being violent, disputed, and government-sponsored. They considered the movement as a dispute that celibate monks initiated with the strong support of the government and two rulers, I Seungman (1875-1965) and Bak Jeonghui (1917-1979). They ignored the key precepts of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism and emphasized other key precepts of non-arbitrariness, nonviolence, non-dispute and the separation between religion and state.

Both sides arbitrarily interpreted and applied some precepts for their own sectarian and political interests. They did not interpret and apply the precepts consistently and objectively but inconsistently and subjectively in the movement. They arbitrarily utilized some, not all, precepts only for their orthopraxis purposes from their sectarian and political positions. So, this section treats the background of orthopraxis, how and why both camps emphasized some precepts and ignored others of the *Brahma Net Sūtra*, the authoritative text for Bodhisattva precepts in East Asian Buddhism, for their own political and sectarian positions. After first outlining the scripture, we will analyze some key precepts which both groups selected, interpreted and applied in advocating or opposing the movement for their own orthopraxis positions.

Ha Dongsan (1890-1965), Yun Goam (1899-1988), Gim Jaun (1911-1992) and Yun Wolha (1915-2003), four major vinaya masters of modern Korean Buddhism, actively participated in the movement, 1954-1970 and attempted to recover celibate monasticism and vegetarianism in Korean Buddhism Japanized during the Japanese occupation period, 1910-1945. They conservatively and literally interpreted precepts of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism and theoretically backed up the movement. They justified the movement based on the conservative interpretation of orthopraxy (precepts).

They developed the movement from their sectarian perspective of celibate monks, removed married monks from the united order consisting of married and unmarried monks, purified the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism and allowed only celibate monks in the order. Married monks were ecumenical and attempted to remain in the same order with themselves. However, due to the success of the movement, they became sectarian and began to officially divide the united and ecumenical Jogye Order but they did not succeed in partitioning it in two. So, they separated themselves from the Jogye Order and established a new order named Taego Order for married monks. Unlike them, celibate monks became ecumenical and asked married monks to be harmonious.

Three vinaya masters Ha Dongsan, Yun Goam and Gim Jaun, all of whom were eminent disciples of Baek Yongseong (1864-1940), loyally inherited their master and strongly emphasized and preserved some precepts. Yun Wolha, served as the vinaya master of Tongdo-sa Temple in modern times, transmitted the vinaya lineage that Seo Haedam (1862-1942) revitalized and attempted to recover traditional monasticism of Korean Buddhism at Tongdo-sa Temple, the head temple of vinaya in Korean Buddhism. They successfully deconstructed Japanized Korean Buddhism and completely recovered celibate monasticism and vegetarianism in post-colonial Korean Buddhism.

## 1. Vinaya lineages and texts

### 1.1. Vinaya lineages

Modern Korean Buddhism has two major lineages of vinaya. It has transmitted the traditional vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism from Daeun (1780-1841) who revitalized vinaya at Chilbul-am Hermitage on Mt. Jiri and the authentic vinaya lineage of Chinese Buddhism founded by Guxin (1535-1615) who recovered vinaya at Fayuan-si Temple in Beijing. Both lineages did not exclude but supplemented each other. For example, Ha Dongsan and Yun Goam, two major vinaya masters in modern Korean Buddhism, officially and concurrently inherited the two lineages. Daeun and Guxin received precepts through the self ordination ceremony and revitalized vinaya in their own nations.

Based on the self ordination precept prescribed in the 23<sup>rd</sup> precept of the *Brahma Net Sūtra*,<sup>1</sup> Daeun and Guxin revitalized vinaya tradition in Korean and Chinese Buddhism respectively. While Daeun revitalized vinaya tradition of Korean Buddhism in the late Joseon Dynasty (1392-1910) when Buddhism became seriously degenerate, Guxin recovered vinaya tradition of Chinese Buddhism in the Ming Dynasty (1368-1662) when Buddhism severely declined. The *Brahma Net Sūtra* introduces two kinds of ordinations, i.e., formal and

---

<sup>1</sup> T.24.1484.1006c5-18.

informal ordinations. While the *Brahma Net Sūtra*, the *Pusa yingluo benye jing*<sup>2</sup> and *Zhancha shane yebao jing*<sup>3</sup> advocate informal ordination for both monastics and laypersons, *Yuqie shidi lun* (Yogācāra-bhūmi-śāstra)<sup>4</sup> accepts informal self-vow ordination only for laypersons, not for monastics.<sup>5</sup>

I Jigwan (b. 1932) wrote a book entitled *Hanguk bulgyo gyeul jeontong: Hanguk bulgyo gyebeop ui jajujeok jeonseung* (Korean Buddhism's Vinaya Tradition: Independent Transmission of the Vinaya Teaching) (Seoul: Gasan bulgyo munhwa yeongu-won, 2005) and academically systemized Korean Buddhism's vinaya tradition. He included source materials on the vinaya tradition of Korean Buddhism in it. He also comprehensively included the sixteen kinds of ordination certification used in modern Korean Buddhism.<sup>6</sup>

If we analyze the 16 ordination certifications included in the aforementioned book, while Tongdo-sa Temple, Beomeo-sa Temple, Woljeong-sa Temple, the Center for Seon Studies (Seonhak-won) and the nectar precept platform of Haein-sa Temple inherited the vinaya lineage of Guxin,<sup>7</sup> Songgwang-sa Temple, the diamond precept platform of Haein-sa Temple, Daeheung-sa Temple, Mangwol-sa Temple, Hwaecom-sa Temple and Yonghwa-sa Temple inherited the vinaya lineage of Daeun.<sup>8</sup> As analyzed above, modern Korean Buddhists generally accepted the two vinaya lineages in ordaining monastics and laypersons.

Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, including Tongdo-sa Temple, Haein-sa Temple and Beomeo-sa Temple, its three big monasteries, generally accepted the vinaya lineage of Guxin, the authentic vinaya lineage of Chinese Buddhism. Taego Order of Korean Buddhism that married monks separated themselves from the united Jogye Order and officially established in 1970 generally inherited the vinaya lineage of Daeun. Guk Mukdam (1896-1981), served as the supreme patriarch of the Taego Order four times, inherited the vinaya lineage continued from Daeun through Geumdam Bomyeong (1765-1848), Choui Uisun (1786-1860), Beomhae Gagan (1820-1896), Gim Jesan (1862-1930), Ho-eun Munseong (1850-1918) and Geumhae Gwanyeong (1856-1926) to Song Manam (1876-1956).<sup>9</sup>

<sup>2</sup> T.24.1485.1010b2-1023a10.

<sup>3</sup> T.17.839.901c6-910c12.

<sup>4</sup> T.30.1579.279a2-882a14.

<sup>5</sup> T.30.1579.589b6-594c18.

<sup>6</sup> I Jigwan, *Hanguk bulgyo gyeul jeontong: Hanguk bulgyo gyebeop ui jajujeok jeonseung* (Korean Buddhism's Vinaya Tradition: Korean Buddhism's Independent Transmission of the Vinaya Teaching) (Seoul: Gasan bulgyo munhwa yeongu-won, 2005), 139-221.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, 254-256.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, 256-258.

<sup>9</sup> See Hanguk bulgyo chongnam pyeonjip wiwon-hoe (The Editing Committee for the Comprehensive Collection of Source Materials of Contemporary Korean Buddhism), ed., *Hanguk bulgyo chongnam* (The Comprehensive Collection of Source Materials of Contemporary Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Daehan bulgyo jinheung-won, 1993), 221-223.



Korean Buddhist monks were traditionally supposed to inherit the vinaya lineage of Vinaya Master Jajang (590-658) who transmitted vinaya from China and established the vinaya tradition in Korean Buddhism and to receive precepts from vinaya masters. However, if Manha Seungnim of Yongyeon-sa Temple in Daegu transmitted the vinaya lineage of Guxin from Vinaya Master Changtao Hanpo at Fayuan-si Temple in 1892, handed them to Seo Haedam of Tongdo-sa Temple and O Seongwol (1866-1943) of Beomeo-sa Temple at the diamond precept platform of Tongdo-sa Temple in 1897 and established a new vinaya lineage in Korean Buddhism, we are logically supposed to negate the traditional vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism originated from Vinaya Master Jajang and pre-existent before the acceptance of the new vinaya lineage.

Even though we could not negate the historical fact that Manha Seungnim inherited the vinaya lineage from Chinese Buddhism and revitalized the vinaya tradition of Korean Buddhism, we should not negate the importance of the traditional vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism. Even though the vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism was degenerate in late Joseon Dynasty, all Koreans should receive precepts from three vinaya masters and seven witnesses at ordination ceremonies to become monks even in the most degenerate period. None became a monk without taking precepts at an ordination ceremony.

Manha Seungnim received precepts and became a Korean monk under the traditional vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism and inherited the authentic vinaya lineage of Chinese Buddhism as a Korean monk, not as a Chinese monk. He did not go to China as a layperson but as a monk. We could not see any textual and historical evidences that he gave up Korean monkhood, received precepts from three vinaya preceptors and seven witnesses and became a Chinese monk. He went to China as a Korean monk and received precepts again at the diamond precept platform of Fayuan-si Temple in Beijing in the vinaya context of Chinese Buddhism. It seems to strengthen his vinaya lineage of Korea that he took and succeeded, because he had not abandoned his Korean monk status.

Manha Seungnim became a monk under the authentic and traditional vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism originated from Vinaya Master Jajang who transmitted the vinaya from China, established Tongdo-sa Temple and its affiliate Diamond Precept Platform and founded the vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism. Because vinaya spirit and lineage became weakened in late Joseon Dynasty, Manha Seungnim inherited the authentic vinaya lineage of Guxin to revitalize the vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism. He took the vinaya lineage of Chinese Buddhism not to destroy but to strengthen the vinaya tradition of Korean Buddhism. I think that we should not literally interpret the vinaya

---

Hereafter, I will refer this source book as its abbreviation *Chongnam*. Taego Order enlists its supreme patriarch from the independence from Japan on August 15, 1945. Guk Mukdam served as its 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 11<sup>th</sup> supreme patriarch.

lineage of Chinese Buddhism which Manha Seungnim inherited as biological lineage, but look at it symbolically.

Joseon Dynasty adopted Confucianism as its state ideology and persecuted Buddhism. When the vinaya lineage and spirit of Korean Buddhism became seriously weakened, Daeun of Dogap-sa Temple on Mt. Wolchul in Yeong-am, South Jeolla Province along with his master Geumdam Bomyeong entered intensive prayer for seven days and inherited the vinaya lineage in prayer at Chilbul-am Hermitage on Mt. Jiri. When Baek Yongseong served as the spiritual leader of Geum-eo Seon Center affiliated with Beomeo-sa Temple, he transmitted the vinaya lineage to Ha Dongsan on November 18, 1936.<sup>10</sup> If we review the vinaya transmission certificate that Baek Yongseong gave to his disciple Ha Dongsan, we can see the vinaya lineage of Daeun.<sup>11</sup> Ha Dongsan was also said to inherit the vinaya lineage of Guxin from Yeongmyeong Boje.

According to the vinaya transmission certificate with which Baek Yongseong provided Ha Dongsan<sup>12</sup> and the ordination certification which Baek Yongseong used at the diamond precept platform of Mangwol-sa Temple on Mt. Dobong in Yangju County, Gyeonggi Province,<sup>13</sup> Daeun practiced at Chilbul Seon Center of Chilbul Hermitage on Mt. Jiri, along with his master Geumdam Bomyeong, took a vow to the Buddha in 1826 based on the *Brahma Net Sūtra* and received precepts from the Buddha in prayer. When he sincerely prayed to the Buddha for seven days, he received auspicious lights on the crown of his head and recovered the traditional vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism.

He received the Mahāyāna Bodhisattva precepts from the Buddha and recovered the vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism continuously transmitted from Vinaya Master Jajang, Vinaya Master Jinpyo (b. 714), Jigong (d. 1363), Muhak (1327-1405) and Hwanseong Jian (1664-1729). He transmitted his vinaya lineage to his master Geumdam Bomyeong. Geumdam Bomyeong transmitted his vinaya lineage to Choui Uisun of Daeheung-sa Temple in Haenam, South Jeolla Province; Choui Uisun to Beomhae Gagan of Daeheung-sa Temple; and Beomhae Gagan to Seon-gok of Tongdo-sa Temple. Baek Yongseong transmitted the vinaya lineage from Vinaya Master Seon-gok at Tongdo-sa Temple in 1884. Unfortunately we cannot textually review Vinaya Master Seon-gok at all.

Baek Yongseong transmitted his vinaya lineage of Daeun to his disciple Ha Dongsan in 1936. However, if we review the ordination certification which Beomeo-sa Temple used at its diamond precept platform in 2005, the certification clearly positioned Ha Dongsan in the vinaya lineage of Guxin.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>10</sup> *Bulgyo sibo* 18 (January 1, 1937): 13.

<sup>11</sup> Dongsan mundo-hoe (Association of Master Ha Dongsan's Dharma Descendants), ed., *Dongsan daejongsa munjip* (The Collection of Grand Master Ha Dongsan's Works) (Busan: Beomeo-sa Temple, 1998), 370-371.

<sup>12</sup> Dongsan mundo-hoe, ed., 370-371 and I Jigwan, 246-247.

<sup>13</sup> I Jigwan, 179-185.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 163-167.

According to the certification, Manha Seungnim inherited the authentic vinaya lineage of Chinese Buddhism at Fayuan-si Temple in 1892 and transmitted it to O Seongwol at Tongdo-sa Temple in 1897.

O Seongwol transmitted the vinaya lineage of Guxin to Ilbong Gyeongnyeom at the diamond precept platform in Beomeo-sa Temple; Ilbong Gyeongnyeom to Jeong Unbong (1889-1946); Jeong Unbong to Yeongmyeong Boje; Yeongmyeong Boje to Ha Dongsan; Ha Dongsan to Yun Goam; Yun Goam to Yu Seogam (1911-1992); Yu Seogam to Gim Jaun; Gim Jaun to Go Gwangdeok (1927-1999); Go Gwangdeok to Gim Deongmyeong (1926-2003); and Gim Deongmyeong to I Heunggyo (b. 1942).

However, we need to review the ordination certification critically, carefully and academically. If we see the *Dongsan daejongsa munjip* (The Collection of Grand Master Ha Dongsan's Works), *Munjip* for abbreviation, edited by Dongsan mundo-hoe (Association of Master Ha Dongsan's Dharma Descendants), Manha Seungnim transmitted his vinaya lineage of Guxin to O Seongwol of Beomeo-sa Temple at the diamond precept platform of Tongdo-sa Temple in 1897 and O Seongwol established the diamond precept platform at Beomeo-sa Temple and transmitted his vinaya lineage to Ilbong Gyeongnyeom in 1904; later Ilbong Gyeongnyeom to Yeongmyeong Boje; and Yeongmyeong Boje to Ha Dongsan.<sup>15</sup>

According to the *Munjip*, O Seongwol presided over and transmitted the Bodhisattva precepts at the ordination ceremonies at the diamond precept platform of Beomeo-sa Temple from 1904 to 1922 fourteen times; Ilbong Gyeongnyeom from 1923 to 1935 thirteen times; Jeong Unbong in 1936 one time; Yeongmyeong Boje from 1937 to 1942 six times; and Ha Dongsan from 1943 to 1965 twenty three times.<sup>16</sup> Ha Dongsan presided over and transmitted Bodhisattva precepts at the ceremony on March 15-17, 1965 and he transmitted the vinaya lineage to Yu Seogam on March 17.<sup>17</sup> As I reviewed above, we need to critically examine the ordination certificate.

I could not find any textual evidence that Ha Dongsan transmitted the vinaya lineage of Guxin to Yun Goam and Yun Goam to Yu Seogam in the *Munjip* and Yun Seonhyo, ed., *Goam daejongsa beobeo-jip: Jabi bosal ui gil* (Great Master Goam's Analects: The Ways of a Compassionate Bodhisattva) (Seoul: Bulgyo yeongsang hoebo-sa, 1990) and *Goam keunseunim pyeongjeon: Nege han mulgeon i itteuni* (A Critical Biography of Great Master Goam) (Seoul: Bulgyo yeongsang, 1994). Yun Seonhyo, a disciple of Yun Goam, clearly described his master Yun Goam transmitted to Go Gwangdeok his vinaya lineage which he inherited from his master Baek Yongseong.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Dongsan mundo-hoe, ed., 123-124, 377-379.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, 124.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid, 396-397.

<sup>18</sup> Yun Seonhyo, ed., *Goam keunseunim pyeongjeon: Nege han mulgeon i itteuni* (A Critical Biography of Great Master Goam) (Seoul: Bulgyo yeongsang, 1994), 43.

I Jigwan, a disciple of Gim Jaun, argued that his master Gim Jaun prayed to Mañjuśrī Bodhisattva at Sangwon-sa Temple in Gangwon Province on Mt. Odae for one hundred days to revitalize vinaya in Korean Buddhism. He finally received response from the Bodhisattva and decided to publish vinaya texts and propagate vinaya teachings in Korean Buddhism.<sup>19</sup> Gim Jaun described in his drafted certification for offering Bodhisattva precepts at Cheonhwa (One Thousand Flowers) Precept Platform of Haein-sa Temple on Mt. Gaya that he inherited the vinaya lineage from Ilbong Gyeongnyeom at the diamond precept platform of Beomeo-sa Temple.<sup>20</sup> I have never seen any textual evidence that Gim Jaun inherited his vinaya lineage from Yu Seogam and transmitted it to Go Gwangdeok.

Baek Yongseong received full monastic precepts and Bodhisattva precepts from Vinaya Master Seon-gok at the diamond precept platform of Tongdo-sa Temple and inherited the vinaya lineage of Daeun in 1884. Vinaya Master Daeun revitalized traditional vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism which Vinaya Masters Jajang and Jinpyo established. Thereafter, Baek Yongseong sincerely attempted to revitalize the vinaya lineage in Korean Buddhism. Based on his strong emphasis on vinaya, he vehemently criticized married monasticism and non-vegetarianism popularized and Japanized during the Japanese occupation period, 1910-1945 and tried to recover celibate monasticism and vegetarianism in Korean Buddhism. He made efforts to recover traditional monasticism of Korean Buddhism by stressing great emphasis on vinaya and Seon Buddhism. The movement's activists in the post-colonial period succeeded to Baek Yongseong and endeavored to revitalize traditional monasticism and Seon Buddhism from Japanized Korean Buddhism.

Separately from the vinaya lineage of Daeun who revitalized the authentic and traditional vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism, Vinaya Master Manha Seungnim of Yongyeon-sa Temple in Daegu went to China and inherited the authentic vinaya lineage of Chinese Buddhism from Vinaya Master Changtao Hanpo at Fayuan-si Temple in Beijing in 1892. He transmitted it and recovered the discontinued vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism in Korea. Emperor Muzong (r. 1861-1874) of the Qing Dynasty appointed Changtao Hanpo to the government's vinaya master and he was enthroned as the vinaya master at the diamond precept platform of Fayuan-si Temple in 1869.

After Manha Seungnim returned to Korea, he presided over the ordination ceremony at the diamond precept platform of Tongdo-sa Temple and newly established a vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism in 1897. The vinaya masters who inherited the vinaya lineage of Guxin generally contended that because Korean Buddhists could not continue the traditional and authentic vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism, Manha Seungnim recovered the vinaya lineage in Korean Buddhism. However, even though the vinaya lineage became weakened in the

---

<sup>19</sup> I Jigwan, 211-215.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, 217-221.

degenerate period of Korean Buddhism, it has never been discontinued throughout the history of Korean Buddhism. All of Korean Buddhist monks have received and preserved the precepts based on the vinaya tradition of Korean Buddhism without exception.<sup>21</sup>

Even Manha Seungnim was ordained under the vinaya tradition of Korean Buddhism and went to China as a Korean Buddhist monk, not a layperson. I think that he received the authentic vinaya lineage of Chinese Buddhism from Changtao Hanpo to strengthen, not nullify, the vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism. After coming back to Korea, he did not negate the vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism to completely establish a new vinaya lineage of Chinese Buddhism in Korea. He received and transmitted the vinaya lineage of Chinese Buddhism to reinforce the vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism. I think that we should not literally and biologically understand the vinaya lineage of Guxin because if we adopted and maximized the literal and biological aspect of the vinaya lineage, we would logically have to negate the authenticity and continuation of the traditional vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism pre-existent before the establishment of the vinaya lineage by Manha Seungnim.

There are the two major vinaya lineages of Daeun and Guxin in modern Korean Buddhism. The lineages directly and indirectly interconnected and mutually influenced each other. For example, Yun Wolha served as the vinaya master of the diamond precept platform of Tongdo-sa Temple in modern times. He officially asserted that he inherited the vinaya lineage of Guxin from Cha Seonghwan in 1944. Cha Seonghwan transmitted the vinaya lineage from Seo Haedam in 1935 who inherited it from Seo Haedam from Manha Seungnim in 1897.<sup>22</sup> Before Manha Seungnim transmitted the vinaya lineage of Guxin to Seo Haedam at Tongdo-sa Temple in 1897, Seo Haedam received precepts and became a monk under traditional and authentic vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism continuously inherited from Vinaya Master Jajang, the founder of the temple. Because Seo Haedam did not negate the authenticity of traditional vinaya lineage of Daeun, he received the vinaya lineage of Chinese Buddhism which Manha Seungnim inherited and supplemented the vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism.

Baek Yongseong succeeded to the vinaya lineage of Daeun who revitalized vinaya at Chilbul-am Hermitage on Mt. Jiri. However, his three eminent disciples, Ha Dongsan, Yun Goam and Gim Jaun, very important vinaya masters in modern Korean Buddhism,<sup>23</sup> did not basically follow his master's vinaya lineage, the authentic vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism but the vinaya lineage

---

<sup>21</sup> (Seok) Hakdam, "Yongseong Jinjong seonsa ui wondonyul sasang gwa seonyul gyeomhaeng ui seonpung" (Baek Yongseong's Thought on Vinaya and His Ecumenical Approach to Seon and Vinaya), in *Daegak sasang* (Maha Bodhi Thought) 10 (2007): 285-415.

<sup>22</sup> I Jigwan, 139-144, 145-147.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid, 211-216, 217-221.

of Guxin, the authentic vinaya lineage of Chinese Buddhism.<sup>24</sup> If we review the ordination certification which Beomeo-sa Temple used at its diamond precept platform in 2004, it positioned the three major disciples of Baek Yongseong in the vinaya lineage of Guxin.<sup>25</sup> They did not transmit the vinaya lineage of Baek Yongseong but the vinaya lineage of Guxin according to the certification.

Even though the certification just introduced that Ha Dongsan inherited the vinaya lineage of Guxin from Yeongmyeong Boje, he also inherited the vinaya lineage of Daeun from his master Baek Yongseong. Yun Goam actually inherited the vinaya lineage of Daeun from Gim Jesan under whom he became a monk and the vinaya lineage of Daeun from Baek Yongseong from whom he also inherited the Dharma lineage and the vinaya lineage of Guxin from Bang Hanam (1876-1951) under whom he studied Buddhism.<sup>26</sup> He transmitted to Go Gwangdeok, the grand-disciple of Baek Yongseong, the vinaya lineage which he inherited from Baek Yongseong; to Gim Tanheo (1913-1983), a disciple of Bang Hanam, the vinaya lineage which he inherited from Bang Hanam; and to Jeon Gwan-eung (1910-2004), a grand-disciple of Gim Jesan, the vinaya lineage which he inherited from Gim Jesan.

If we review the ordination certification which Bang Hanam used at the diamond precept platform of Woljeong-sa Temple in Gangwon Province on Mt. Odae on May 5, 1933,<sup>27</sup> he received precepts and transmitted the vinaya lineage of Guxin from Manha Seungnim at the diamond precept platform of Tongdo-sa Temple in 1914.<sup>28</sup> He established and transmitted the vinaya lineage at the diamond precept platform of Woljeong-sa Temple on May 5, 1933. And Gwon Sangno (1879-1965) stated that Gim Jesan inherited the vinaya lineage of Daeun.<sup>29</sup> So, Yun Goam inherited the vinaya lineage of Guxin from Bang Hanam and the vinaya lineage of Daeun from Gim Jesan and Baek Yongseong.

As shown above, we cannot clearly dissect the two lineages in modern Korean Buddhism. If we take the genealogical aspect of vinaya lineage to the extreme, we cannot properly comprehend the vinaya lineages in modern Korean Buddhism. Many vinaya masters did not consider them as being exclusive but as being inclusive in transmitting their vinaya lineage. Ha Dongsan and Yun Goam

---

<sup>24</sup> (Seok) Hakdam very positively evaluated the vinaya lineage of Baek Yongseong and critically reviewed the vinaya lineage of Ha Dongsan, Yun Goam and Gim Jaun in his aforementioned lengthy article.

<sup>25</sup> I Jigwan, 163-167.

<sup>26</sup> Yun Seonhyo, ed., 43.

<sup>27</sup> I Jigwan, 173-177.

<sup>28</sup> Gyeong-un Hyeongjun stated that Bang Hanam inherited the vinaya lineage of Seo Haedam and Seo Haedam transmitted the vinaya lineage of Manha Seungnim. Because Seo Haedam presided over the ordination ceremonies around 1914, it seemed like natural that Ban Hanam inherited the vinaya lineage of Seo Haedam, not Manha Seungnim. See Gyeong-un Hyeongjun, ed., *Haedong buljo wollyu* (The Origin of Buddhas and Patriarchs in Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Bulseo bogeup-sa, 1979), 465.

<sup>29</sup> Gwon Sangno, "Joseon ui yuljong" (Vinaya Sect of Korean Buddhism), in *Bulgyo* 56 (February 1, 1929): 13.

concurrently inherited two lineages. If a vinaya master exclusively inherited the authentic vinaya lineage of Guxin of Chinese Buddhism, he was logically supposed to negate the authenticity of vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism prior to the introduction of Chinese Buddhism's new vinaya lineage. He also should negate Korean monks who had received precepts from traditional vinaya lineage of Korean Buddhism.

## 1.2. Main vinaya texts

Ha Dongsan, a key leader of the movement, modeled the Chan / Pure Land syncretism after Yanshou (904-975), Hyujeong (1520-1604)<sup>30</sup> and Zhuhong (1535-1615) and ecumenized Chan Buddhism with Pure Land Buddhism. As the preceding ecumenists stressed the preservation of vinaya in Sino-Korean Buddhism, Ha Dongsan also emphasized the strict observation of vinaya. He ordained many novice monks in modern Korean Buddhism. He must have used Zhuhong's *Shami luyi yaolue* (Essential Rules and Ceremonies for Buddhist Novice Monks) prevalent among Korean Buddhists. We can easily conjecture that Ha Dongsan must have read and have received influence from the text even though we cannot find his direct quotations from the text in his writings. Unfortunately, his *Collected Works of Grand Master Ha Dongsan* did not include his ordination manuals and preaching on them at all.

Korean Buddhists have used the *Shami luyi yaolue* as the guiding text when they have received the novice ordination. Ha Dongsan as one of the most representative vinaya masters in modern Korean Buddhism must have ordained novice monks and must have taught the precepts to them based on the text. Ha Dongsan appears to have received strong influence from Zhuhong's two writings, *Shami luyi yaolue* and *Changuan cejin* (Outline of Chan Buddhism). He formulated his syncretism between Chan and Pure Land Buddhism relying on the *Changuan cejin* and possibly the *Zhuchuang suibi* (Jottings under a Bamboo Window). Even though we do not have textual evidence in his book, Ha Dongsan seemed to emphasize the strict observation of vinaya depending on the *Shami luyi yaolu*.

I Jigwan comprehensively discussed the textbooks used in Korean Buddhist monastic seminaries in his masterpiece *Hanguk bulgyo soui gyeongjeon yeongu* (Researches in Korean Buddhist Monastic Seminary Textbooks). He included and discussed the *Shami luyi yaolue* in detail in the book.<sup>31</sup> If we discuss the publication and circulation of the text before Ha Dongsan's death in modern times, Haein-sa Temple first printed and circulated the text in 1908. Gim Jaun,

---

<sup>30</sup> See I Jeong, ed., *Hanguk bulgyo inmyeong sajeon* (Dictionary of Korean Buddhist Names) (Seoul: Bulgyo sidae-sa, 1993), 366-167.

<sup>31</sup> I Jigwan, *Hanguk bulgyo soui gyeongjeon yeongu* (Researches in Korean Buddhist Monastic Seminary Textbooks), 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (1969, Seoul: Dongguk daehakgyo seongnimhoe, 1983), 473-489.

Ha Dongsan's younger Dharma brother and I Jigwan's master, revitalized and popularized the study in vinaya in modern Korean Buddhism.<sup>32</sup> He published the text at Bongam-sa Temple on Mt. Huiyang in Mungyeong, North Gyeongsang Province in 1950 and at Cheonhwa Vinaya Center in Busan in 1959. He also published the text with the Korean translation of I Unheo (1892-1980), a prominent Korean translator, at Cheonhwa Vinaya Center in 1960. Gim Ilta (1929-1999)<sup>33</sup> selected important sentences from two commentaries on the text by two Chinese vinaya masters of the Qing Dynasty (1616-1912) and appended them to Zhuhong's original texts. He also added Korean postpositional particles to the classical Chinese sentences by himself and facilitated Korean Buddhists to read the text more easily. He edited and published the text at Tongdo-sa Temple on Mt. Yeongchuk in the County of Yangsan, South Gyeongsang Province on June 30, 1965.

Ha Dongsan, Gim Ilta and Yu Seogam, three major vinaya masters of modern Korean Buddhism, got strong influence from Yanshou in his vinaya thoughts. Yanshou tremendously influenced Zhuhong. He was the forerunner of and theoretically systemized the syncretism of Chan / Pure Land Buddhism. He also emphasized the strict observation of vinaya. Heavily relying on Yanshou's *Shou pusa jiefu* (A Manual for Receiving Mahāyāna Bodhisattva Precepts),<sup>34</sup> Ha Dongsan wrote his own lengthy manual for offering Bodhisattva precepts to lay Buddhists and monastics and emphasized the preservation of precepts in 1965, just before his death on April 24, 1965.<sup>35</sup>

Korean Buddhists adopted the following three vinaya texts as their authoritative and basic texts. They considered the *Shami luyi yaolue* in one fascicle the authoritative text of the novice monastic ordination, the *Brahma Net Sūtra* in two fascicles the authoritative text of (Mahāyāna) Bodhisattva Precepts, and the *Sifen lu* (Fourfold Rule of Monastic Discipline) of the Dharmagupta sect (of Indian Buddhism) in 60 fascicles the authoritative text of the full monastic ordination. I Jigwan detailed three vinaya texts in his *Researches in Korean Buddhist Monastic Seminary Textbooks*, assigning the section of the *Shami luyi yaolu* in pages 473-489, the section of the *Brahma Net Sūtra* in pages 490-503, and the section of the *Fourfold Rule of Monastic Discipline* in pages 504-558. The abovementioned three texts in vinaya are tremendously important and influential in Korean Buddhism.

Ha Dongsan, along with other key figures of the movement, emphasized the preservation of vinaya and suggested Korean Buddhist monks to advocate vegetarianism and celibate monasticism. He succeeded his master Baek Yongseong's view of vinaya originated from strong antagonism against

---

<sup>32</sup> I Jeong, ed., 288-289. See also Jin-wol Lee, "Master Yongseong's Life and Works: An Engaged Buddhism of Peace and Justice," in Chanju Mun, ed., *Buddhist Exploration of Peace and Justice* (Honolulu, Hawaii: Blue Pine, 2006), 247-261.

<sup>33</sup> *Chongnam*, 538.

<sup>34</sup> X.59.1088.365b5-369a4.

<sup>35</sup> Dongsan mundo-hoe, ed., 82-124.



Japanized non-vegetarianism and married monasticism exercised during Japanese occupation period, 1910-1945, inherited his master's vinaya lineage and became a vinaya master. He utilized his master's vegetarianism and celibate monasticism as the movement's main themes and guided Korean Buddhists to recover the celibate monastic and vegetarian tradition in post-colonial Korean Buddhism.

## 2. Outline of the *Brahma Net Sūtra*

### 2.1. The influence of the *Huayan Sūtra*

Even though modern scholars generally consider the *Brahma Net Sūtra* to be an apocryphal text composed in China, Kumārajīva (344-412) was traditionally considered to translate it in 405 or 406.<sup>36</sup> We can also see a similar title in the *Dīgha-nikāya*, translated in Chinese by Zhiqian between 223 and 253. However, these versions of the *Brahma Net Sūtra* are totally different in content. He allegedly translated the tenth chapter of the 120-fascicles Sanskrit text entitled the *Bodhisattva-śīla-sūtra*. The scripture available now was titled as the *Fanwang jing pusa xindi-pin* ("Chapter of the Bodhisattva's Mind Ground" of the *Brahma Net Sūtra*) and the *Fanwang jiepin* ("Chapter of Bodhisattva Precepts" in the *Brahma Net Sūtra*).

The current scripture constitutes two fascicles. Its first fascicle discusses topics such as the forty stages of the Bodhisattva path. Its second fascicle introduces the ten major precepts and the forty-eight minor precepts. East Asian Buddhists have not generally emphasized the importance of the first fascicle but have highly evaluated second. Likewise, they have typically written commentaries only on the second fascicle. Its first fascicle, in which Vairocana Buddha expounded the stages of the Bodhisattva path, seems to receive a lot of influence from the *Huayan Sūtra*, in which Vairocana Buddha detailed the fifty-two stages of the Bodhisattva path. The main persona of the two scriptures, the *Brahma Net Sūtra* and the *Huayan Sūtra*, is Vairocana Buddha.

There are three Chinese translations of the *Huayan Sūtra*, (1) sūtra in 60 fascicles translated between 418 and 422 by Buddhabhadra (359-429), (2) the sūtra in 80 fascicles translated between 695 and 699 by Śikṣānanda (652-710), and (3) the scripture in 40 fascicles translated between 795 and 798 by Prajñā (b. 734). Prajñā's translation constitutes just the "Ru fajie pin" (The Chapter on Entering the Dharma-realm) of the scripture. Therefore, we can safely guess that

---

<sup>36</sup> The *Brahma Net Sūtra* is T.24.1484.997a1-1010a23. See the entry of "*Fanwang jing*" in A. Charles Muller, ed., *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, [http://www.buddhism-dict.net/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?68.xml+id\('b68b5-7db2-7d93'\)](http://www.buddhism-dict.net/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?68.xml+id('b68b5-7db2-7d93')) (accessed July 18, 2009).

the *Brahma Net Sūtra* was compiled in China after the translation of the *Huayan Sūtra* in 60 fascicles.<sup>37</sup>

The fifty-two stages of the Bodhisattva practice expounded in the *Huayan Sūtra* consist of ten stages of faith (1-10), ten stages of security (11-20), ten stages of practice (21-30), ten stages of merit-dedication (31-40), ten stages of development (41-50), the stage of near-perfect enlightenment (51), and the stage of perfect enlightenment (52). The *Brahma Net Sūtra* divides the Bodhisattva path into forty stages consisting of ten stages of security (1-10), ten stages of practice (11-20), ten stages of merit-dedication (21-30), and ten stages of development (31-40). It does not include the ten stages of faith, the stage of near-perfect enlightenment and the stage of perfect enlightenment. Bodhisattvas progressively proceed from the lower stage to the higher stage and advance in Buddhist practice, finally arriving in the stage of perfect enlightenment.

Ten stages of faith from the first to tenth stage of the fifty-two stages of Bodhisattva practice are composed of (1) the arousing of pure faith, (2) ever-mindfulness, (3) assiduousness, (4) concentration, (5) wisdom, (6) the preservation of precepts, (7) the dedication of previously acquired good fortune toward attaining enlightenment, (8) the guarding of the mind against earthly desires, (9) detachment, and (10) aspiration.<sup>38</sup>

Ten stages of security from the eleventh to twentieth stage of the fifty-two stages of Bodhisattva practice consist of (1) the arousing of the aspiration for Buddhahood, (2) the contemplation of the non-substantiality of things, (3) the performance of all possible good deeds, (4) the clear understanding of the principle of non-substantiality, (5) the application of all good deeds as a means to developing one's perception of the non-substantiality of things, (6) the perfection of the wisdom to perceive the non-substantiality of things, (7) no-backsliding from the realization of the truth of the non-substantiality of things, (8) no-arising of false views and no-cessation of the aspiration for enlightenment, (9) deep understanding of the Buddha's teachings to the point where one is assured of attaining Buddhahood in the future, and (10) attainment of the wisdom to perceive the non-substantiality.<sup>39</sup>

While the aforementioned twenty stages of Bodhisattva practice are practices for personal development, ten stages of practice from the twenty-first to thirtieth stages of the fifty-two stages of Bodhisattva practice are practices for altruistic deeds. The ten stages are (1) the stage of joyful service in which one awakens to the non-substantiality of all things and causes others to rejoice by offering them everyone's possessions; (2) the stage of beneficial practice, in which one always instructs and benefits others; (3) the stage of non-opposition,

<sup>37</sup> Shigeru Osuka, trans., *The Very Mahāyāna Buddhist Ethics: Introduction and Translation of the Fan-wang-ching* (Tokyo: Chuo University Press, 2005), 8.

<sup>38</sup> See the entry of "ten stages of faith" in the English Buddhist Dictionary Committee, ed., *The Soka Gakkai Dictionary of Buddhism* (Tokyo: Soka Gakkai, 2002), 681.

<sup>39</sup> See the entry of "ten stages of security" in *ibid*, 682.

in which one engages in the practice of forbearance and frees oneself from anger, not offending others; (4) the stage of limitless assiduousness, in which one continues earnest practice in order to lead others to enlightenment, whatever the hardships involved; (5) the stage of non-confusion, in which one is not hindered by illusions or ignorance; (6) the stage of appearance in the Buddha land, in which one is always born in a Buddha land; (7) the stage of non-attachment, in which one perceives all things as non-substantial and frees oneself from attachment to them; (8) the stage of attaining the difficult, in which one perfects the practice for cultivating virtues, which is difficult to accomplish; (9) the stage of being a model in the preaching of the Buddhist teaching, in which one's practice of preaching and protecting the Buddhist teaching becomes a model for all others; and (10) the stage of realizing the truth, in which one is awakened to the truth of the Middle Way.<sup>40</sup>

In the ten stages of merit-dedication from the thirty-first to fortieth stages of the fifty-two stages of Bodhisattva practice, one guides one's blessings, merits, and benefits toward other people. The ten stages of Bodhisattva practice are (1) the stage of saving all sentient beings without any mental image of sentient beings, in which one, while practicing six perfections among the sentient beings of the six transmigrating paths, makes efforts to save all of them and at the same time liberates oneself from the characteristics of a common mortal; (2) the stage of indestructibility, in which one, with indestructible faith in the three treasures of Buddhism, penetrates the true nature of all phenomena, realizing their non-substantiality; (3) the stage of impartial devotion to all Buddhas, in which one practices, in successive lifetimes, under all the Buddhas of the three existences and one increases all kinds of good roots and transfers their benefit to all beings impartially; (4) the stage of transferring one's benefits to the Buddhas in all lands, serving and making offerings to them and to all other beings; (5) the stages of obtaining limitless blessings, in which one directs everyone's good fortune to the practice of Buddhism, thereby obtaining limitless good fortune and benefit; (6) the stage of impartial benefit, in which one benefits all beings equally; (7) the stage of observing the nature of all people, in which one perceives the coexistence of good and evil inherent in people's lives; (8) the stage of realizing the true aspect of all phenomena, in which one transfers the benefits one obtains through this realization to others; (9) the stage of freedom from all attachments, in which one perceives all phenomena from the standpoints of both difference and equality and frees oneself from all attachments, thereafter leading others to emancipation; and (10) the stage of perceiving all phenomena with infinite wisdom, in which one regards all phenomena as manifestations of the Middle Way and which performing a variety of meritorious acts, one uses the resultant benefits for the sake of others.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> See the entry of "ten stages of practice" in *ibid*, 681-682.

<sup>41</sup> See the entry of "ten stages of devotion" in *ibid*, 680-681.

The ten stages of development from the forty-first through the fiftieth stages in the system of the fifty-two stages of Bodhisattva practice are (1) the stage of joy, in which one rejoices at realizing a partial aspect of the truth; (2) the stage of freedom from defilement, in which one is free from all defilement; (3) the stage of the emission of light, in which one radiates the light of wisdom; (4) the stage of glowing wisdom, in which the flame of wisdom burns away earthly desires; (5) the stage of overcoming final illusions, in which one surmounts the illusions of darkness or ignorance of the Middle Way; (6) the stage of the sign of supreme wisdom, in which the supreme wisdom begins to appear; (7) the stage of progression, in which one rises above the paths of the two vehicles; (8) the stage of immobility, in which one dwells firmly in the truth of the Middle way and cannot be perturbed by anything; (9) the stage of the all-penetrating wisdom, in which one preaches Buddhism freely and without restrictions; and (10) the stage of the dharma cloud, in which one benefits all sentient beings with Buddhist teaching, just as a cloud sends down rain impartially upon all things.<sup>42</sup>

Chinese Buddhists generally consider Vairocana Buddha as the *dharmakāya* (Body of Great Principle) of the three bodies of the Buddha.<sup>43</sup> The three bodies of the Buddha consist of (1) the *dharmakāya*, (2) *sambhogakāya* (Body of Delight), and (3) *nirmāṇakāya* (Body of Transformation). Amitābha Buddha represents the *sambhogakāya* and Śākyamuni Buddha the *nirmāṇakāya*. Vairocana Buddha, the *dharmakāya*, is the main persona and taught Buddhism in the *Brahma Net Sūtra* and the *Huayan Sūtra*.

(1) The body of the great order is the true nature of the Buddha or the essence of the universe. The body is realized through wisdom. Chinese Buddhists define the body as the cosmic consciousness, the unified existence that lies beyond all concepts. All sentient and non-sentient forms as well as the moral order originate from this body. (2) They define the *sambhogakāya* as the experience of the ecstasy of enlightenment. Chan Buddhists, particularly, regard the body as the experience of the dharma-mind of the Buddha and the patriarchs and of the spiritual practices that they transmitted. (3) Chinese Buddhists consider the *nirmāṇakāya* as the radiant, transformed Buddha-body.<sup>44</sup>

## 2.2. The doctrine of mind ground

<sup>42</sup> See the entry of “ten stages of development” in *ibid*, 680.

<sup>43</sup> Ingrid Fischer-Schreiber, et al, Micheal H Kohn, trans., *The Shambhala Dictionary of Buddhism and Zen* (Boston: Shambhala, 1991), 229-230.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid*.

The *Brahma Net Sūtra* emphasizes the doctrine of mind ground and holds that all sentient beings possess mind ground from which the true mind originates and on which both all sentient beings and all sages depend. Because sentient beings do not realize the mind ground, they receive four kinds of birth<sup>45</sup> in three realms of desire, form and formless-ness, transmigrate in six paths,<sup>46</sup> and experience the suffering of birth and death. However, because the sages realize this mind ground, they are supposed to return to the origin of mind and to completely cut off the stream of birth and death.

If we want to return to the origin of mind, we should rely on the proper precepts of mind ground and plant proper causes to attain enlightenment. If we make endeavors to attain enlightenment, we are subject to attain ultimate effects of Vairocana Buddha. Based on the teaching of mind ground, we are able to attain Buddhahood. If we preserve precepts, we are supposed to return to mind ground. The precepts actually originate from mind ground, not from external objects.

Wonhyo (617-686)<sup>47</sup> interpreted mind ground in three in his *Beommang-gyeong bosal gyebon sagi* (Personal Notes on the Bodhisattva Precepts of the *Brahma Net Sūtra*), “Mind ground means the subject of generation and the object of abiding. We can summarize the meaning of (mind) ground in three. (1) The first (meaning) is (mind ground) of the forty stages of mind before the first stage of the Bodhisattva path and of ten stages of mind from above the [first] stage of development. Because these fifty stages of (Bodhisattva) mind in total are the grounds in which practicing Bodhisattvas abide, we can call it the “mind ground.” They are these fifty stages of (Bodhisattva practice) in which a Bodhisattva abides and the mind of enlightenment in which a Bodhisattva abides. The object of abiding is the fifty stages and the subject of abiding is the mind of enlightenment. (2) The second (meaning) considers (mind ground) of the three categories of precepts as the object of abiding and regards the enlightened mind as the subject of abiding. (3) The third (meaning) takes the dharma realm as the object of abiding and the practitioners as the subject of abiding. Even though all sentient beings transmigrate in five paths (except the heavenly beings among six paths), they cannot transcend the dharma realm. The dharma realm is the object of abiding and the mind of sentient beings is the subject of abiding.”<sup>48</sup>

The *Brahma Net Sūtra* identifies Mahāyāna Bodhisattva precepts as the precepts of mind ground.<sup>49</sup> While Mahayanists consider monastic codes of Abhidharma Buddhism as the precepts of characteristics, the scripture defines

<sup>45</sup> See the entry of “four forms of birth” in the *Soka Gakkai Dictionary of Buddhism*, 218. The four forms of birth are (1) birth from the womb, (2) birth from eggs, (3) birth from wetness, and (4) birth by transformation.

<sup>46</sup> See the entry of “six paths” in *ibid.*, 612. Six paths are six realms of (1) hell, (2) hungry ghosts, (3) animals, (4) demi-gods, (5) human beings, and (6) heavenly beings.

<sup>47</sup> I Jeong, ed., 208-210.

<sup>48</sup> H.1.586c9-17.

<sup>49</sup> T.24.1484.997b9 and T.24.1484.1003b7.

the Bodhisattva precepts as the precepts of (Buddha) nature.<sup>50</sup> While the monastic codes concentrate on the formalistic preservation of precepts, Bodhisattva precepts concentrate on their actual intention for preserving precepts.

### 2.3. The influence of Confucian filial piety

The *Brahma Net Sūtra* uses fifteen times the term “filial piety” (*xiao*), a central Confucian virtue, in its exposition of several precepts.<sup>51</sup> Confucianism emphasizes filial piety coupled with loyalty to the state and considers the two virtues as the major and central ones that Confucians should preserve. The first, second, third, and tenth major precepts and the first, thirteenth, seventeenth, twenty-first, twenty-eighth, thirty-fifth, forty-sixth, and forty-eighth minor precepts emphasize filial piety. Of the 10 major and 48 minor Bodhisattva precepts, 12 precepts include the term “filial piety” and incorporate the Confucian ethics into Buddhism to some degree. Even when Śākyamuni Buddha began to generally explain the Bodhisattva precepts, he very highly emphasized filial piety as follows.<sup>52</sup>

At the time when Śākyamuni Buddha first sat under the bodhi tree and attained supreme enlightenment, he began by explaining the Bodhisattva’s *prātimokṣa* (code of vinaya precepts). (You should have) filial piety toward parents, masters, monks, and the three treasures. (You should also have) filial piety toward supreme Buddhist teaching. Filial piety is called a precept and also called prevention (of evil actions). The Buddha emitted endless bright light from his mouth. At that time, hundreds of thousands of billions of the great assembly, various Bodhisattvas, the eighteen heavens of the realm of form,<sup>53</sup> the six heavens of

<sup>50</sup> T.24.1484.1003c24 and T.24.1484.1009c25.

<sup>51</sup> The *Brahma Net Sūtra* uses fifteen times the term “filial piety (*xiao*),” T.24.1484.1004a25 (three times), T.24.1484.1004b19, T.24.1484.1004b24, T.24.1484.1004b28, T.24.1484.1005a14, T.24.1484.1005b1, T.24.1484.1006a4, T.24.1484.1006a28, T.24.1484.1006b23, T.24.1484.1007a22, T.24.1484.1007b28, T.24.1484.1009b6, and T.24.1484.1009b23 and are naturally subject to utilize Confucian ethics and to popularize precepts among Chinese Buddhists.

<sup>52</sup> T.24.1484.1004a23-28.

<sup>53</sup> See the entry of “eighteen heavens” in the *Soka Gakkai Dictionary of Buddhism*, 143. The form realm constitutes four meditation heavens, which are further subdivided into eighteen heavens. The eighteen heavens are composed of (1) three heavens in the first meditation heaven, (2) three heavens in the second meditation heavens, (3) three heavens in the third meditation heavens, and (4) nine heavens in the fourth meditation heavens.

desire,<sup>54</sup> and the kings of sixteen nations,<sup>55</sup> all put their palms together sincerely and wished to listen to the Buddha's recitation of the Mahāyāna precepts.<sup>56</sup>

As above, the text considers filial piety even as a precept and guides Buddhists to prevent evil actions. The author(s) of the text might have sinicized the concept of precepts originated from the foreign nation of India and popularized the precepts among Chinese Buddhists. The sinicization might naturally have caused Chinese to easily and smoothly accept them. Because Chinese strongly based their ethics on Confucian familism, they could not basically accept celibate monasticism. Because Buddhists should have naturalized the foreign concept of celibate monasticism in their nation in which they had never had the tradition, they needed to utilize the Confucian concept of filial piety to let Chinese accept celibate monasticism. Even though Chinese Confucians applied the concept of filial piety to serve parents, the text extended its application scope and included filial piety towards even masters, monks, the three treasures, and supreme Buddhist teaching.

When the text expounds the first major precept of “non-killing of all sentient beings,” considered as a cardinal precept that all Buddhists should accept and preserve, it suggests, “Therefore, Bodhisattvas always maintain compassion and filial piety, and save and protect all sentient beings with skillful means. If, instead, you kill sentient beings, or, with delight, intend to kill them, this is a Bodhisattva's unpardonable sin.”<sup>57</sup> The text introduces the two major virtues, compassion and skillful means, which Bodhisattvas should maintain and practice. It parallels compassion and filial piety and introduces them as the two virtues that Bodhisattvas should maintain and practice.

The *Brahma Net Sūtra*, similarly to the aforementioned first major precept, introduces the concept of filial piety in several precepts and regards the preservation of precepts as an act of filial piety. For instance, the scripture describes the thirteenth minor precept by using the term “filial piety,” “Buddhists should avoid speaking with groundless words purposely based on malice toward good people, preaching monks, master monks, kings, and noble

---

<sup>54</sup> See the entry of “six heavens of the world of desire” in *ibid*, 608, “In the ancient Indian cosmology, the six heavens are located in the world of desire and are situated between the earth and the Brahma Heaven. The six heavens of the desire realm are (1) the Heaven of the Four Heavenly Kings, (2) the Heaven of the Thirty-three Gods, (3) the Yama Heaven, (4) the Tusita Heaven, (5) the Heaven of Enjoying the Conjured, and (6) the Heaven of Freely Enjoying Things Conjured by Others.”

<sup>55</sup> See the entry of “sixteen great states” in *ibid*, 616. The sixteen major states that existed in India during the time of Śākyamuni Buddha are located in the northern part of the Indian subcontinent around the Ganges Valley. The *Long Āgama Sūtra* enlists the names of the sixteen nations, “Anga, Magadha, Kāshī, Kosala, Vriji, Malla, Chedi, Vatsa, Kuru, Panchāla, Ashvaka, Avanti, Matsya, Shūrasena, Gandhara, and Kamboja.”

<sup>56</sup> Osuka, trans., 91.

<sup>57</sup> T.24.1484.1004b18-20 and Osuka, trans., 92.

people who have committed seven cardinal sins<sup>58</sup> or violated one of the ten major precepts. You should promote filial piety and compassion toward parents, brothers, or any of the six types of relatives.<sup>59</sup> If, instead, you harm them and cause them to fall into undesirable conditions, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>60</sup>

## 2.4. Comparison between monastic and Bodhisattva precepts

Mahāyāna Buddhism categorized a set of Bodhisattva precepts in three, (1) the precept that encompasses all the rules and standards of behavior set forth by the Buddha for Mahāyāna Bodhisattvas, (2) the precept that encompasses all good deeds, and (3) the precept that encompasses all sentient beings.<sup>61</sup> Based on Mahāyāna Buddhists who summarized their precepts above, we can outline them as follows.

First, unlike monastic precepts which prioritize individual salvation to salvation of others, Bodhisattva precepts aim at two goals of equally saving individuals and others. Second, while monastic precepts prohibit monks from committing evils, Bodhisattva precepts suggest Mahāyāna practitioners should actively participate in helping others. Third, while we can literally interpret monastic precepts, we can freely interpret Bodhisattva precepts. Fourth, while we should apply monastic precepts very strictly regardless of different situations, we do not need to apply Bodhisattva precepts so strictly. And fifth, Bodhisattva precepts strongly emphasize the importance of intention. So, if Mahāyāna practitioners unintentionally commit immoral acts, they are not guilty.

If we summarize precepts, including 10 major and 48 minor precepts, the precepts basically aim at promoting good and helping others. The 10 major precepts suggest Buddhists to cultivate our minds and benefit others, making Buddhism flourish and society happy. The *Brahma Net Sūtra* encourages Buddhists not to conduct any kinds of evil actions in the first to the thirtieth minor precepts but to do virtuous actions in the thirty-first to thirty-ninth minor precepts. It also suggests Buddhists to help others in trouble in the fortieth to the

---

<sup>58</sup> See the entry of “seven cardinal sins” in the *Soka Gakkai Dictionary of Buddhism*, 575. The seven cardinal sins are “(1) injuring a Buddha, (2) killing one’s father, (3) killing one’s mother, (4) killing a monk of high virtue, (5) killing an *ācārya* (a Buddhist teacher), (6) causing disunity in the Buddhist Order, and (7) killing a sage.”

<sup>59</sup> There are different sets of six types of relatives, for example, (1) father and mother, elder and younger uncles and elder and younger brothers, (2) father and mother, elder and younger brothers, father and mother in law, and (3) father and mother, elder and younger sisters, father and mother in law.

<sup>60</sup> T.24.1006a2-5 and Osuka, trans., 100-101.

<sup>61</sup> The English Buddhist Dictionary Committee, ed., 700-701.



forty-eighth minor precepts.<sup>62</sup> Bodhisattva precepts are supposed to guide Buddhists to cultivate their minds and develop Bodhisattva stages and finally to lead them to obtain Buddhahood.

While monastic precepts are just available to qualified novice monks and the procedures of receiving the precepts are strictly regulated, Bodhisattva precepts are open to all sentient beings, including animals, and the procedures of receiving the precepts are not formalistic. So, the *Brahma Net Sūtra* explains, “All Buddhists should listen to the precepts carefully. Whoever receives the Buddha’s precepts, whether kings, prince, one of the hundred officials, prime minister, monk, nun, one of the eighteen heavens of the realm of form, one of the six heavens of desire, one of the ordinary people, eunuch, male prostitute, female prostitute, slave, one of the eight divisions of ghost, diamond spirit, animal, or transformed being, need to only understand the Dharma master’s words, acquire and accept the precepts. All of them are designated absolutely pure and clean.”<sup>63</sup>

Even though monastic precepts strictly require guilty monks to repent and confess in public and receive pardon from the public, Bodhisattva precepts do not require practitioners who commit crimes to repent and confess in public and pardon from the public. So, the *Brahma Net Sūtra* introduces the fifth minor precept of repentance, “Buddhists should teach confession to all sentient beings who violate five, eight or ten precepts or break any other prohibitions or who engage in seven cardinal sins and eight difficulties (in which it is difficult to hear the teaching), or any other violations of the precepts. However, if you, Bodhisattvas, fail to teach repentance but live with monks for their benefit, do not share offerings, do not join the assemblies where precepts are preached, and still do not call attention to confess the sins and do not teach repentance, you have committed a minor moral offense.”<sup>64</sup>

So, Shigeru Osuka argued, “The *Fan-wang-ching* emphasized confession and repentance of sinners to Buddha, without any intermediators like monks or nuns. In earlier times, public confession and repentance were necessary before re-admission of sinners to the Buddhist community, but in the *Fan-wang-ching* this was modified. Personal confession and repentance to Buddha were permitted. A guilty person feels relieved of the heavy burden on his/her mind, and with religious zeal he/she resolves not to commit that offense again. He/she is encouraged to fulfill his/her moral responsibility to the Buddhist community.”<sup>65</sup>

## 2.5. Characteristics of Bodhisattva precepts

---

<sup>62</sup> Osuka, trans., 11.

<sup>63</sup> T.24.1484.1004b6-10 and Osuka, trans., 91-92.

<sup>64</sup> T.24.1484.1005b17-21 and Osuka, trans., 98.

<sup>65</sup> Osuka, trans., 12-13.

The *Brahma Net Sūtra* extensively emphasizes friendliness and compassion, Mahāyāna key ethical virtues, and arranged at least 14 precepts such as the first three major precepts, the sixth and ninth major precepts, and the third, thirteenth, seventeenth, twentieth, twenty-first, twenty-fifth, twenty-ninth, thirty-first and forty-sixth minor precepts for Mahāyāna practitioners to receive and preserve the virtues.<sup>66</sup> Buddhists needed Bodhisattva precepts to make Mahāyāna Buddhism realized in their thinking and actions. The precepts were theoretically based on Mahāyāna Buddhism.

For example, the text introduces how much Buddhists practice friendliness and compassion in the twenty-first minor precept, “Buddha said that Buddhists should avoid returning anger with anger or avenging beatings with beatings. Even if your father, mother, brother, or one of your six close degrees of relatives is murdered, you should avoid seeking revenge. Even if a king is assassinated for another’s sake, you should not seek revenge. Killing sentient beings out of revenge does not follow the way of filial piety. Moreover, you should not keep slaves nor beat or curse. Doing so brings on the three karmas, day after day, and leads to endless sin of the mouth. How much worse is it to commit the seven cardinal sins? Therefore, this is a Bodhisattva who has left home. If, instead, you purposely take revenge without any consideration of compassion for the one of six close degrees of relatives, you have committed a minor moral offense.”<sup>67</sup>

The *Brahma Net Sūtra* emphasizes karma in the ten major precepts and very well reflects the causality of sins. It says in each of the ten major precepts, “If you violate this precept, you will accumulate the cause, effect, transmigration, and karma of the sin.” The precepts match good actions and thoughts (causes) to good results and bad actions and thoughts to bad results, so they guide Buddhists not to commit wrong actions. We can extend the chain between causes and results from this life to next lives. If we do good actions and thoughts (causes), we can have good results in this life or in next lives and if we do bad actions and thoughts (causes), we can have bad results in this life or in next lives.

For example, if we steal people’s possessions (cause), we should have a bad result (retribution) in this life or in next lives. So, the text explains the relation between cause and effect in the second major precept, “Buddhists should themselves avoid stealing, encouraging others to steal, and stealing by circumstantial means. If you do so, you may accumulate the steal’s cause, condition, transgression and karma. A stolen curse or ghost spirit exists in stolen things for an eon. Furthermore, you should avoid stealing things, valuables of all kinds, a needle, even grass. Therefore, Bodhisattvas generate Buddha nature, mindfulness of filial piety and compassion. You should always help all people and generate happiness and joy. If, instead, you steal people’s valuable things, this is a Bodhisattva’s unpardonable sin.”<sup>68</sup>

<sup>66</sup> We can see the compound word “friendliness and compassion” six times in the *Brahma Net Sūtra*, T.24.1484.1000b29, 1004b19, 1004b24, 1004c2, 1005b11, 1006a4.

<sup>67</sup> T.24.1484.1006b21-26 and Osuka, trans., 104.

<sup>68</sup> T.24.1484.1004b21-25 and Osuka, trans., 92-93.

We can also see relations between bad cause (lying) and bad result in the fourth major precept, “Buddhists should themselves avoid lying, encouraging others to lie, and lying by circumstantial means. If you do so, you may accumulate the lied cause, condition, transgression, and karma. Furthermore, you should avoid telling others that you have seen what you have not seen or that you have never seen what you have actually seen; and you should avoid lying about either physical or mental deeds. Therefore, Bodhisattvas always generate right speech and right views and lead all sentient beings to have right speech and right views. If, instead, you lead all sentient beings to engage in heterodox speech, heterodox views, and heterodox karma, this is a Bodhisattva’s unpardonable sin.”<sup>69</sup>

Chinese Buddhists separated the second fascicle from the scripture and circulated it as an independent text on the precepts by the end of the fifth century. East Asian Buddhists considered its second fascicle as a scriptural foundation for Mahāyāna Bodhisattva precepts. They defined Bodhisattva precepts based on the text, received them from preceptors and practiced them in their religious lives.

The text explains why the Mahāyāna Buddhists should receive and preserve ten major precepts, “The Buddha told all of his disciples that there are ten major *prātimokṣa* precepts. Even though you have received the Bodhisattva precepts, if you do not recite them, you are not a Bodhisattva, nor do you have a Buddha’s seed. Therefore, I also recite (these precepts) for all Bodhisattvas who have already studied them in the past, all Bodhisattvas who will study them in the future, and all Bodhisattvas who are studying them at the present. I have already summarized and explained the various forms of the Bodhisattva precepts. You should study and uphold (these precepts) with respect.”<sup>70</sup>

After generally emphasizing the importance of ten major precepts as above, the text enlists and explicates ten major precepts one by one as follows:<sup>71</sup> (1) No killing, (2) no stealing, (3) no sexual misconducts, (4) no lying, (5) no selling of intoxicants, (6) no exposure of the faults of others, (7) no praise of themselves and no criticism of others, (8) no stinginess, (9) no anger, and (10) no disrespect of the three treasures, i.e., the Buddha, the Buddha’s teachings, and the Buddha’s followers. If Buddhists violate ten major precepts, they are not pardonable and are completely removed from the Buddhist community.

The text also introduces 48 minor precepts one by one and asks Mahāyāna Buddhists to strictly observe them.<sup>72</sup> (1) Mahāyāna Buddhists should respect masters and other colleague Buddhists. (2) They should not drink intoxicants. (3)

<sup>69</sup> T.24.1484.1004c3-7 and Osuka, trans., 93-94.

<sup>70</sup> T.24.1484.1004b11-15 and Osuka, trans., 92.

<sup>71</sup> T.24.1484.1004b11-1005a24 and Osuka, trans., 92-96. See Ciyi, ed., *Foguang dacidian* (Foguang Dictionary of Buddhism), the 5<sup>th</sup> edition (Kaohsiung, Taiwan: Foguang chupan-she, 1989), 461.

<sup>72</sup> T.24.1484.1005a25-1009c8 and Osuka, trans., 96-122. Refer to the entry of 48 minor Bodhisattva precepts in *Foguang Dictionary of Buddhism*, 1636.

They should not eat any kinds of meats.<sup>73</sup> (4) They should not eat the five kinds of pungent plants, i.e., garlic, chives, leeks, shallots, and onions. (5) They should confess the violations of the precepts. (6) They should welcome the visitors to their temple, household, or city. (7) They should take lectures on vinaya in all places. (8) They should not criticize Mahāyāna Buddhism. (9) They should take care of sick persons. (10) They should not collect any weapons such as knives, clubs, bows, arrows, spears, axes, nets, traps, and others. (11) They should not intervene as their nation's envoys and cause wars. (12) They should not trade people, slaves, or any of six animals.<sup>74</sup> (13) They should not speak ill of others without proper reason. (14) They should not burn the mountains and fields from April to September. (15) They should not teach non-Buddhist teachings. (16) They should not distort the proper teachings for their own personal benefits. (17) They should not make special relationships with kings, prime ministers, or any sorts of government officials for their own personal benefits. (18) They should learn and memorize these Bodhisattva precepts. (19) They should not maliciously make dissension. (20) They should protect and save living beings. (21) They should not anger and revenge themselves on enemies. (22) They should not be arrogant and should not think little of Buddhist teachings. (23) They should sincerely receive these precepts. (24) They should diligently study Buddhism. (25) They should not appropriate community property for their own personal benefits. (26) They should generously welcome visitors and provide them with the necessary materials such as rooms, cloths, blankets, and others. (27) They should not accept invitations for their own personal benefits. (28) When they invite a Buddhist, they should not discriminate ones against others, regardless of monastics and laypersons. (29) They should not trade male or female prostitutes. (30) They should not serve as a matchmaker or pimp for male or female prostitutes. (31) They should not sell images of the Buddha or Bodhisattvas. (32) They should not have any kinds of knives, clubs, or bows and should not trade fake scales and measuring devices. (33) They should not maliciously observe all kinds of fights between males and females, battling armies, or quarrelling burglars. (34) They should protect and uphold these precepts. (35) They should respect parents, masters, and the three treasures. (36) They should vow and keep these precepts. (37) They should observe a summer intensive retreat. (38) They should sit in the prescribed order of the Dharma. (39) They should save all living beings, and establish monasteries and pagodas. (40) When they confer these precepts, they should not discriminate someone against others. (41) They should not become a teacher for their personal benefits. (42) They should not explain the precepts in front of people who do not know the doctrine of moral karma. (43) They should not accept alms while breaking the precepts. (44) They should constantly and wholeheartedly receive, uphold, read

---

<sup>73</sup> The 3<sup>rd</sup> minor precept of 48 minor Bodhisattva precepts serves as the theoretical background why Chinese Buddhists should be vegetarians.

<sup>74</sup> Six animals are (1) the dog, (2) the bird, (3) the snake, (4) the hyena, (5) the crocodile, and (6) the monkey.

and recite these precepts. (45) They should have a compassionate mental state. (46) They should respectfully listen to the sermons. (47) They should not destroy copies of these precepts. (48) They should not explain the precepts to a king or to any officials for their fame and personal benefits. If Buddhists violate 48 minor precepts, they should confess and repent in public and receive pardon from the public.

The text suggests Mahāyāna Buddhists should propagate and circulate the Bodhisattva precepts among Buddhists as much as possible. It guarantees the five benefits for the practitioners of the Bodhisattva precepts, “Wise persons are subject to make enduring wisdom strong. If they are able to preserve the teaching of Bodhisattva precepts, even though they do not attain Buddhahood, they can safely attain five benefits. (1) All Buddhas of ten directions feel pity for and always protect them. (2) When they face death, they will be delighted with the proper views in their minds. (3) Wherever they are born, they are subject to be the companions to all Bodhisattvas. (4) Because the benefits are accumulated, they can attain the perfection of morality. (5) In the present and future lives, they are subject to perfectly attain the Buddha’s precepts, blessings and wisdom. If so, they are able to become the true sons of Buddhas. Therefore, the wise persons should well consider (the benefits of the Bodhisattva precepts).<sup>75</sup>”

### **3. Purification Buddhist Movement: Interconnecting orthopraxy and anti-orthopraxy**

The movement, 1954-1970, had two missions. The first mission was to revitalize traditional Seon Buddhism degenerated during Japanese occupation period, 1910 – 1945 and the second mission was to recover the monastic tradition of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism from Japanized Korean Buddhism. The second mission is closely related to the spirit of vinaya in Korean Buddhism. Because Korean Buddhists rely on the *Brahma Net Sūtra*, I will hereafter investigate the theoretical connection between the *Brahma Net Sūtra* and the movement’s second mission.

---

<sup>75</sup> T.24.1484.1009c19-1010a1.

### 3.1. The movement's orthopraxy

#### 3.1.1. Vegetarianism

The movement bases its theoretical background for vegetarianism on the *Brahma Net Sūtra*. Because the *Brahma Net Sūtra* clearly includes the precept of vegetarianism, the third minor precept, in the forty eight minor Bodhisattva precepts, the theorists of the movement referred to the text and theoretically supported their vegetarianism. The *Brahma Net Sūtra* introduces the third minor precept (vegetarianism) as follows:

You Buddhists should intentionally avoid meat-eating. You should not eat any kinds of meats of all living beings. If you eat meat, you might destroy the root of the great compassion and Buddha nature; and if all living beings see you, they will escape from you. Therefore, all Bodhisattvas should avoid eating all kinds of flesh of all living beings. If you eat meat, you may commit unlimited sins. If you purposely eat meat, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>76</sup>

We can see the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* which arranged a chapter entitled “Negation of Meatism,”<sup>77</sup> seriously criticized meatism and strongly advocated vegetarianism. The text comprehensively discussed and advocated vegetarianism from various angles. In the beginning of the chapter, Mahāprajñā Bodhisattva asks the Buddha why Buddhists should not eat meat but vegetables. The Buddha answers his question and describes the merits and demerits of meat-eating as follows:

Generally, meat-eating leads to limitless mistakes. If Bodhisattvas and Mahāsattvas cultivate great compassion, they should not eat meat. I will briefly explain the merits and demerits of meat-eating and the merits and demerits of vegetarianism (hereafter). Please listen carefully to my words.

Mahāprajñā Bodhisattva! According to my observation, because sentient beings are accustomed to eating meat from the beginning-less time, they addict themselves to the taste of meat and based on their addiction, they are subject to kill each other, to be estranged from wise beings and holy beings, and to receive the sufferings from the cycle of birth and death.

If we remove our taste for meat, we are subject to listen to the taste of the correct Buddhist teaching. If we properly cultivate ourselves in the Bodhisattva's spiritual stages, we are subject to quickly attain supreme enlightenment. If we cause sentient beings to enter the spiritual stages of hearers and solitary realizers, we are subject to get into the resting stage after the stages and then, finally to the Buddha's spiritual stage.

<sup>76</sup> T.24.1484.1005b10-13 and Osuka, trans., 97.

<sup>77</sup> There are two versions of the *Laṅkāvatāra sūtra* in the Taishō canon, each of which includes a chapter entitled “negation of meatism,” T.16.671.561a20-564c10 and T.16.672.622c28-624c18.

Mahāprajñā Bodhisattva! Like mentioned above, we should benefit ourselves with our compassionate minds. Meat-eaters are subject to remove the seed of great compassion. How can they attain great benefits? Therefore, Mahāprajñā Bodhisattva! According to my observation, sentient beings are subject to turn the cycle of birth and death in six paths, to raise each other, and to become parents, brothers and sisters in turn. They are subject to become the groups of those such as males, females, the middle, the external, the internal, and the six family relations (i.e., father, mother, older and younger siblings, wife, and children), and to always generate other existential types, such as wholesome existential types and unwholesome existential ones. Based on the causes and conditions, according to my observation, if sentient beings eat meat, they are subject to eat the meat of their past relatives. Because they adhere to the taste of meat, they kill and eat each other in turn and they always generate their minds to kill other people. They are subject to augment the suffering of actions, to transmigrate in the cycle of birth and death and not to transcend the cycle.<sup>78</sup>

The formal and monastic precepts observed by the monks of the small vehicle do not allow Buddhists to eat meat in some cases. The cases are explained in the three types of impure meat, (1) the meat seen to be killed for them, (2) the meat heard to be slaughtered for them, and (3) the meat suspected to be killed for them.<sup>79</sup> Even though I found references to ten types of impure meat in texts, unfortunately I could not find a list of the ten types.<sup>80</sup>

The formal and monastic precepts preserved by the monks of the small vehicle allow Buddhists to eat meat in some exceptional cases. The allowance of meat-eating is explained in the three types of pure meat, the five types of pure meat, and the nine types of pure meat.<sup>81</sup> The three types of pure meat constitute (1) the meat that they have not seen to be slaughtered for their meals, (2) the meat that they have not heard to be butchered for their meals, and (3) the meat that they have not suspected to be killed for their meals. The five types of pure meat consist of the above three types and two additional types, (4) the meat of an animal that died naturally, and (5) the meat of an animal that the birds left behind after partly eating. The nine types of pure meat are composed of the above five types and four additional types, (6) the meat of an animal that was not killed for them personally, (7) the dried meat of an animal that died naturally, (8) the meat accidentally eaten by the monks, and (9) the meat that is ready to be served. However, even though the Buddha allows Buddhists to eat meat in the exceptional cases, he actually preferred Buddhists to be vegetarians, provisionally allowed them to eat meat and finally guided them to become vegetarians in the *Laṅkāvatāra sūtra* as follows:

---

<sup>78</sup> T.16.671.561b8-23.

<sup>79</sup> T.23.1435.264c28f, T.24.1428.872b6, and other texts.

<sup>80</sup> T.12.375.626a13, T.52.2103.299a24, X.38.694.664c1, and other texts.

<sup>81</sup> X.28.586.233a17, and X.60.1125.574c10-11.

Mahāprajñā! I allowed the monks of the small vehicle to eat (the three types of) meat in this world because the three types constitute (1) the meat that they have not seen to be slaughtered for their meals, (2) the meat that they have not heard to be butchered for their meals, and (3) the meat that they have not suspected to be killed for their meals.

Mahāprajñā! Some foolish person will become a monk under my guidance in the future period, groundlessly explain the vinaya, destroy and confuse the proper teaching, criticize me and say, “The Buddha allowed Buddhists to eat meat and he himself already ate meat.”

Mahāprajñā! If I allowed them to eat meat, I was not a person who generated compassionate mind, practiced contemplative meditation, did the ascetic practice, and took the path of the great vehicle. How can I encourage laymen and laywomen to consider all living beings as their own only sons and to eat their meat?

Mahāprajñā! Even though I have told the ten kinds of impure meat and the three kinds of pure meat in all places, I have encouraged all Buddhists gradually not to eat meat but cultivate themselves and learn Buddhism. I already did not allow my disciples to eat meat (in the past life), do not allow them to eat meat in this life and will not allow them to eat meat in the future life.

Mahāprajñā! If monks eat meat, they will be impure.

Mahāprajñā! If a foolish man critically says that the Buddha allowed his disciples to eat meat and the Buddha himself ate meat, you should know that the person will be bound with unwholesome actions and will eternally fall into a detrimental hell.

Mahāprajñā! Even all the holy disciples of mine do not eat the visible meals of ordinary beings (such as boiled rice, noodles, and seasoned vegetables). How can I eat the impure meals such as bloody meat?

Mahāprajñā! Even hearers, solitary realizers and all Bodhisattvas are subject to eat Dharma meals. How can the Buddha eat (impure) meat?

Mahāprajñā! The Buddha’s body of the great order is not the omnivorous body.

Mahāprajñā! I already removed all defilements. I already purified all perfumed customs. I already well selected the wisdom of all minds. I universally observed sentient beings with great compassion just as parents took care of their only sons. How can I allow my disciples, the hearers, to eat their own sons? How can I eat meat by myself? How can you think that their sayings are reasonable and valid?<sup>82</sup>

The ninety-third fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* (The Forest of Jewels in a Dharma Garden)<sup>83</sup> arranged one section on non-vegetarianism<sup>84</sup> and discussed vegetarianism from two perspectives of the provisional teaching and the ultimate teaching. From the perspective of the ultimate teaching, the Buddha has never allowed his disciples to eat meat. But, from the perspective of the provisional

---

<sup>82</sup> T.16.672.624a18-b11.

<sup>83</sup> T.53.2122.970b23-977b22.

<sup>84</sup> T.53.2122.974a24-977b21.



teaching, the Buddha has allowed his disciples to eat meat in some cases. It summarized the errors of non-vegetarians in ten points based on the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*'s chapter on the criticisms against non-vegetarianism as follows:<sup>85</sup>

- (1) Buddhists should not eat the meat of any being because all sentient beings are their relatives from the beginningless time.<sup>86</sup>
- (2) If Buddhists eat meat, sentient beings are afraid of them. Therefore, they should not eat meat.<sup>87</sup>
- (3) If Buddhists eat meat, they destroy trust in other beings. Therefore, they should not eat meat.<sup>88</sup>
- (4) If Buddhists generate their compassionate minds and attempt to reduce their greed, they should not eat meat.<sup>89</sup>
- (5) Meat-eaters were wicked *rākṣanas*<sup>90</sup> in the past time. Due to the permeated perfumes, they addict to eat meat in this present time. Therefore, they should not eat meat.<sup>91</sup>
- (6) Even though meat-eaters study spells in this world, they cannot learn them. How can they learn and prove the super-mundane teachings? Therefore, they should not eat meat.<sup>92</sup>
- (7) All sentient beings love their lives just as I love my life. Therefore, Buddhists should not eat meat.<sup>93</sup>
- (8) Because all heavenly beings and holy beings depart from meat-eaters and unwholesome gods visit and terrify them, Buddhists should not eat meat.<sup>94</sup>
- (9) Even meat-eaters should not even eat pure meat. How can they eat impure meat? Therefore, Buddhists should not eat meat.<sup>95</sup>
- (10) Because meat-eaters used to eat meat, when they die, they will be born as *rākṣanas*. Therefore, Buddhists should not eat meat.<sup>96</sup>

As introduced above, the precepts of the great vehicle, also known as the Bodhisattva precepts, strongly advocate vegetarianism and criticize meatism. So, Ha Dongsan, as a key leader of the movement, emphasized the precepts and attempted to recover the celibate and vegetarian tradition of Korean Buddhism

---

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> T.53.2122.974c22-23.

<sup>87</sup> T.53.2122.975a14.

<sup>88</sup> T.53.2122.975a28-29.

<sup>89</sup> T.53.2122.975b9.

<sup>90</sup> See the entry of “*rākṣasa*” in the *Soka Gakkai Dictionary of Buddhism*, 535. The *rākṣasa* is a type of demon. “In Vedic literature, *rākṣasas* are demons that attempt to kill unborn children and infants. Later incorporated into Buddhism, some sūtras describe them as guardian deities of Buddhism, and others, as demons.”

<sup>91</sup> T.53.2122.975b21-22.

<sup>92</sup> T.53.2122.975c4-5.

<sup>93</sup> T.53.2122.975c12-13.

<sup>94</sup> T.53.2122.975c21-22.

<sup>95</sup> T.53.2122.976a1-2.

<sup>96</sup> T.53.2122.976a8-9.

from married monasticism and meat-eating Japanized during Japanese occupation period, 1910 – 1945.

Even though the movement's activists mainly required the preservation of vegetarianism for them to recover traditional vinaya from Japanized Korean Buddhism, they also asked them to keep some other precepts, related with vegetarianism and articulated in the *Brahma Net Sūtra*. They also strictly prohibited monastics from drinking and selling intoxicants and from eating the five kinds of pungent plants such as garlic, chives, leeks, shallots, and onions. The *Brahma Net Sūtra* included two precepts related with intoxicants, the fifth major precept and the second minor precept, and one precept related with the five kinds of pungent plants, the fourth minor precept.

### 3.1.2. No-drinking of intoxicants

The movement's theorists suggested followers should strictly preserve the precepts of no drinking and selling of intoxicants and to remove Japanese influences in Korean Buddhism. The *Brahma Net Sūtra* described the fifth major precept of Mahāyāna Bodhisattva precepts, "Buddhists should themselves avoid selling intoxicants or encouraging others to sell intoxicants. If you do so, you may accumulate the cause, condition, transgression and karma of the sold intoxicants. You should avoid selling any intoxicants. The intoxicants are causes that generate sin. Therefore, Bodhisattvas produce wisdom that is bright and complete for all sentient beings. If, instead, you generate the upside-down way of thinking about all sentient beings, this is a Bodhisattva's unpardonable sin."<sup>97</sup>

The *Fourfold Rule of Monastic Discipline* introduced that drinking intoxicants have ten mistakes: (1) The drinkers of intoxicants are believed to have the color of their faces look worse; (2) not have power; (3) not see objects clearly; (4) make faces angry easily; (5) destroy their business and to lose their properties; (6) generate diseases; (7) like fighting and lawsuits; (8) lose good reputation and increase bad reputation; (9) decrease their wisdom; and (10) be born in three lower realms of existence.<sup>98</sup>

The *Brahma Net Sūtra* introduced the second minor precept and prohibited Buddhists from drinking intoxicants, "Buddhists should on purpose avoid drinking intoxicants. If you do so, you may generate unlimited faults. If you pass a wine glass by your hand to another person and allow him/her to drink, you may have no hands for five hundred generations. How much more severe this would be if you actually drank intoxicants yourself! You should avoid teaching people to drink and allowing all sentient beings to drink. How much more severe this would be if you drank intoxicants yourself! If you on purpose drink yourself or you encourage others to drink, you have committed a minor moral offense."<sup>99</sup>

<sup>97</sup> T.24.1484.1004c8-12 and Osuka, trans., 94.

<sup>98</sup> T.24.1428.672a17-21.

<sup>99</sup> T.24.1484.1005b6-9 and Osuka, trans., 97.

The *Great Wisdom Śāstra* introduced thirty five mistakes for drinking intoxicants.<sup>100</sup> (1) The drinking of intoxicants causes drinkers to lose their properties. If some becomes drunk, he is easily supposed to spend more money. (2-3) The drinking of intoxicants generates diseases and fighting. (4) Even though their clothes are taken off and get torn, they do not feel shy. (5) The drinkers will have bad reputations and will not receive respect from people. (6-7) The drinking of intoxicants causes people to cover wisdom and not to obtain what they are supposed to obtain. (8-9) The drinkers reveal hidden secrets to other people and do not make their business be successful. (10-11) Drinking becomes the source of worries and decreases physical power. (12) Drinking makes the face of a drinker become worse. (13-20) Drinking makes drinkers not respect their fathers, mothers, mendicants, Brahmins, seniors, Buddhas, Buddhist teachings, and monks. (21-23) Drinkers are supposed to like bad friends, dislike good friends, and finally violate precepts. (24) Drinking makes people not feel shy nor have manners. (25-26) It makes people not control their emotions and to be lazy. (27) It makes people dislike drinkers. (28) It makes even close relatives dislike drinkers. (29-30) It makes drinkers repeat bad actions and abandon good teachings. (31) The wise persons do not trust drinkers. (32) Drinkers keep the teaching of enlightenment away from themselves. (33) They are supposed to be foolish and crazy in the future. (34) If they pass away, they will be born in the three lower realms of existence. (35) Even though drinkers are born as humans, they are always supposed to become crazy men. The text summarized drinking's negative side effects in verses:

Drinkers lose their recognition,  
dishonor their bodies and minds,  
confuse their wise minds,  
and do shameful actions.

Drinkers lose proper thinking and increase angry minds,  
lose pleasure and destroy family.  
Even though they say that they drink intoxicants joyfully,  
they actually drink fatal poison.

When they do not need anger, they are angry;  
When they do not need laughter, they laugh;  
When they do not need to cry, they cry; and  
When they do not need to hit, they hit.

Drinkers say what they should not say,  
They are like mad people,  
They take all wholesome virtues,  
Ones who know shame do not drink.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup> T.25.1509.158b9-c1.

<sup>101</sup> T.25.1509.158c3-10.

Similarly to the *Great Wisdom Śāstra*, the *Fenjie shan-e suoqi jing* (Sūtra of Distinguishing of Good from Evil) also enlisted thirty six mistakes for drinking intoxicants and strongly persuaded Buddhists not to drink intoxicants.<sup>102</sup> (1) If people like to drink and become drunk, children are supposed to not respect their parents and subjects not to respect their ruler. So, they do not distinguish relations between rulers and subjects and between fathers and sons. (2) Drinkers speak a lot of mistaken languages. (3) They become double-tongued and talkative. (4) They like to reveal the secrets of others. (5) They criticize heaven and do not refrain from urinating in front of shrines. (6) They sometimes throw themselves down on street and do not return to their homes and sometimes lose their possession. (7) They cannot control their bodies. (8) If they lower the upper part of the body, they will topple down or fall into a ditch or a hollow. (9) If they topple down and get up, they will hurt their faces. (10) They will destroy their business and make disputes with others. (11) Even though they lose their jobs, they are not worried about their future. (12) They spend their properties. (13) They do not consider the hunger of their wives and children. (14) They loudly use abusive languages and violate national laws. (15) They undress themselves and run naked. (16) They enter the houses of other people without permission and hold other women. (17) If other persons pass by, drinkers attempt to dispute with them. (18) Drinkers cry stamping one's feet on the floor and frighten the neighbors. (19) They kill insects at random. (20) They break household goods and office fixtures into pieces. (21) They treat their family members like prisoners and use offensive languages against them. (22) They will become a party with wrongdoers. (23) They keep wise men away from themselves. (24) If they wake up, they will be sick like sick persons. (25) Because they vomit dirty foods, their wives and children dislike them. (26) Because they have violent temperament, they do not get away from elephants and wolves. (27) They do not respect ascetics, Brahmins, mendicants and wise persons versed in scriptures. (28) They do not hesitate to raise sexual desire. (29) When they are drunk and behave like mad men, other persons run away. (30) When they are drunk and become like dead persons, they do not recognize other persons. (31) They sometimes become pockmarked persons, sometimes become sick, sometimes have haggard faces, and sometimes look pale. (32) All of the heavenly beings, dragons, and demons consider intoxicants to be evil. (33) Good friends daily dislike drinkers. (34) When they are drunk, squat down, and haughtily treat officials, officials whip them. (35) Even though they want to enter even a high mountain hell, they cannot live there. Even though they want to die, they cannot die. (36) Even though they get away from hells and become humans, they always are foolish and do not judge properly because they, foolish and ignorant persons, used to drink intoxicants from their previous lives.

---

<sup>102</sup> T.17.729.518b24-c28.

The *Zhufa jiyao-jing* (Skt., *Dharmasamuccaya-sūtra*) also detailed a number of harmful side effects of drinking intoxicants and strongly suggested Buddhists not to drink intoxicants in verses as follows:

If we like drinking,  
 We are supposed to generate wisdom.  
 Because we cannot find the ways to enlightenment,  
 we should always keep intoxicants away from ourselves.  
 (Drinking) will be the most serious fault  
 for the saying of wise persons,  
 and will destroy us and others.  
 Therefore, we should always keep away drinking from ourselves.  
 If we like to drink intoxicants,  
 we are supposed to say secular affairs  
 and create a number of disputes.  
 Therefore, we should always keep away drinking from ourselves.  
 If we drink intoxicants, we are supposed to lose our properties  
 and we will be stupefied and lazy.  
 Because we are supposed to have the fault,  
 we should always keep away drinking from ourselves.  
 Because of drinking intoxicants,  
 We are supposed to generate anger  
 and increase foolishness.  
 Therefore, we should always keep away drinking from ourselves.  
 Because drinking is the source of disasters,  
 it causes drinkers not to think and act properly.  
 Due to drinking,  
 we will be born in hells.  
 Drinking makes us laugh loudly,  
 use violent languages,  
 hurt good persons,  
 and let good persons terrified.  
 If we are drunk,  
 we cannot distinguish good from evil.  
 Therefore, we should keep away drinking from ourselves.  
 If we drink, we will be tired.  
 If we are confused, we will be like dead persons.  
 Even though we seek for pleasure for long times,  
 we are supposed to augment disasters.  
 Drinking is the source of all disasters and misfortunes.  
 Because we always live in the foolishness,  
 we are gradually supposed to take steps to die.  
 After we are born in a hell,  
 we will again be born in a realm of demons  
 and other lower realms.  
 So, all bad results originate from drinking.  
 Intoxicants are the most poisonous materials  
 and the most serious diseases.  
 Wise persons says that

if we like to drink intoxicants,  
 we are supposed to augment sufferings,  
 destruct wisdom,  
 exhaust properties and  
 hurt pure actions.  
 When even the respectful persons become drunk,  
 they are not able to recognize anything else,  
 become laughing stocks for others,  
 and do not know how to feel shame.  
 Like a sharp ax,  
 drinking is able to cut off all wholesome teachings.  
 Because drinkers do not feel shame,  
 people despise them.  
 If we become drunk,  
 we are not able to stop drinking intoxicants.  
 Because we do not make all wholesome actions,  
 we do not have knowledge and wisdom.  
 If we love to drink intoxicants,  
 we will be confused in our minds.  
 So, we sometimes generate laughers  
 and sometimesangers.  
 Due to drinking intoxicants,  
 we are supposed to cover wisdom with ignorance  
 in this and next lives  
 and burn the teaching to emancipation from worldly attachments.  
 If we like the taste of intoxicants,  
 we are like eating the fruit of *jinbo*.  
 If we eat it in the beginning, we feel it is very sweet.  
 However, it is changed to poison.  
 Therefore, wise persons suggested  
 people not to drink intoxicants.<sup>103</sup>

Like introduced above, Buddhism clearly required Buddhists not to drink intoxicants. Even so, Korean Buddhists publicly began to remove the precept and drink intoxicants from the time of Japanese rule, 1910-1945. The movement's activists asked Korean Buddhists to exercise the precept with other precepts of celibate monasticism and observe no eating of meat and five pungent plants and recovered the tradition of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism which Korean Buddhists had traditionally preserved for its long history.

### 3.1.3. No-eating of five pungent plants

The *Brahma Net Sūtra* introduced the fourth minor precept and prohibited Buddhists from eating the five kinds of pungent plants.<sup>104</sup> The *Sūraṃgama Sūtra*

---

<sup>103</sup> T.17.728.480b8-c17.

<sup>104</sup> T.24.1484.1005b14-16.

also explained why Buddhists should not eat the five kinds of pungent plants, “When all sentient beings cultivate concentration, they should not eat the five kinds of bitter vegetables. If they cook and eat them, they are supposed to generate sexual desires. If they eat them without cooking, they are supposed to generate anger. Even though we teach the twelve divisions of the whole Buddhist teaching<sup>105</sup> to them who eat the five kinds of pungent plants, all heavenly beings and immortals of ten directions will get away from us because they dislike the smell of them. All wicked demons including hungry ghosts will suck and lick the lips of the persons who eat the five kinds of pungent plants. The persons who eat the plants will always live with wicked demons, will not have good luck and virtue and will not finally have any benefit. Even though they cultivate concentration, all good deities such as Bodhisattvas, heavenly beings, and immortals of ten directions cannot protect them. The powerful king of demons pretends as the Buddha, preaches Buddhist teachings, slanders precepts and admires obscene, angry and foolish minds. When the drinkers die, they will be born as members of the demon king. If they finish their life terms in the realm of the demon king, they will be born in the unremitting hell. Ānanda, the persons who cultivate their minds to obtain enlightenment should not eat the five kinds of bitter vegetables. We can say that, if so, they are gradually able to cultivate their minds.”<sup>106</sup>

### 3.1.4. Celibate monasticism

The movement also based its theoretical background for celibate monasticism on the *Brahma Net Sūtra*. Of course, even though vegetarianism heavily derived from the *Brahma Net Sūtra*, a Chinese origin, celibate monasticism actually originated from the monastic codes of an Indian origin. While Indian Buddhism emphasized celibate monasticism but did not keep

---

<sup>105</sup> The whole Buddhist teachings are classified into twelve divisions according to their content and style. The twelve divisions have the different lists. They are “(1) *sūtra*, teachings in prose; (2) *geya*, restatements of *sūtra* in verse; (3) *vyākaraṇa*, the Buddha’s predictions of the enlightenment of disciples; (4) *gāthā*, teachings set forth by the Buddha in verse; (5) *udāna*, teachings preached by the Buddha spontaneously without request or query from his disciples; (6) *nidāna*, descriptions of the purpose, cause, and occasion of propounding teachings and rules of monastic discipline; (7) *avadāna*, tales of previous lives of persons other than the Buddha; (8) *itivrittaka*, discourses beginning with the words “Thus the World-Honored One said” (According to another definition, stories that describe previous lives of the Buddha’s disciples and Bodhisattvas); (9) *jātaka*, stories of the Buddha’s previous lives; (10) *vaipulya*, expansion of doctrine; (11) *adbhutadharmā*, descriptions of marvelous events that concern the Buddha or his disciples (also applied to descriptions that praise the great merit and power of the Buddha and his disciples); and (12) *upadesha*, discourses on the Buddha’s teachings.” See the entry “twelve divisions of the scriptures” in the *Soka Gakkai Dictionary of Buddhism*, 773-774.

<sup>106</sup> T.19.945.141c4-13.

vegetarianism, Chinese Buddhism strongly preserved two slogans of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism and completely established the version of East Asian Buddhist monasticism.

The *Brahma Net Sūtra* arranged the third major precept and strongly backed up celibate monasticism, “Buddhists should themselves avoid solitary sexual indulgence, encouragement of others to commit adultery, or intentional engagement in sexual misconduct with any women. If you do so, you may accumulate the sexually indulged cause, condition, transgression, and karma. Further, you should avoid sexual activities with animals, female heavenly spirits and ghosts of women. The adultery is not Buddhist way. Therefore, Bodhisattvas generate mindfulness of filial piety, rescue all sentient beings, and provide the pure teachings to the people. If, instead, you encourage the rise of sexual indulgence with people, with animals and with mothers, sisters, or any of the other six types of close relations, you commit adultery and have no compassion. This is a Bodhisattva’s unpardonable sin.”<sup>107</sup>

Buddhism required no sexual conduct as the first and most important precept for monastics. The *Fourfold Rule of Monastic Discipline* introduced the ten reasons why the Buddha made the first monastic precept, “(1) The Buddha made the first precept of no sexual conduct to guide laypersons to the monastic community; (2) to let monks delighted; (3) to cause monks to be happy; (4) to lead non-believers to believe in Buddhism; (5) to make believers increase their belief in Buddhism; (6) to easily tame the persons whom we are difficult to control; (7) to provide pleasure to the persons who confess their sins; (8-9) to remove present and future defilements; and (10) to make proper teachings reside in this world for a long time.”<sup>108</sup>

If monastics violate the first precept, they are not allowed to stay in the monastic community but lose thirty five rights as monastics as follows:<sup>109</sup> (1) They cannot ordain novice monks with full monk precepts; (2) they cannot be teachers; (3) they cannot educate novice monks; (4) they cannot teach nuns; (5) they cannot visit nunneries to teach nuns; (6) they cannot make confession of their sins; (7) they cannot answer the questions of vinaya; (8) they are not allowed to attend general meetings in their temples; (9) they cannot attend meetings to elect positions in their temples; (10) they cannot take positions in the temples; (11) they cannot go to villages at an early hour; (12) they are not allowed to come back to their temples very late; (13) they are not allowed to make friends with pure monks; (14) they are not allowed to make friends with laypersons and heretics; (15) they should follow even the directives of nuns; (16) they should not violate the precept once more; (17) they should publicly regard themselves as monks who violate the precept; (18) they should not hide their violation; (19) they should not criticize what the mass of the monks pass

<sup>107</sup> T.24.1484.1004b26-c2 and Osuka, trans., 93.

<sup>108</sup> T.24.1428.570c3-7.

<sup>109</sup> T.40.1804.19c8-28, T.85.2793.676b9-24.



resolutions; (20) they should not criticize the persons who pass resolutions; (21) they will not receive respect as pure monks; (22) they cannot receive services from others to wash their feet; (23) they cannot receive utensils from others to wash their feet; (24) they cannot receive tools from others to shine their shoes; (25) they cannot have massage treatments from others; (26) they cannot receive respect from nuns; (27) they cannot receive respect from others; (28) they cannot receive greetings from others; (29) they will not be welcomed; (30) they are not allowed to receive robes and bowls from others; (31) they cannot criticize pure monks; (32) they cannot become witnesses for others; (33) they cannot prevent others from making confession of their sins; (34) they cannot prohibit others from repenting at the end of the summer meditation retreat; and (35) they are not allowed to make disputes with pure monks.

### **3.2. The movement's anti-orthopraxy**

The movement clearly violated the Buddhist orthopraxy's general principles of non-arbitrariness, non-dispute, non-violence and the separation between state and religion. First, even though Buddhism strongly and generally accepted the orthopraxy of non-arbitrariness (universal application of precepts) in their vinaya texts, the movement's activists arbitrarily emphasized some precepts and ignored other precepts for their own political and sectarian interests. The movement's opponents also arbitrarily emphasized some precepts and ignored other precepts for their sectarian purposes. Both sides did not universally and neutrally apply but sectarianistically and subjectively applied the precepts with prejudices.

Second, even though Buddhists made the vinaya texts and basically aimed at making the Buddhist community be harmonious among its members, the movement's proponents, celibate monks, intentionally ignored the precept of harmony (non-dispute) and sectarianistically removed married monks from the united and ecumenical order constituting married and unmarried monks upon the success of the movement. Unlike them, married monks literally and conservatively interpreted the precept and criticized unmarried monks before the movement's success. However, while celibate monks literally and conservatively interpreted the precept after the movement's general success, married monks intentionally ignored the precept and justified their separation from the ecumenical Jogye Order and the establishment of their sectarian Taego Order.

Third, even though the vinaya texts clearly stipulated and emphasized the precept of non-violence, the movement's proponents generously used violence and accomplished the movement successfully. They individually used physical violence and also easily resorted to structural violence that the government's authorities adopted and implemented for celibate monks. The movement's opponents literally and conservatively interpreted the precept and vehemently criticized the movement's activists who heavily relied on individual and

structural violence and implemented the movement. They also defensively, not aggressively, interpreted and accepted violence against the movement's activists.

Fourth, even though Buddhism strictly prescribed the precept of separation between state and religion in monastic and Bodhisattva precepts and strongly asked Buddhists to keep the autonomy and sovereignty of the Buddhist community, lay and/or monastic, the movement's activists violated the precept and made the movement a government-patronized one. So, the movement's opponents defined the movement as a government-sponsored movement. They also accomplished their goal to separate themselves from the ecumenical order of Jogye Order and to establish their sectarian order named Taego Order for themselves after the movement's general success.

### 3.2.1. Non-arbitrariness

The *Brahma Net Sūtra* strongly required Buddhists to receive and preserve Bodhisattva precepts without the arbitrary interpretation and application of them for their own political interests. The scripture emphasized the preservation of precepts, arranged a number of precepts, and encouraged Buddhists to strictly preserve monastic and Bodhisattva precepts. Even so, both the opponents and proponents of the movement arbitrarily emphasized some precepts and intentionally ignored other precepts for their own political and sectarian purposes. Both sides selectively emphasized some precepts and ignored other precepts and sectarianistically backed up their own political positions in the movement's process.

The text concretely states Buddhists should not arbitrarily receive and preserve precepts for their economic and political interests and benefits, as seen in the eleven minor precepts such as the fifth,<sup>110</sup> eleventh,<sup>111</sup> sixteenth,<sup>112</sup> seventeenth,<sup>113</sup> twenty-sixth,<sup>114</sup> twenty-seventh,<sup>115</sup> twenty-ninth,<sup>116</sup> thirty-sixth,<sup>117</sup> forty-first,<sup>118</sup> forty-second,<sup>119</sup> and forty-third minor precepts.<sup>120</sup> Other than the above precepts, we can also in the text see the precepts including the sixth, seventh, fifteenth, twenty-fourth, thirty-fourth, thirty-fifth, thirty-ninth, fortieth, forty-fourth, and forty-sixth minor precepts which prohibit Buddhists from arbitrarily receiving and preserving precepts.

---

<sup>110</sup> T.24.1484.1005b19.

<sup>111</sup> T.24.1484.1005c20.

<sup>112</sup> T.24.1484.1006b23.

<sup>113</sup> T.24.1484.1006b25,27.

<sup>114</sup> T.24.1484.1007a9.

<sup>115</sup> T.24.1484.1007a13,14.

<sup>116</sup> T.24.1484.1007a23.

<sup>117</sup> T.24.1484.1008a9.

<sup>118</sup> T.24.1484.1009a2.

<sup>119</sup> T.24.1484.1009a7.

<sup>120</sup> T.24.1484.1009a14.

The sūtra required Buddhists to prioritize the great vehicle to the small vehicle and to respect and learn Buddhism from the teachers of the great vehicle. So, it advocated the sectarianism of the great vehicle and strongly requested Buddhists to respect the teachers of the great vehicle as highly and sincerely as possible in the sixth minor precept, “Buddhists should show hospitality to the monks of the great vehicle, fellow learners, and fellow who has same views and practice together, when they arrive at monasteries, households, or towns; or, when they see them coming from one hundred *li* or one thousand *li* distance, you should stand up and sincerely welcome them, give offerings to them as they arrive and bid them farewell as they leave. You should offer them three meals a day, three *liangs*<sup>121</sup> of gold, drinks and foods of hundreds of flavors, bedding, sitting, sitting mats, and medicines and give them everything they need. You should always ask the monk to preach three times a day, you should bow three times a day, and you should not dwell on thoughts of anger and worry. Even if you destroy the body for the sake of the teaching, you should not be lazy in asking for the teaching. If not, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>122,</sup>”

The text requested Buddhists to learn the vinaya texts from vinaya preceptors and preserve the precepts included in the texts at any place and at any time in the seventh minor precept, “Buddhists should in all places go to listen lectures on the vinaya scripture. If there is a lecture within the city, novice Bodhisattvas should bring a copy of the vinaya scripture and go to the monk to listen, receive, and ask questions about the teaching. Even if they are under a tree in a mountain or a monastery, you should go and listen and take in the lectures that are held everywhere. If not so, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>123,</sup>”

The scripture asked Buddhists to apply Mahāyāna Bodhisattva precepts universally and without exception in the eighth minor precept, “Buddhists should avoid turning away in your heart from the scripture of the great vehicle and should not speak on non-Buddhist teachings. Furthermore, you should not accept or promote the doctrines of two vehicles, the small vehicle, non-Buddhist teachings, or false points of view, including heterodox ones with all their prohibitions. If you do so, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>124,</sup>”

The text strictly prohibited Buddhists from violating Bodhisattva precepts and asked them to gradually promote their spiritual stages in the fifteenth minor precept, “Buddhists should teach Buddhist disciples, non-Buddhists, the six types of close relatives, and all good spiritual friends to receive and uphold the vinaya scripture of the great vehicle. You should teach them to understand both the meaning and the principle, and awaken in them the Buddha nature, the Ten Dedicated Mental States, the Ten Eminently Prepared Mental States, and the Ten Diamond Mental States. Within those thirty mental stages, you should

<sup>121</sup> One *liang* is 37.5 gram in weight.

<sup>122</sup> T.24.1484.1005b21-28 and Osuka, trans., 98.

<sup>123</sup> T.24.1484.1005b29-c4 and Osuka, trans., 99.

<sup>124</sup> T.24.1484.1005c5-7 and Osuka, trans., 99.

understand each order and function of the teaching. Therefore, this is a Bodhisattva. If, instead, you have malicious and angry mindsets and intentionally teach other arrogant doctrines, such as the doctrines of two vehicles, the vinaya scriptures of the small vehicle, and non-Buddhist and heterodox interpretations, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>125</sup>

The Bodhisattva precepts prioritized the teaching of the great vehicle to that of the small vehicle and other religious traditions and requested Buddhists to diligently study the great vehicle's teaching in the twenty-fourth minor precept, "Buddhists should possess the Buddhist scripture and the precepts of the great vehicle, the correct doctrine, a right idea, a right nature, and the right body of universal order. If you do not diligently study and practice these, you abandon the seven jewels. If you study the heterodox ideas of the two vehicles of hearers and solitary realizers, non-Buddhist teachings, conventional books, the discourse of the small vehicle, other various discourses, or literature, you cut off the Buddha nature. This is the obstacle way of cause and effect, not a practice of the Bodhisattva way. If, instead, you on purpose do so, you have committed a minor moral offense."<sup>126</sup>

The sūtra suggested Buddhists to protect and preserve Bodhisattva precepts in the thirty-fourth minor precept, "Buddhists should protect and observe these precepts in the six periods of the day and night, whether walking, standing, sitting, or lying, you should read and recite these precepts as if you were as precious as a diamond, as even a person who wishes to cross the ocean uses floats, or as a full monk does not move when bound with weeds. You should always arouse a virtuous faith in the teachings of the great vehicle. You should also regard yourself as you are an unenlightened one. All other Buddhas are already enlightened Buddhas. You should seek the enlightened level of being and not forget the aspiration for a moment. If, instead, you generate the perspective of the two vehicles and other non-Buddhist thought for even a single moment, you have committed a minor moral offense."<sup>127</sup>

The scripture suggested Buddhists not to neglect the precepts even for a moment but consider them more importantly than our bodies and lives in the thirty-fifth minor precept, "Buddhists should always profess to every vow and should also have filial piety to your father and mother, to the teacher monks, and to the three jewels. And you should vow to find excellent teachers, fellow students, virtuous friends, and spiritual friends who always refer to the vinaya scripture of the great vehicle, the ten dedicated mental states of development, the ten eminently prepared mental states, the ten diamond mental states, and the ten mental states of the essential nature of reality. Such lead you to enlightenment and to practice according to the teaching, firmly upholding the Buddha's precept even to abandoning your bodies and lives. Even if you lose your body and life,

---

<sup>125</sup> T.24.1484.1006a10-15 and Osuka, trans., 101.

<sup>126</sup> T.24.1484.1006c19-23 and Osuka, trans., 106.

<sup>127</sup> T.24.1484.1007b21-26 and Osuka, trans., 110.

you should not abandon the precept for a moment. Therefore, this is the Bodhisattva. If, instead, you do not profess these vows, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>128</sup>

The sūtra firmly suggested Buddhists to generate the thirteen great vows<sup>129</sup> and preserve the Buddha's precepts and not to arbitrarily interpret and practice them in the thirty-sixth minor precept, "Buddhists, if you have committed to the ten great vows<sup>130</sup> and observe the Buddha's precepts, you should profess by making the following vows. (1) Rather than violating the vinaya scripture in the three periods of various Buddhas, even if I should sacrifice my body and enter into raging flames, a deep abyss, or a mountain of knives, I should not engage in impure conduct with any women. (2) And, again, you should make this vow. Rather than violating the body of precepts, even if I should sacrifice anybody wrapped and bound a thousand times around with hot iron nets, I should not take any of a member's clothes. (3) And, again, you should make this vow. Rather than violating the mouth of the precepts, even if I should sacrifice my mouth by swallowing hot iron halls or flowing raging flames for a hundred thousand eons, I should not take a member's food and drinks of a hundred flavors. (4) And, again, you should make this vow. Rather than violating the body of precepts, even if I should sacrifice my body by lying down in a raging fire of nets or hot irons, I should not take a member's hundred kinds of bedding and seating. (5) And, again, you should make this vow. Rather than violating the body of precepts, even if I should sacrifice my body by receiving three hundred spear pierces for one or two eons, I should not take a member's medicines of a hundred flavors. (6) And, again, you should make this vow. Rather than violating the body of precepts, even if I should sacrifice my body by entering into a hot iron pot for hundreds of thousands of eons, I should not take a member's one thousand kinds of shelter, housing, gardens, and fields. (7) And, again, you should make this vow. Rather than violating the body of precepts, even if I should sacrifice and break my body with an iron hammer and break to pieces from head to toe, I should not take a member's reverence, respect, and bows. (8) And, again, you should make this vow. Rather than violating the spirit of the precepts, even if I am gouged in the eyes with hundreds of thousands of hot iron swords and spears, I should not see others' beautiful appearances. (9) And, again, you should make this vow. Rather than violating the spirit of the precepts, even if I am poked in both ears with hundreds of thousands of iron gimlets for one or two eons, I should not listen to pleasant music. (10) And, again, you should make this vow. Rather than violating the spirit of the precepts, even if my nose should be chopped away with hundreds of thousands of knives and swords, I should not smell fragrance. (11) And, again, you should make the vow. Rather than violating the spirit of the precepts, even if my tongue should

<sup>128</sup> T.24.1484.1007b27-c2 and Osuka, trans., 110-111.

<sup>129</sup> Some versions of the *Brahma Net Sūtra* enlist ten, not thirteen, great vows.

<sup>130</sup> Even though the scripture mentions ten great vows here, it actually introduces thirteen great vows. I itemized them for readers to easily identify the number of vows.

be cut out with hundreds and thousands of knives and swords, I should not taste any of the hundred kinds of pure food. (12) And, again, you should make this vow. Rather than violating the spirit of the precepts, even if I should be hacked and chopped by sharp axes, I should not have attachment to pleasant sensations of touch. (13) And, again, you should make this vow. I should commit to attaining enlightenment for all sentient beings. Therefore, this is the Bodhisattva. If, instead, you fail to profess these vows, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>131</sup>

The text requested Buddhists not to criticize precepts in the forty-third minor precept, “Buddhists, even if you receive the true Buddha’s precept by leaving home led by a disposition of faith, you should avoid accepting any member’s offerings. If you on purpose violate this secret precept, you should also be prohibited from walking on the land of the king and prohibited from drinking the water of the king. The five thousand great ghosts constantly block your passage and the ghosts denounce you as a chief burglar. If you enter the monastery or a house in the city, the ghosts will constantly sweep your every step. Ordinary people will abuse you and say that you are a burglar within Buddhism. All sentient beings do not wish to see you. A violator of the precepts is not different from an animal or a piece of dead wood. If, instead, you violate this true precept, you have committed a minor moral offense.”<sup>132</sup>

The sūtra persuaded Buddhists to constantly and wholeheartedly receive, uphold, read and recite the scriptures and precepts in the forty-fourth minor precept, “Buddhists should always and wholeheartedly accept, observe, read, and receive the vinaya scripture of the great vehicle. You should be willing to peel off your skin for paper, draw with your own blood for ink, extract your marrow for water, split your bone for a pen, and you should copy the Buddha’s precept. You should also constantly write and transmit the precept on bark, paper, silk, or bamboo. You should always use the seven kinds of jewels, priceless incense, flowers, and all other gems to adorn the covers and cases in which the volumes of vinaya scriptures are stored. If, instead, you fail to make an offering in accord with this rule, you have committed a minor moral offense.”<sup>133</sup>

### 3.2.2. Non-dispute (harmony)

Buddhism made the precepts and attempted to let the Buddhist community be managed harmoniously among its members. Because the key concept of vinaya is non-dispute (harmony), Buddhists are not allowed to create disputes among themselves but to make the harmonious and peaceful community. Even so, the movement’s activists utilized individual and structural violence and

<sup>131</sup> T.24.1484.1007c3-1008a12 and Osuka, 111-112.

<sup>132</sup> T.24.1484.1009a13-19 and Osuka, trans., 118-119.

<sup>133</sup> T.24.1484.1009a20-24 and Osuka, trans., 119.

created a lot of disputes in Buddhism. They also made disputes in the order for their political and sectarian interests. They ignored the precept of non-dispute to take their hegemony in the order and temples and easily justified the use of dispute (means) for the success of the movement (goal).

The movement was in principle contradictory to the precept of non-dispute. When celibate monks attempted to purify the order and remove married monks from it, they were supposed to generate disputes in the order. If they considered the precept, they could not in principle implement the movement. After they obtained the hegemony in the order and temples, they tried to be harmonious with married monks and suggested married monks to be harmonious with themselves. However, when married monks lost the hegemony in the order and temples, they began to generate disputes and attempted to take back the hegemony. Both sides differently accepted the precept depending on their situations and interests.

The *Brahma Net Sūtra* introduced a number of precepts and attempted to promote harmony among Buddhists. We can see in the text the precepts related with non-dispute such as the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth major precepts and the fifth, thirteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, nineteenth, twenty-first, twenty-second, twenty-fifth, twenty-sixth, twenty-seventh, twenty-eighth, thirtieth, thirty-first, thirty-second, thirty-eighth, forty-seventh and forty-eighth minor precepts and other precepts.

Of them, the tenth major precept particularly required Buddhists not to criticize the Buddha, the Buddhist teaching and the Buddhist community, “Buddhists should themselves avoid dishonoring the three jewels or teaching other persons to dishonor the three jewels. If so, you may have for yourself the dishonor’s cause, condition, transgression and karma. Therefore, whenever Bodhisattvas hear from a non-Buddhist or evil person even one word or hint of dishonoring the Buddha, they should feel a piercing of the heart by three hundred spears. Needless of say, you would not produce faith and filial piety by means of dishonor of the mouth. If, instead, you support the evil people who possess heterodox views and dishonor the three jewels, this is a Bodhisattva’s unpardonable sin.”<sup>134</sup>

The text clearly requested Buddhists to not make disputes in the Buddhist community but make harmony among its members in the twenty-fifth minor precept, “Buddhists, after experiencing the nirvāṇa of Buddha, who become masters of preaching Dharma and become heads of temples, masters of teaching, masters of meditation, or heads of hospice should cultivate a mental state of kindness, settle any quarrels or disputes, and carefully protect the three jewels of Buddhism. You should not use the three jewels as a personal matter. If, instead, you let ordinary people quarrel or dispute, while you use the three jewels as any way you want, you have committed a minor moral offense.”<sup>135</sup>

<sup>134</sup> T.24.1484.1005a11-15 and Osuka, trans., 95-96.

<sup>135</sup> T.24.1484.1006c24-1007a2 and Osuka, trans., 106.

Even though the scripture strongly required Buddhists not to expose the faults of the Buddhist community including monastics and laypersons to others in the sixth major precept, both the movement's proponents and its opponents competitively publicized the faults of counterparts and attempted to receive support from the public. Both sides violated the precept. So, the scripture introduced the precept, "Buddhists should themselves avoid exposing faults of others either who have already left home or who still stay home, either of Bodhisattvas or of monks and nuns, and should avoid teaching others their faults. If so, you may accumulate the cause, condition, transgression and karma of the exposed faults. Whenever Bodhisattvas listen to non-Buddhists, evil people, two vehicles of evil people, or those who preaching neither teachings nor precepts of the Buddha's teaching, always they produce mindfulness of compassion and teach and transform such evil people to be believers of the great vehicle. Therefore, this is a Bodhisattva. If, instead, you expose the fault of Buddhist teaching, this is a Bodhisattva's unpardonable sin."<sup>136</sup>

Even though the movement's activists criticized married monks to get political hegemony and management rights of the order and temples, the scripture requested Buddhists not to criticize others for their interests in the seventh major precept, "Buddhists should themselves avoid either praising themselves and criticizing others or teaching other persons to praise themselves and criticize others. If so, you may accumulate the criticized cause, condition, transgression and karma. Whoever is a Bodhisattva should be willing to accept slander and humiliation for the sake of all sentient beings. Therefore, Bodhisattvas turn misfortune toward them and let others receive fortune. If, instead, you praise your own virtues, covet others' good things, and let others receive slander, this is a Bodhisattva's unpardonable sin."<sup>137</sup>

The text required Buddhists not to criticize others for their economic interests and not to destroy the Buddhist community in the eighth major precept, "Buddhists should themselves avoid being stingy or teaching others to be stingy. If so, you may accumulate the stingy manner's cause, condition, transgression, and karma. Therefore, Bodhisattvas see poor persons and beggars coming, they give those persons any things necessary that they want. This is a Bodhisattva. If you have either malicious thoughts or anger and do not give even so much as a penny, a needle, or a glass, nor accept such persons who are in quest of the teaching, nor preach so much as any verse, one word, or one dust worth of the teaching to such persons, instead, you scold and insult such persons, this is a Bodhisattva's unpardonable sin."<sup>138</sup>

The scripture requested them not to distort the proper teachings for their own personal benefits and not to dishonor the harmony in the Buddhist community in the sixteenth minor precept, "Buddhists should have sound mental

<sup>136</sup> T.24.1484.1004c13-18 and Osuka, trans., 94.

<sup>137</sup> T.24.1484.1004c19-23 and Osuka, trans., 94-95.

<sup>138</sup> T.24.1484.100c24-1005a4 and Osuka, trans., 95.



faculties and, first, study the supreme vinaya scripture of the great vehicle. You should extensively understand the marvelous meanings. Thereafter, whenever, from one hundred *li*<sup>139</sup> or one thousand *li* away, you see a novice Bodhisattva seeking the vinaya sūtra of the great vehicle, you should explain all ascetic practices in accordance with the teaching, which emphasizes that all Buddhists are willing to burn their bodies, elbows, and fingers for the sake of the proper teaching. If one does not make an offering to all Buddhas by burning body, elbow, and finger, one is not a Bodhisattva who has truly renounced the world to be a monk. Furthermore, one should completely abandon one's body, flesh, hands, and feet to hungry tigers, wolves, lions, and all hungry spirits. After you explain these things, in sequence, point by point for the sake of the true teaching, the novice can understand the meaning. Therefore, this is a Bodhisattva. If, instead, for the sake of personal benefit, you on purpose do not answer when you should answer, explain the vinaya sūtra of the great vehicle out of context, without beginning or end, or preach so as to dishonor the three jewels, they have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>140,</sup>

The text encouraged Buddhists not to maliciously make dissension, conflicts and disharmony in the Buddhist community by telling a lie in the nineteenth minor precept, "Buddhists should avoid maliciously stirring dissension. When you see a monk who observes the precepts while holding an incense burner in his hand for Bodhisattva practice, you should not stir arguments between them or provoke wise persons to intervene something that was not said. You should avoid on purpose creating evil. If, instead, you intentionally do so, you have committed a minor moral offense."<sup>141,</sup>

### 3.2.3. Nonviolence

The movement easily justified the use of violence in acquiring their sublime goal of purifying Korean Buddhism. However, the *Brahma Net Sūtra* in particular and Buddhism in general strongly opposed the use of violence. So, the scripture introduced the first major precept, "Buddha said that Buddhists should themselves avoid killing and should avoid encouraging others to kill, killing by circumstantial means, commending killing, delighting in witnessing killing, or killing with a curse. If so, you may accumulate the killed cause, condition, transgression, and karma. Furthermore, you should avoid killing any sentient beings. Therefore, Bodhisattvas always maintain compassion, generate filial piety, and save and protect all sentient beings by whatever methods are suitable. If, instead, you kill sentient beings, or, with delight, intend to kill, this is a Bodhisattva's unpardonable sin."<sup>142,</sup>

<sup>139</sup> One *li* is 0.4 kilometer in length.

<sup>140</sup> T.24.1484.1006a16-24 and Osuka, trans., 101-102.

<sup>141</sup> T.24.1484.1006b6-8 and Osuka, trans., 103.

<sup>142</sup> T.24.1484.1004b16-20 and Osuka, trans., 92.

The scripture strongly requested Buddhists not to kill sentient beings but to save them. It suggested us not to have even killing instruments in the tenth minor precept, “Buddhists should not collect any knives, clubs, bows, arrows, spears, axes, or any other weapons used in fighting, nor should you collect nets, traps for evil actions, or other weapons used in killing. Therefore, this is a Bodhisattva. Furthermore, you should not seek revenge, even if your parents are murdered. How much less should all sentient beings be killed? You should not collect any weapons that kill sentient beings. If you on purpose collect any knives and clubs, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>143</sup>”

The text asked Buddhists not to use the government’s institutional violence (war) to obtain their own personal fame and interests in the eleventh minor precept, “Buddha said that Buddhists should not act as their nation’s military envoys, for the sake of personal benefit, or because of malicious intent. You should not kill unlimited masses of people by battling or fighting in military forces. Therefore, this is a Bodhisattva. You should avoid the comings and goings around military bases; even more so, you should not be a country’s traitor. If you on purpose do so, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>144</sup>”

The scripture persuaded Buddhists not to kill even all living creatures and strongly emphasized non-killing principle in the fourteenth minor precept, “Buddhists should not viciously burn the mountains and wildernesses with great fires, especially from April to September. If you set fire, it burns other people’s houses, cities, villages, monasteries, fields, and trees, or the possessions of ghosts and spirits, and government property. You should avoid on purpose setting fire to anything or to places that are home to living creatures. If you intentionally start such a fire, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>145</sup>”

The sūtra suggested Buddhists to actively advocate non-killing and positively save sentient beings in the twentieth minor precept, “Buddhists out of compassion should practice the moral duty of setting sentient beings free. All males have been our fathers; and all females have been our mothers. We are born into what we are according to our birth and rebirth. Thus, all sentient beings on the six paths are our parents. Therefore, killing and eating sentient beings is the same as killing our bodies. All elements of earth and water are our previous bodies and all elements of fire and wind are our original bodies. Thus, because of the dharma of eternal teaching about receiving life from the process of birth and rebirth, you should always practice setting sentient beings free and teach other people to set sentient beings free. Whenever you see the killing of animals by people, you should rescue and protect the animals by an appropriate means and free them from suffering. You should always teach and preach Bodhisattva precepts and save sentient beings. On the day that one’s father, mother, or bothers dies, you should ask the Dharma master to preach the

---

<sup>143</sup> T.24.1484.1005c14-17 and Osuka, trans., 100.

<sup>144</sup> T.24.1484.1005c20-23 and Osuka, trans., 100.

<sup>145</sup> T.24.1484.1006a6-9 and Osuka, trans., 101.

*Bodhisattva Precept Sūtra*, in order to save the deceased spirit by merit; they may gain for the spirit that it see the various Buddhas and generate the human and heavenly world. If, instead, you do not do so, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>146,</sup>

The text required Buddhists not to use individual and structural violence in the thirty-second minor precept, “Buddhists should avoid keeping any kinds of knives, clubs, or bows and avoid selling and buying false scales and measuring devices. You should also avoid using official power to steal a person’s valuables and avoid being bound by a self-destructive mindset that destroys success. You should also avoid domesticating cats, foxes, wild pigs, and dogs. If, instead, you on purpose do so, you have committed a minor moral offense.”<sup>147,</sup>

The sūtra also suggested Buddhists to not maliciously observe all kinds of fights between males and females, battling armies, or quarrelling burglars in the thirty-third minor precept, “Buddhists should avoid maliciously observing all kinds of fights between males and females, battling armies, or quarreling burglars. You should also avoid listening to the sounds of conch-shells, hand drums, horns, five or seven string harps, twenty-five chord harps, wind-bells, flutes, harps, singing, or other music. Moreover, you should avoid involvement in any forms of fortune-telling and sorcery; you should avoid playing dice, chess, marbles, roulette, ball games, shot putting, darts, or checkers and avoid gambling or horse racing; you should avoid sorcery with nails and mirrors or with grass, pegs, bowls, and skulls. Furthermore, you should avoid assisting burglars. You should also avoid participating in any of these affairs. If, instead, you on purpose do so, you have committed a minor moral offense.”<sup>148,</sup>

### 3.2.4. Separation of religion and state

The movement was a government-sponsored movement. Celibate monks completely removed married monks from their order and successfully accomplished the movement based on the strong support from the government and two rulers, President I Seungman and President Bak Jeonghui. The movement began from the first presidential message of President I Seungman in 1954 and finished with the government’s official approval of married monks to separate themselves from the united Jogye Order consisting of married and unmarried monks and establish their own sectarian Taego Order in 1970 during the regime of President Bak Jeonghui.

However, the *Brahma Net Sūtra* defined the separation of religion and politics, requested Buddhists to protect Buddhism from the intervention and persecution of the government and suggested Buddhist organizations self-regulated and self-ruled in the forty-seventh minor precept, “Buddhists, all those

<sup>146</sup> T.24.1484.1006b9-18 and Osuka, trans., 103-104.

<sup>147</sup> T.24.1484.1007b11-13 and Osuka, trans., 109.

<sup>148</sup> T.24.1484.1007b14-20 and Osuka, trans., 109-110.

receiving the Buddha's precept out of a faith, including even a king, a prince, any of the four hundred officials, or any disciple from one of the four classes, who has a noble position, should avoid destroying the precepts of Buddha's teaching. You should avoid establishing laws prohibiting the disciplines of the four classes who want to renounce the world and practicing the way of Buddhism. You should also not forbid making an image of the Buddha, establishing a Buddha's pagoda, and copying vinaya scriptures. This is the sin of destroying the three treasures. Therefore, if you on purpose destroy the Dharma, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>149</sup>

The scripture requested Buddhists not to rely on external authorities and their powers to accomplish their own personal goals and interests in the seventeenth minor precept, "Buddhists should avoid approaching or making special relationships, for the sake of personal food, drink, money, benefits, offerings, or fame, with kings, prime ministers, or any of the one hundred officials and avoid relying on the influence of these relationships. You should avoid using superior status or power to make coercive demands and avoid beating, extorting, and on purpose stealing money or materials in order to exploit. This is called "seeking evil, seeks many." If, instead, you teach other people to be greedy in their relationships with others, with no compassion and no concern for thought of filial piety, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>150</sup>

The sūtra strongly required Buddhists to learn Buddhist teachings from any teacher who knows scriptures and vinaya well without considering their academic, social and family backgrounds in the twenty-second minor precept, "Buddhists who have only recently left home and who do not yet quite understand the teaching should deprive themselves of their previous accomplishments of intelligence and knowledge, noble backgrounds, ages, family names, high levels of class, great understandings, great degrees of wealth or possession of the seven jewels, and habits of becoming arrogant or failing to listen the vinaya scripture by the senior Dharma master. The Dharma masters may be of lower class, younger in years, humble of backgrounds, poor, or physically disabled, but they have real virtue and extensive understanding of all the vinaya scriptures. Because of this difference, novice Bodhisattvas could not gain in seeing the germ nature of the Dharma nature. If, instead, you come and do not listen to the supreme meaning of truth from the Dharma master, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>151</sup>

The text suggested Buddhists not to discriminate against any being but to treat all beings equally regardless of their social positions and strongly asked them to regulate Buddhist organizations based on Buddhist rules, not based on the social and governmental regulations, in the thirty-eighth minor precept,

---

<sup>149</sup> T.24.1484.1009b9-13 and Osuka, trans., 120.

<sup>150</sup> T.24.1484.1006ba25-29 and Osuka, trans., 102.

<sup>151</sup> T.24.1484.1006b27-c4 and Osuka, trans., 104-105.

“Buddhists should sit in the order prescribed in the Buddhist regulations. Those who first received the precept sit in front, whereas those who later received the precept sit behind them. You should not question whether one is old or young, monk or nun, of noble status, a king, a prince, a eunuch, or a slave. Those who first received the precept sit in front, whereas those who later received the precept sit behind. You should avoid sitting like a non-Buddhist or a fool or like those who have no order of old or young, and no order of in front or behind. To have no particular order is the teaching of fighting and slavery. Buddhists who first received the precept sit in front, whereas those who later received the precept sit behind them. Therefore, this is the Bodhisattva. If, instead, you are not sitting according to the prescribed order, you have committed a minor moral offense.<sup>152</sup>”

The sūtra required Buddhists not to discriminate anyone against others but to equally treat all beings regardless of their social and existential positions, including a king, a prince, a high official, a monk, a layperson, a lewd man, a slave and a ghost spirit, in the fortieth minor precept, “Buddha says that when conferring the precepts on others, Buddhists should avoid discriminating and selecting people according to whether one is a king, a prince, a high ranking official, one of the hundred officials, a monk, a Buddhist layman, a Buddhist laywoman, a lewd man, a lewd woman, or in possession of the special characteristics of the eighteen heavens of the real form, the six heavens of the eighteen heavens of the real form, the six heavens of desire, the non-sexual organs, the male and female sexual organs, a eunuch, a slave, or any of the kinds of ghost spirit. You should surely let them all receive the precept. Buddhists should teach such people to wear blended color Buddhist robes that should match the practice of the way. All Buddhist robes are dyed with blended colors of blue, yellow, red, black, and purple. Furthermore, all clothes including sitting cloths should be dyed with blended colors. And ordinary clothes should also be dyed. If there are particular styles of clothes of the people throughout an entire country, a monk should wear different clothes from the citizens and ordinary people. When a person wishes to receive the precept, the preceptor should first ask and say, “Have you committed any of the seven deadly sins in this life?” A Bodhisattva preceptor should not give the precept to anyone who has committed any of the seven deadly sins in this present life. The seven deadly sins are shedding a Buddha’s blood, killing a father, mother, monk, or teacher, subverting a monk, and killing a saint. If anyone commits one of the seven deadly sins, that person cannot receive the precept in this present life. All other persons are eligible to receive the precept. Buddhists who have left home should not pay homage to kings, parents, the six kinds of close relatives, or ghosts and those who come from one hundred *li* or one thousand *li* distance to seek the teaching should understand only the preceptor’s worlds. If you, as a Bodhisattva

---

<sup>152</sup> T.24.1484.1008b1-7 and Osuka, trans. 114.

preceptor, maliciously do not confer equally the precept for all sentient beings, you have committed a minor moral offense.”<sup>153</sup>

The text persuaded Buddhists to keep the Buddhist community to be harmonious and protect it from being destroyed. It strongly suggested Buddhists to regulate and rule their community by themselves, not by other beings and forces, in the forty-eighth precept, “Buddhists, who have renounced the world with a right intention, should avoid explaining the Seven Buddhas’ precepts to a king or officials for the sake of fame and personal benefit. A monk, a nun, or a disciple of Bodhisattva should not be dishonest about the precepts; this is like eating a lion’s meat which has been destroyed by worms produced within the lion’s body. Neither non-Buddhists nor by heavenly enemies to Buddhism destroy (the precepts, but only malicious Buddhists can destroy Buddhist teachings). If you receive the Buddha’s precept, you should protect the Buddha’s precept as if caring for your only son, or as if practicing filial piety for a father and a mother. Therefore, whenever you, as a Bodhisattva, hear the Buddha’s precept abused by the malicious words of non-Buddhists or malevolent people, you should feel the same pain as if three hundred spears were struck into your heart and one thousand swords and ten thousand clubs beat your body. You should rather enter hell for a hundred eons than tolerate hearing, even for a moment, any destroying of Buddha’s precept by malicious words. Furthermore, you should not destroy the Buddha’s precepts yourself, nor teach others any cause of condition which leads to destroying the Dharma. To do so indicates a lack of filial piety. If, instead, you on purpose do so, you have committed a minor moral offense.”<sup>154</sup>

---

<sup>153</sup> T.24.1484.1008b21-c8 and Osuka, trans., 115-116.

<sup>154</sup> T.24.1484.1009b14-23 and Osuka, trans., 120-121.

### **Part III**

#### **Colonial Korean Buddhism, 1910-1945: The movement's historical background**

Modern Korean Buddhism begins with the opening of its country's border to foreign nations in 1876. Korean Buddhism received influences from the serious changes in the basic social, economic and political structure. As Korea became modernized, its society was greatly impacted. Korea was forced to have diplomatic relations with various foreign nations, including China, Russia, Japan, England, the United States, Germany and France, through which it was naturally exposed to foreign cultures, religions, advanced technologies, and science. For centuries, Korea essentially extended its communications with foreign nations only to China and Japan. In the modern era, the nation greatly expanded them beyond neighboring nations.

Most Korean bureaucrats in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century still considered Neo-Confucianism to be their state ideology adopted at the foundation of Joseon Dynasty (1392-1910). They studied Confucian texts in traditional village schools and public academies and took Confucian-based state examinations to become government officials. If they passed, they could get posts in the government administration. Due to narrowness of such an education, after becoming government administrators, they could not manage the government very efficiently. Specifically, they did not have skills and knowledge for modern government administration. They just learned major Confucian texts with Neo-Confucian commentaries and had difficulty in dealing with the complexities of modern society and international relations.

Because Korea received advancements in culture from China for such a long time in its pre-modern history, Koreans naturally felt China was a more greatly civilized nation than their own. China had been the fountain of their culture and civilization. Likewise, because Korea historically transmitted Chinese culture and civilization to Japan, Koreans once regarded Japan as an inferior nation to theirs. So, even when Korea opened its border to foreign nations including those of Europe and North America, Koreans generally considered China as a big brother they should follow and Japan as a young brother they should take care of.

In contrast, Chinese people traditionally considered themselves as chosen nationals. According to their worldview, China was the center of the world as well as the center of the universe. One can remember that China calls itself as the Middle Kingdom to this day. Naturally, the people living in the center of world should consider themselves superior to those in neighboring nations. Historically, they called people of surrounding nations as barbarians. In referring to neighbors, they designated the nationals surrounding their center by directional names, for example, Eastern barbarians, Western barbarians, Southern barbarians, and Northern barbarians. They characterized Koreans under the category of Eastern barbarians. In their written records, Chinese discussed Korean history under the category of the history of the East barbarian tribes.

Koreans loyally accepted Chinese nationalistic views and hierarchically located themselves beneath China's higher level. Koreans accepted Neo-Confucianism as a state ideology during the Joseon Dynasty along with the classification that China was a greater nation. With this came the notion that Korea was a smaller replica of the greater China and naturally located Japan in a lower position than Korea. Most Koreans placed themselves in the middle between China and Japan except a few Korean nationalists in the pre-modern period who rejected the China-centric worldview. Even though Koreans had their own independent nation in the Joseon Dynasty, they did not have a strong idea to be independent ideologically and spiritually, but relied on the worldview of the larger nation, China. They subordinated themselves to the greater Chinese. Although contemporary Koreans do not like to accept the shameful fact, they had done so.

Even when modernized European and North American countries expanded their influences to China, Chinese considered them to be inferior nations based on their traditional worldviews. The military weapons of foreign imperial nations were much stronger than Chinese traditional armaments and China and other Asian nations were easily defeated and colonized. The Chinese, who regarded themselves as superior to any other nationals, were very seriously shocked by the advantage of scientific technology and modernized weapons of the Western "barbarian" nations compared to their own. They had a sentimental difficulty in admitting the superiority of the Western science and technology.



Even so, they should accept the higher technology and civilizations from Western nations and should modernize their nation.

Meanwhile, Japan had eagerly accepted higher technology, science, and culture from the West, successfully modernizing itself. Even though Japan was a nation less developed than Korea and China during medieval times, the younger brother had defeated the elder and gone on to beat Russia. Afterwards, some Korean intellectuals argued their country should accept the harsh reality of modernity and follow the model of Japan.

Korean nationalists considered those who promoted modernization to be also advocating Japanese imperialism. They disliked the international change around them and maintained anti-Japanese and anti-Western sentiments. While they appear to be patriots, they can hardly be seen as realists. This was their dilemma. Nationalists emphasized the need for protection of the nation and were considered conservatives. Modernists called for globalization and modernization and so appeared to support the imperialists.

While radical nationalists asked the people to close Korea's doors to stronger foreign powers, radical modernists pushed to open the nation to technological advancement from industrialized nations. Radical nationalists categorized the modernists as unpatriotic. Radical modernists complained that the nationalists were being unrealistic. Modernists called themselves globalists while nationalists saw themselves as patriots. Moderate nationalists and moderate modernists wanted to balance two opposing issues: globalism and protectionism. While both groups of moderates sought globalization and modernization, they also hoped to preserve their nation's culture and traditions.

Some Buddhist leaders reacted drastically to modernization and preservation due to the perceived intrusion of foreign religious traditions such as Catholicism, Protestantism and various forms of Japanese Buddhism. Theoretically, we can view the radical group as having had two polar antagonistic sub-groups, the radical modernists and the radical nationalists. Some moderately reacted upon the issues while others tried to balance them. Likewise, the moderate group also might be seen as two sub-groups, moderate modernists and moderate nationalists.

Even though it seemed the lives of Buddhists could not remain free of politics, Buddhism could not be a political organization. Some Buddhists, such as Seon (Chn., Chan; Jpn., Zen) and Pure Land practitioners, ignored such social issues as modernization, preservation, independence, imperialism, human rights, environmentalism and peace. Instead, they dedicated themselves to religious objectives such as enlightenment and soteriology, to cultivating the mind and obtaining Buddhahood.

After opening its country's border to Japan in 1876, China and Japan fought for control of Korea in the First Sino-Japanese War, August 1, 1894 to April 17, 1895. To the shock of the Korean people, Japan defeated China and removed its influence from the Peninsula. This was the symbolic beginning of the rise of

Japan as the major technological and economic power in East Asia and the decline of China, which had been in that role for so long.

A number of religion-based military incidents led up to this surprising development and continued afterwards. On January 10, 1894, Jeon Bongjun (1855-1895), a military leader of farmer soldiers, rebelled against the government with the members of a new religion called Eastern Learning (Donghak). In 1905, the religion changed its name to the Religion of the Heavenly Way (Cheondo). With beliefs rooted in Korean shamanism, Daoism and Korean Buddhism, members organized to rid Korea of the Japanese political and military influence. They hoped to abolish the social hierarchy and build an egalitarian and peaceful society in Korea. Executing government officials, the group experienced limited success by occupying some areas and ruling there based on its ideals.

In 1860, Choe Je-u (1824-1864), a Confucian scholar, syncretized the three major traditional religions of East Asia, Buddhism, Confucianism and Daoism, establishing a nationalist religion against the encroachment of Catholicism. He argued that every human was God, that God and humans should be considered equal.<sup>1</sup> The religion vigorously opposed to feudalism and the social hierarchy. Based on egalitarian principles, it developed strong antagonisms against foreign nations and religions that were based on nationalism. Accordingly, it opposed Japan as an imperialist nation.

Because rebel armies became so strong, the government could not put down their forces. In desperation, they requested the Chinese government to dispatch its military on April 28, 1894. When China complied on May 5 - 7, 1894, Japan also dispatched its military on May 9, leading to the First Sino-Japanese War. Eventually, Japan, which Koreans had regarded as a younger brother, defeated China, which Koreans consider an elder brother. This was an unthinkable transgression in Confucian eyes.

In February 1904, one year before the establishment of the Japanese puppet government in Korea, a hard example of those methods came with the beginning of the Russo-Japanese War. The war ended in May of the next year with the defeat of Russia. Russia was considered by the world one of its strongest powers. Its defeat by an Asian country, which also removed Russia's influence from the Korean Peninsula, was astonishing. Some began to hope Japan might be able to save their countries from Western imperialism that was sweeping Asia with uneven trade agreements.

However, following the Western model, on November 17, 1905, Japan forced Korea into an international treaty. The treaty required Korea to forfeit its rights in foreign affairs to Japan and to become a protectorate state of Japan. Japan created the office of Residency-General Korea and ruled the Peninsula for

---

<sup>1</sup> This concept of God (Haneullim, "Lord of Heaven") was taken from Korean shamanism.

several decades. On December 20, Itō Hirofumi (1841-1909), who led the signing of the unequal treaty, became the first Resident-General in Korea.

At the time, conservative Koreans were preserving the tradition of wearing topknots and not cutting their hair. On November 15, 1895, King Gojong (r. 1863-1907) cut his topknot and shaved his hair, encouraging the populace to do the same. Korean Confucians traditionally believed that because people inherit their bodies, hair, skin, and other physical parts from their parents, they should not harm them in any way. Koreans did not generally accept the government's insistence that this was a part of modernization, but saw it as an attempt to destroy their Confucian ethics. Regarding this as Japanese cultural encroachment, Koreans resisted, developing anti-Japanese sentiments and leading demonstrations based on nationalism and Neo-Confucianism.

The Japanese Government-General approved the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples (Sachal-ryeong) on May 29, 1911 and promulgated it on June 3, 1911 after Japan's official annexation on August 29, 1910. It announced its enforcement ordinance on July 8 and enforced the ordinance and its enforcement ordinance from September 1, 1911. The enforcement ordinance established the parish system of Korean Buddhism and stipulated the hierarchical relations between 30 parish head temples and their respective branch temples. The Japanese Governor-General was empowered to approve the abbot of each parish head temple and the local governor the abbots of its branch temples. So, the government bureaucratized Korean Buddhism through the parish system and was officially and administratively able to control Korean Buddhism and its temples.

In one hand, Korean progressive activists reacted against Japanese control of Korean Buddhist temples and properties and began to demand that the Japan's Governor-General Office should abolish the ordinance and the parish system in the early 1920's, this is, just since the massive March 1<sup>st</sup>, 1919 movement for independence from Japan. However, they were unsuccessful in nullifying the ordinance because pro-Japanese abbots and Japan's colonial government crushed the movement. On the other hand, Korean Seon practitioners, the majority of whom were celibate monks, founded the Center for Seon Studies (Seonhak-won) in 1920, just after the March First movement, and directly and/or indirectly tried to recover Korean Buddhism's celibate tradition and other conventions of Korean Seon Buddhism.

Some elite Korean monks went to and studied Buddhism and other disciplines at various universities in Japan. When they became married before and after coming back to their nation of Korea, they needed to secure the good and stable positions in their temples and support their families. They were able to change the articles and bylaws of each parish head temple which prohibited married monks from becoming abbots with the support of the Japanese government and established monks and obtained the approval of their revised regulations from the Japanese Government-General in mid 1920's. They adopted married monasticism and non-vegetarianism from Japanese Buddhism

through the revision of the regulations of each parish head temple and popularized and made official the tradition in Korean Buddhism since then.

After the liberation from Japan in 1945, celibate monks initiated a sectarian movement for themselves they called the Purification Buddhist Movement in 1954, discontinued its sectarian momentum in 1962, and institutionally accomplished it in 1970. They adopted orthopraxy (precepts) from the *Brahma Net Sūtra* and applied celibate monasticism and vegetarianism in the movement. So, they completely recovered the celibate monastic and vegetarian tradition from Korean Buddhism Japanized during the Japanese occupation period, 1910-1945. So, I discussed how and why Korean Buddhists reacted to Japanese Buddhism and generally became Japanized during the Japanese colonial rule and detailed the historical background for the movement in this part.

## 1. The establishment of Imje Seon Sect

On August 28, 1910, Japan officially annexed Korea. On October 1, it established the office of the Japanese Government-General and appointed the military general Terauchi Masatake (1852-1919) as governor-general. Before and after the annexation, Koreans protested against Japanese imperialism. The Japanese colonialists enlisted pro-Japanese Korean intellectuals, politicians, journalists, and others in their cause and came to occupy the Korean Peninsula. Korean intellectuals can be categorized into two groups, those opposed to Japanese imperialism and those supportive of it. These groups fought serious confrontations. Supporters of Japanese imperialism were given good jobs and received other benefits because of their position. Those who protested against Japanese imperialism found that they could no longer live in their own country. Some exiled themselves to foreign nations, particularly Russia and China, to escape oppression.

A Korean civilian militia also fought against the Japanese military for national sovereignty. 16,700 Korean civilian soldiers are said to have died and another 36,770 were wounded between 1907 and 1909.<sup>2</sup> After Korea became a Japanese colony in 1910, the activities of the Korean civilian militia decreased.

In 1911, the Japanese Governor-General Office established the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples, effectively colonizing Korean Buddhism. The ordinance heavily influenced modern Korean Buddhism during its occupation period (1910-1945) and continued to do so to the present. In complete acquiescence to the ordinance, the Korean government passed the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties in 1962 and controlled all of Korean Buddhist Temples under the hands of its dictator, Bak Jeonghui (1917-1979). Because progressive Buddhist activists protested against the undemocratic law under the name of Minjung (Liberation) Buddhist Movement, the government

---

<sup>2</sup> I Manyeol, ed., *Hanguk-sa nyeonpyo* (A Chronological Table of Korean History) (Seoul: Yeongmin-sa, 1985), 194.

substituted it with the Law of the Preservation of Traditional Temples in 1987. Even though the scope of the government's control was reduced from all Buddhist temples to the traditional temples, the current Korean government is still imposing the undemocratic law to manipulate Korean Buddhism by continuously revising it in to appease Korean Buddhist opposition.

Based on the ordinance, the Japanese colonial government organized all of Korean Buddhist temples under its bureaucratic hierarchy and established the system of the thirty parish head temples in which the vertical relations between the head temple and its respective branch temples are strictly regulated. In order to easily rule Korean Buddhism, the Japanese Governor-General Office approved the abbots, in contrast to the Korean Buddhist tradition in which abbots are appointed in accordance with the unanimous recommendations of monastic members. The articles and bylaws of the thirty parish head temples had to be approved by the government. The ordinance also stipulated that all Korean temples must report their temple affairs in detail to the government.

On December 30, 1910, the Government-General further drafted and promulgated the Ordinance of Korean Corporations. This required corporations to obtain government approval for establishment and dissolution. After the implementation of the ordinance, the Government-General controlled the management of corporations. The aim of the ordinance was the suppression of the growth of Korean corporations and the subordination of those corporations as suppliers of raw materials to the Japanese corporations.<sup>3</sup>

In June 1911, the Japanese colonial government made several ordinances, which stipulated the control and management of fishing, travel, forests, overseas study by Korean students, reclamation works, and so on. This expanded the government's control of colonial Koreans in many different ways.<sup>4</sup> For example, people were required to report their travel schedules to government offices.

On August 23, 1911, the government promulgated the Ordinance of Education, which proscribed how Koreans were to be educated to become loyal subjects to the Japanese colonial government. On November 1, it implemented the ordinance. The ordinance also stipulated that the Japanese language was to be at education institutions and popularized among Koreans.<sup>5</sup> The ordinance was to be applied only to colonial Koreans, not to Japanese living in Korea. It aimed at making colonial Koreans professional workers, not leaders, for the colonial government and Japan's economic purpose. Because government approval was required for the establishment of a school, it could legally suppress private schools founded by Korean nationalists. It also made additional detailed enforcement rules based on the ordinance.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, 198.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, 200.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

In early December, October 15, 1910 by the lunar calendar, Bak Hanyeong (1870-1948),<sup>6</sup> Jin Jineung (1873-1941),<sup>7</sup> Gim Jongnae, and others planned to have a massive conference at Jeungsim-sa Temple in Gwangju, South Jeolla Province at which they tried to protest against unequal agreements between I Hoegwang (1862-1933),<sup>8</sup> leader of Won Order of Korean Buddhism, and the leader of Sōtō Zen Sect. The organizers were monastic leaders of the Jeolla and Gyeongsang provinces. Even though they sent fliers to monks across the nation and requested them to attend the conference and oppose the agreements, they could not host the conference because only a few of monks attended. On January 15, 1911, Han Yongun (1879-1944), along with Bak Hanyeong, Jin Jineung, Gim Jongnae, Jang Girim, Song Manam (1876-1957) and Gim Haksan successfully held the national monastic conference at Jeungsim-sa Temple.

On February 11, more than 300 monks attended the first general meeting, established new Imje (Chn., Linji; Jpn., Rinzai) Order at Songgwang-sa Temple in Suncheon, South Jeolla Province and opposed against pro-Japanese monk leader I Hoegwang who tried to subordinate Won Order of Korean Buddhism to Sōtō Zen Sect of Japanese Buddhism. At the time, I Hoegwang was the supreme patriarch of Won Order. They established the provisional headquarters of the new order at Songgwang-sa Temple and strongly fought against the pro-Japanese Won Order. He was elected as the secretary of general affairs and Gim Gyeong-un (1852-1936), a senior leader of Seonam-sa Temple, as its president. However, because Gim Gyeong-un was very old and could not serve the presidency, Han Yongun became the acting president on behalf of Gim Gyeong-un. They named their order as the Imje (Seon) Sect to oppose Japanese Sōtō Zen Sect and wanted to imply in the order title that Korean Seon tradition was totally different from Japanese Sōtō Zen tradition.

On March 16, Han Yongun resigned the secretary of general affairs and became the president. On May 5, he held the second general meeting at Ssanggye-sa Temple on Mt. Jiri in the County of Hadong, South Gyeongsang Province. More than one hundred monks attended the meeting and passed a resolution that they should include to the new order the Beomeo-sa Temple in Busan, South Gyeongsang Province. Beomeo-sa Temple complained that it was not invited to the first general meeting and did not attend the second general meeting.

Han Yongun and its four delegates, Gim Haksan, Jang Girim, Gim Jongnae and Im Manseong, went to the temple and persuaded it to join his order. When they promised that the order should move its headquarters from Songgwang-sa Temple to Beomeo-sa Temple, Beomeo-sa Temple accepted their request and they moved its headquarters to Beomeo-sa Temple.

---

<sup>6</sup> I Jeong, ed., *Hanguk bulgyo inmyeong sajeon* (Dictionary of Korean Buddhist Names) (Seoul: Bulgyo sidae-sa, 1991), 268-269.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, 50.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, 123-124.

To spread the spirit of Imje Seon Sect and to strengthen the power of the order, Han Yongun established the order's propagation centers in Wonsan, Busan, Daegu, Seoul and Jeonju. Representatives of Gwiam-sa Temple, Baegyang-sa Temple and their neighboring temples in South and North Jeolla Provinces planned to establish a propagation center of the Imje Seon Sect in Jeolla Provinces.<sup>9</sup> When they met and celebrated the Buddha's birthday in 1912 at Baegyang-sa Temple in the County of Jangseong, South Jeolla Province, they fundraised 1,000 won in gold from Baek Yonggyu of Gwiam-sa Temple in the County of Geumsan, North Jeolla Province and 200 won in gold from Song Jinseop of Bulam-sa Temple of the County of Yeonggwang, South Jeolla Province and decided to make its propagation center in the Jeolla area. Gim Jongnae successfully propagated Buddhism at the center located in the County of Jeonju, North Jeolla Province.<sup>10</sup> Gim Ryunha, Eom Gubong, Gang Cheongwol, and other monks in Seogwang-sa Temple, one of the parish head temples of Imje Seon Sect, bought a house in Wonsan with 800 won in gold and had an inauguration ceremony of its propagation center on May 1, 1912 of the lunar calendar.<sup>11</sup>

In October, Han Yongun traveled to Manchuria. After coming returning, from November 1911 he tried to establish the Central Propagation Center in Seoul, which later played important roles in the development of modern Korean Buddhism. He raised funds from Beomeo-sa, Hwaecom-sa, Tongdo-sa, Baegyang-sa, Cheoneun-sa, Guam-sa, Yongheung-sa, Gwaneum-sa, and other temples. Of 4,000 yen that he fundraised from temples, he spent 3,000 yen and constructed the center at Insa-dong in downtown Seoul. On April 10, 1912, he finished the construction and on May 26. Two days later, just after the Buddha's birthday, he held the inauguration ceremony. Baek Yongseong (1864-1940) was appointed as its director. Afterwards, he stayed with Baek Yongseong for three years at the center and had cooperated with each other to transmit Buddhism in downtown Seoul.

According to the May 26 and 28, 1913 issues of the daily newspaper *Maeil sinbo*,<sup>12</sup> Han Yongun successfully hosted the inauguration ceremony on May 26 at three o'clock in the afternoon. The children music band of Hodong School attended the ceremony and presented congratulatory songs, Han Yongun explained the purposes of the establishment. Baek Yongseong preached a sermon and two lay leaders, Jeong Unbok and I Neunghwa (1869-1945), offered complimentary speeches. More than 800 lay Buddhists registered as members and more than 1300 people observed.

Notably, I Neunghwa, an eminent scholar in Buddhism, gave a speech and argued as follows:<sup>13</sup> "Korean religion is Dan-gun Religion, and Korean

<sup>9</sup> See the April 23, 1922 issue of *Maeil sinbo*, S.1.1.313.

<sup>10</sup> See the December 4, 1912 issue of *Maeil sinbo*, S.1.1.323.

<sup>11</sup> See the June 5, 1912 issue of *Maeil sinbo*, S.1.1.316.

<sup>12</sup> See the May 26 and 28, 1912 articles of the *Maeil sinbo*, S.1.1.315.

<sup>13</sup> See the May 30, 1912 issue of the *Maeil sinbo*, S.1.1.316.

Buddhists have respected Dan-gun (the mythological founder of the nation Korea) since its introduction to Korea until to now. Dan-gun Religion describes that, according to the *Huayan Sūtra* and the *Lotus Sūtra*, when Śākyamuni Buddha passed away and ascended to a heaven, Dan-gun assembled a myriad of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas and expounded the human evils and goods at the Trāyastriṃśa Heaven, the second heaven of the desire realm. Therefore, if we respect and believe in Buddhism, the belief in Buddhism is identical to the belief in Dan-gun Religion.” I Neunghwa’s arguments are rather based on mythological stories and nationalist views. In the Japanese occupation period, I Neunghwa seemed to unite indirectly and intentionally Korean Buddhists under nationalism by connecting Buddhism with a myth of their nation’s foundation.

The Japanese colonial government arrested Han Yongun, charging him that he fundraised 4,000 yen without having approvals from the government. On June 21, 1912, the court ruled that he should pay a fine of 30 yen and that if he could not pay it, he should have a labor service for the government for 20 days.

On June 21, 1912, the Japanese colonial government decided that both sides, the pro-Japanese Won Order and the nationalist Imje Seon Sect, should not use the order names respectively. On June 17, a few days prior to the date, abbots of the parish head temples, belonging to the Won Order, had a meeting at which they passed a resolution that they would have their activities based on the directions that the Japanese government allowed. They decided to adopt as the order’s official name the strange order name “Korean Buddhist Order of Seon Sect and Doctrinal Sect” which the Japanese colonial government prescribed in the “Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples,” proclaimed by the Japanese Governor-General Office on June 3, 1911.

He could not use the title of Imje Seon Sect. Instead, he used Korean Seon Order. They changed the propagation center’s title to Korean Seon Order’s Central Propagation Center. Because of the strong intervention from the Japanese occupation government, they could not use the title of Imje Seon Sect.

To clarify the context of the conflict, an outline the historical background of the Won Order of Korean Buddhism is given as follows. On March 6, 1908, fifty-two monastic representatives from 13 provinces across the nation met at Wonheung-sa Temple in Seoul and established the first modern order named Won Order and its central headquarters. I Hoegwang became its order’s supreme patriarch.

In July 1908, the headquarters of the order appointed Takeda Hanshi (1863-1911), a Japanese Sōtō Zen priest and nationalist activist, as its chief advisor. On July 27, 54 monk delegates from 13 provinces, the main representative of which was I Hoegwang, submitted a petition to the prime minister and the secretary of internal affairs of Korean puppet government in which he petitioned the government to allow its order to establish its central headquarters in Seoul, but they could not get approval from the government. After Takeda Hanshi became the chief manager of Sōtō Zen Sect in Korea on July 30, Takeda Hanshi



submitted a letter and urged the Japanese Resident-General to approve the order based on the July 27, 1908 petition on September 20.

Immediately after Japan's annexation of Korea, I Hoegwang, patriarch of the Won Order of Korean Buddhism, the first modern united Korean Buddhist order, signed in Tōkyō a seven-article agreement between him and Hirotsu Setsusan, the representative of the Japanese Sōtō Zen Sect on October 6, 1910. The seven articles subordinated all of Korean Buddhism to a Japanese sect, Sōtō Zen Buddhism. The articles are as follows:

1. The Won Order (of Korean Buddhism) should completely and eternally unite with the Japanese Sōtō Zen Sect and propagate Buddhism.
2. The central headquarters of Korean Buddhism's Won Order should request the Japanese Sōtō Zen Sect to appoint its supervisor.
3. The Japanese Sōtō Zen Sect should assist the Korean Buddhist Won Order in obtaining official recognition from the government.
4. The Korean Buddhist Won Order should provide its facilities for the Japanese Sōtō Zen Sect to propagate Buddhism.
5. The Korean Buddhist Won Order should invite several missionaries from the central administrative office of the Japanese Sōtō Zen Sect, assign them to each large temple, and cause each of them to propagate Buddhism and educate young Buddhist monks in each temple. When the central administration of the Japanese Sōtō Zen Sect dispatches its missionaries, the Won Order should provide housing and make arrangements for them to propagate Buddhism and to educate young Buddhist monks at each temple.
6. If any party does not agree with the above five agreements, they can nullify or revise them at any time.
7. The agreements will become effective upon receiving approval from each party.<sup>14</sup>

Bak Hanyeong, Han Yongun, O Seongwol (1866-1943),<sup>15</sup> Gim Jongnae, and other patriotic monks mostly in South Gyeongsang Province and South Jeolla Province protested against the agreements and launched a new independent order called the Imje Order. The Imje Order advocated the Seon meditative tradition of Korean Buddhism. Unlike the sectarian convention of Japanese Buddhism, even though Korean Seon Buddhism loyally transmitted the Dharma lineage of China's Linji Sect, it has remained essentially ecumenical in the tradition of Korean Buddhism.<sup>16</sup>

A Korean Buddhist monastic complex generally has four major centers: a seminary, a vinaya center, a Pure Land center and a Seon center. Korean Buddhists practice Chan (Seon), Pure Land, vinaya, and academic study based

<sup>14</sup> I Neunghwa, I Byeongdo, trans., *Joseon bulgyo tongsa: Geundae pyeon* (The History of Korean Buddhism: The Part of Modern Period) (Seoul: Hyeon, 2003), 82-83.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, 145-146.

<sup>16</sup> Chanju Mun, "Introduction," *The History of Doctrinal Classification in Chinese Buddhism: A Study of the Panjiao Systems* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2006), xvii-xxxiii.

on their own preference in the ecumenical fashion. Even so, they used the title “Imje Seon Sect” because of strong anti-Japanese sentiment, to mark the difference between Japanese Buddhism and traditional Korean Buddhism. They may have considered the fact that Korean Buddhism is the descendent of the Linji Sect and is different from the Sōtō Zen Sect (Chn., Caodong; Kor., Jodong), to which I Hoegwang tried to subordinate Korean Buddhism.

When the government ordered Korean Buddhists not to use the title of Imje Seon Sect but to use “Korean Buddhist Order of Seon Sect and Doctrinal Sect,” the official title of Korean Buddhism prescribed in the “Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples,” Baek Yongseong harshly criticized the official title. He argued that even though Korean Buddhism had traditionally been transmitting Imje Seon, ignorant Korean Buddhists lost their own spirit by following the strange title. He likened it to a person with two heads<sup>17</sup> and argued that Korean Buddhism should be Imje Seon Buddhism.<sup>18</sup> He protested against the Japanese colonial government’s policies on Buddhism from the perspective of Imje Seon sectarianism in *Byeonjong-non* (Essays on the Meaning of Sect) as follows:

Even though many rivers compete with each other to run into a great ocean, the blue ocean became the head of them. (Here, Baek Yongseong likened the head to mean the sect.) Even though there are so many mountain peaks, Mt. Sumeru is the head of them. Although there are the sun, the moon, and stars in sky, the sun is the head of them. Even though there are numberless citizens, an emperor is the head of them. Although there are sages like the number of dusts and sands, the Buddha is the head of them. Even though there are numberless teachings across the unlimited number, the special transmission outside the orthodox teaching is the head of them.

The Buddha received the teaching from Patriarch Jin-gwi<sup>19</sup> and transmitted his teaching to his disciple Mahākāśyapa at three locations.<sup>20</sup> China

---

<sup>17</sup> Ha Dongsan, ed., (Seok) Dongbong, trans., *Yongseong keun seunim eorok: Pyeongsangsim i do ra ireuji malla* (Grand Master Baek Yongseong’s Analects) (Seoul: Bulgwang chulpan-bu, 1993), 455-464.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> Only Korean Buddhism has the assertion that the Buddha received Dharma transmission from Patriarch Jin-gwi. The unique assertion appeared in the first in *Seonmun bojang-nok* (Record of the Treasure Storehouse to Seon Gate) in three fascicles by National Master Jinjeong Cheonchaek (b. 1206) of Goryeo Dynasty. Jinjeong Cheonchaek describes in it that Beomil (810-889) stated that the Buddha inherited the Dharma lineage from Patriarch Jin-gwi. Beomil studied Seon under Yanguan Zhaian, a disciple of Mazu Daoyi (707-786), transmitted the Dharma lineage from China, and established his own mountain lineage on Mt. Sagul in Korea. X.64.1276.807c5-6.

<sup>20</sup> At the first transmission location, when a host of disciples assembled to hear the teaching from the Buddha, the Buddha lifted a flower to show his teaching without speaking at Vulture Peak Mountain (Skt., Gr̥dharakūṭa). Only his eminent disciple Kāśyapa comprehended the profound meaning and smiled. So, he was considered the first Indian patriarch in the lineage of Dharmic transmission in Chan Buddhism. At the second location, the Buddha shared his seat with his disciple Mahākāśyapa in front of

transmitted the teaching from Bodhidharma (c. 470-543), the 28<sup>th</sup> Dharma successor from the Buddha. Bodhidharma became the first Dharma holder in China and transmitted the teaching to Huineng (638-713), the 6<sup>th</sup> Dharma successor (in Chinese Chan Buddhism).

From Huineng, five families and (seven sects) originated. Even though we call them the masters, belonged to the lineages, of Chan Sect who enjoyed writing the literary pieces and were versed in Buddhist scriptures, discipline codes and treatises, I have never heard the word “Doctrinal Sect.”

Ignorant Seon practitioners in modern times lost the original spirit of their lineage, and arbitrarily called their tradition the Korean Buddhist Order of Seon Sect and Doctrinal Sect. The title can be figured metaphorically to a two-headed person. The Dharmic descendants of Linji Sect call themselves the followers of Linji Sect. The Dharmic descendants of Caodong Sect call themselves the followers of Caodong Sect. The Dharmic descendants of Yunmen Sect consider themselves the followers of Yunmen Sect. The Dharmic descendants of Weiyang Sect consider themselves the followers of Weiyang Sect. The Dharmic descendants of Fayen Sect consider themselves the followers of Fayen Sect. Even though the eminent monks of Seon Sect knew three baskets, scriptures, discipline codes and treatises very well, they founded their Seon sectarian positions based on their own special interests.

Because Korean Buddhism has only one tradition, Imje Sect that has been inheriting from the beginning of Seon Buddhism, we do not need to explain other sects. If an intellectual person hears the awkward title “Korean Buddhist Order of Seon Sect and Doctrinal Sect,” he will laugh at it.

Someone asked me, “Korean Seon Order originated from Taego (1301-1382), active in the late period of the Goryeo Dynasty (918-1392). He inherited to Korea Chinese Linji Chan Sect from his master Chinese Chan Master Shiwu Qinggong (1272-1352) and became the first Dharmic master of Imje Seon Buddhism in Korea. Like the title of Linji Sect originated from the name of its sect founder Linji Yixuan (d. 866), I think that it will be ok for us to call Korean Buddhism as Taego Sect. And because (Cheongheo) Hyujeong (1520-1604), (generally known as Master Seosan), active in mid Joseon Dynasty popularized Korean Seon Buddhism, I also think that it will be okay for us to call Korean Buddhism as Cheongheo Sect. Why should we call Korean Buddhism only the Imje Sect?”

I answered his question as follows: “I do not think so. Because the Dharmic descendants of Linji did not make discipline codes and praxis methods separate from the ones of the Linji Sect but followed the Linji Sect’s discipline codes and praxis methods, they did not need to establish another independent sect. Linji Sect established three mysteries,<sup>21</sup> three points,<sup>22</sup> four

---

Bahuputraka Pagoda in Vaiśālī. At the third location, the Buddha lifted a leg from the coffin under twin Sara trees in Kuśinagara.

<sup>21</sup> Three mysteries are the mystery of the mysteries, the mystery revealed through language, and the mystery manifested through experience.

<sup>22</sup> Each mystery has three main points, essence, forms and functions. There are nine points in all.

interpretations between subject and objects,<sup>23</sup> four relations between masters and disciples,<sup>24</sup> and four shouts<sup>25</sup> and summarized all Seon sects. Caodong Sect established five relations between phenomena and noumenon,<sup>26</sup> Yunmen Sect three phrases<sup>27</sup> and Fayan Sect the mind-only. Because they transmitted Dharma only from mind to mind, they did not need intellectual theories. Even though people use rafters, pillars, bricks, gravels, purlines, doorframes, and so on in constructing a building, the main material of and the most important in the building is a crossbeam. Even though there are limitless Buddhist teachings, the most important is only the mind. Therefore, we should directly point to the mind, see the (Buddha) nature, and finally become a Buddha.”

Someone asked me, “Hyujeong, generally known as Master Seosan, says, “Seon Sect contains the Buddha’s mind and Doctrinal Sect the Buddha’s teachings.” Even Master Seosan established two sects, the Seon Sect and Doctrinal Sect. How can you negate Korean Buddhist Order of Seon Sect and Doctrinal Sect?”

I answered his questions as follows: “As I told you before, because all masters of Seon Buddhism have studied all Buddhist texts, they have been versed in three canons of Buddhism, i.e., scriptures, discipline codes and treatises. Even so, because they prioritize Seon over Buddhist doctrines, we call them the Seon masters. If some prioritize Huayan (Kor., Hwaeom; Jpn., Kegon) Buddhism, we call them the masters of Huayan Sect. If some prioritize the Lotus teaching, we call them the masters of Tiantai Sect. Many sects are based on scriptures and do not investigate even in for instant the mind, unlike the Seon Sect which was transmitted independent of orthodox teachings.

---

<sup>23</sup> Four interpretations are (1) the interpretation that negates subject, not object, (2) the interpretation that negates object, not subject, (3) the interpretation that negates subject and object, and (4) the interpretation that does not negate object and subject.

<sup>24</sup> Four relations between masters and disciples are (1) the relation that the disciple does not understand the master’s teachings, (2) the relation that the disciple understands the master’s teaching, (3) the relation that the master cannot educate the disciple, and (4) the relation that the master can educate the disciple.

<sup>25</sup> Four shouts are (1) the shout that looks like Diamond King’s Treasure Sword, (2) the shout that seems like a lion who draws in his legs, (3) the shout that resembles the fishing net, and (4) the shout that does not work. The Chan Kōan case of four shouts is introduced in *Linji lu* (The Record of Linji Yixuan) (T.47.1985.504a26-29): “The Chan Master Linji Yixuan asked a Chan monk, “(1) A shout is sometimes like the Diamond Kingly Treasure Sword. (2) A shout is sometimes like the Golden Haired Lion who Draws his Legs. (3) A shout is sometimes like the Reflected Grass under a Loft Pole. (4) A shout sometimes does not function. How do you think (the four shouts)?” The Chan monk was tardy to answer the question. The Chan master shouted suddenly.”

<sup>26</sup> Five relations are (1) the phenomena in the noumenon, (2) the noumenon in the phenomena, (3) the appearance in the noumenon, (4) the appearance in the phenomena, and (5) the simultaneous appearance of the phenomena and the noumenon.

<sup>27</sup> The meaning of the Buddha, Dharma and Dao can be summarized in the following three phrases: According to the first phrase, the Buddha is the pure mind; according to the second, Dharma is the bright mind; and according to the third, Dao is the unobstructed light.

If some who are mainly interested in Seon Sect have studied all of Buddhist teachings included in the three canons, scriptures, discipline codes and treatises, we still call them people who belong to the Seon Sect. If the waters of all rivers go through to the great ocean, the different river waters can finally be the same in it. The metaphor can be taken just as we call them the same water in the great ocean.

Have you ever read the *Seongyo-seok* (Interpretations on Seon and Doctrine) by Master Seosan? We can find Master Seosan's fundamental teachings in it. He equally treats and educates the three levels of practitioners, the high level, the middle and the low one, based on their capacities in *Seon-ga gwigam* (The Standard Teaching of Seon Buddhism). Just as we call in society a student as one of a teacher, we can name Korean Seon Sect as Imje Sect because Koreans have inherited the Dharmic lineage from Chinese Chan Master Linji Yixuan. We Koreans should clearly profess that we are the Dharmic descendants of the Linji Sect.<sup>28</sup>

He wrote another article entitled "Yin chongdok-bu mun Joseon jongpa gubyeon-non" (My Answers on the Japanese Governor-General Office's Questions Regarding Korean Buddhist Sects), clearly revealed the unique characteristics of Korean Buddhism and strongly argued against the Japanese Governor-General Office's measures as follows:

Seon Sect is the special transmission outside the orthodox teachings. Patriarch Jin-gwi transmitted the teaching to Śākyamuni Buddha. The Buddha transmitted it to only one master. Only Huineng, the 33<sup>rd</sup> Patriarch from India and the 6<sup>th</sup> Patriarch in China, directly inherited the Buddha's teaching from mind to mind. After Huineng, several offshoots emerged. Before him, we cannot find any offshoot.

Five factions originated from Huineng and inherited their original lineages. Those five factions are Linji Sect, Caodong Sect, Yunmen Sect, Weiyang Sect and Fayen Sect. Their teaching standards are different. If I enlist them, we can summarize them as follows:

For example, Linji Sect set up three mysteries, three points, four interpretations between subject and objects, four relations between masters and disciples, and four shouts. Yunmen Sect established the fundamental teaching of three phrases. Caodong Sect set up five relations between masters and subjects. Weiyang Sect established two phrases, complete essence and complete function. Fayen Sect set up the great illuminating storehouse of the mind-only. Each Seon practitioner, belonged to each Seon sect, has inherited its own tradition, and it has not established its fundamental teachings additionally. Therefore, regardless of China, Korea, and Japan, I have never heard other Seon sects except the aforementioned five Seon sects. Of course, there was the great Chan master Huangbo Xiyun (d. 850). Because he was the master of Linji Yixuan, people did not mention him in particular.

Even Korean Seon masters, Taego and Hyujeong, belong to the Linji Dharmic lineage. Korean monks have conventionally practiced Pure Land

---

<sup>28</sup> Ha Dongsan, ed., 455-461.

Buddhism, recited mantras, read Buddhist texts and done other practices. Even though they lived together, they learned different teachings based on their capacities and interests. For example, while some monks recite the title of Amitābha Buddha, they also chant mantras and read scriptures. While some monks chant mantras, they recite the title of Amitābha Buddha. However, even though Korean Seon practitioners, regardless of any temple and its affiliate Seon centers in Korea, have lived at their Seon center, they have never concurrently practiced multiple praxis forms and have concentrated only on Seon praxis.

Seon practitioners did not share their standard teachings with other practitioners. They inherited their standard teachings from Linji Yixuan from generation to generation. The Seon tradition of Korea is totally different from that of China and Japan. Japanese Governor-General Office has currently prohibited Korean Buddhists from using the title of Imje Sect. However, Korean Seon Buddhists have inherited the fundamental teaching of Linji Sect.<sup>29</sup>

Even though Korean Seon Buddhism has loyally transmitted Chinese Linji Sect's Dharmic lineage, Korean Buddhism is basically ecumenical.<sup>30</sup> As you can easily see in the aforementioned citation, Baek Yongseong selected just the tradition of one Seon center from four centers and generalized Korean Buddhism with that of the Seon center. Even so, he used the title Imje Seon Sect from a strong anti-Japanese sentiment to reveal how unique Korean Buddhism had been. He might consider in his argument that Korean Buddhism that inherits Linji Sect (Jpn., Rinzai; Kor., Imje) is different from Sōtō Zen Sect (Chn., Caodong; Kor., Jodong) to which I Hoegwang tried to subordinate Korean Buddhism.

I Hoegwang came back to Korea after signing the agreements. He visited major temples across thirteen providences on the Korean Peninsula and explained, without showing the agreements, that Korean Buddhism's Won Order had agreements with Japanese Sōtō Zen Sect on an equal level. He asked the temples to authorize the agreement, which they did by signatures. The complete version of agreements was known to the monks of Tongdo-sa Temple in the County of Yangsan, South Gyeongsang Province from a secretary of the central administration headquarters of Korean Buddhism's Won Order.

Han Yongun and other patriotic monks mostly in South Gyeongsang Province and South Jeolla Province protested against the agreements and launched the new independent order named Imje Seon Sect. However, Because of the Japanese Governor-General Office's prohibitions, Korean Buddhists could not use the title of the Imje Seon Sect. Instead, they used the name Korean Seon Order. They also changed the name of the propagation center to Korean Seon Order's Central Propagation Center.

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid, 462-464.

<sup>30</sup> Chanju Mun, "Introduction," in *The History of Doctrinal Classification in Chinese Buddhism: A Study of the Panjiao Systems* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2006), xvii-xxxiii.

## 2. Han Yongun (1879-1944) and married monasticism

Han Yongun<sup>31</sup> was a Buddhist reformer and an activist for the independence movement from Japanese occupation (1910-1945) as well as a very renowned essayist, poet and novelist in Korea. He is generally called Manhae. His original name is Yucheon, his ordination name Bong-wan, his dharma name Yongun, his dharma nickname Manhae. He is a nationalist Korean Buddhist peacemaker. He might represent the progressive Buddhist reformer and the nationalist activist for independence from Japan in modern Korean Buddhism.<sup>32</sup> He suggested Korean Buddhists that they should modernize their Buddhism. He argued that Korean Buddhism should consider even the adoption of married priesthood in Korean Buddhism and that Korean Buddhism should be secularized. He discussed how to make Buddhism survive in the changed social context and suggested Korean Buddhists to revolutionize their religion.

On August 29, 1879, he was born as the second son of Han Eungjun in the County of Hongseong, South Chungcheong Province, Korea. Since 1884, while in his childhood, he studied Confucianism at a traditional village school. In 1892, at the age of 14, he married Jeon Jeongsuk. He endeavored to learn classical Confucian texts. In 1894, at the age of 16, during the Donghak (East Learning) Revolution's period, the government's military force took his parents and brothers to its office and killed them there. In 1896, he became a village school teacher and educated village students. He also participated in the anti-government and pro-revolution army and took a lot of cashes from the government's warehouse in the County of Hongseong to subsidize the military funds.

In 1897, because the anti-government movement failed, he began to wander from here to there. In 1899, he escaped to Oseam Hermitage, Baekdam-sa Temple on Mt. Seorak in Gangwon Province. Later, he planned to travel across the world, came down from Mt. Seorak and went to Vladivostok, a port city on the far Eastern coast of Russia, where he was discriminated against. After coming back to Korea, he moved around the nation without destination. He, thereafter, began to realize the people's difficulties and think about fundamental problems on life.

---

<sup>31</sup> I Jeong, ed., 119-121; Im Hyebong, *Ilje ha bulgyo-gye ui hang-il undong* (Korean Buddhism's Anti-Japanese Movement under Japan's Occupation Period) (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 2001), 125-133; and Woo-sung Huh, "Beyond Manhae (1869-1944) and Seongcheol (1912-1993)," in Chanju Mun, ed., *Buddhism and Peace: Theory and Practice* (Honolulu, Hawaii: Blue Pine, 2006), 407-427.

<sup>32</sup> Robert E. Buswell, Jr., "Geumyok eun sidae chago inga: Ilje gangjeomgi bulgyo sesokhwa e daehan Hanguk ui nonjaeng" (Is Celibacy Anachronic?: Korea's Controversies on Buddhism's Secularization during Japanese Occupation, 1910-1945), in *Bulgyo pyeongnon* (Buddhist Review) 32 (Autumn, 2007): 113-128.

In early 1904, he went back to his home and stayed for several months. On December 21, 1904, his first son Han Boguk was born. Han Boguk actively participated in socialist activities during the Japanese occupation period (1910-1945) and the US military government period (1945-1948). He crossed the border with South Korean political leaders and attended the joint conference between South and North Korean political leaders held in Haeju, Hwanghae Province, North Korea on April 19, 1948. In 1950, the South Korean Government imprisoned Han Boguk and after the civil war broke out on June 25, 1950, he was freed. While in the Korean War, he served as the communist leader of his hometown in the County of Hongseong, and moved to North Korea along with his family. He is said to have had five daughters. He passed away in 1976. Because Han Yongun opposed Communism's anti-religious stance, he disliked that his son became a communist activist.<sup>33</sup>

In mid 1904, Han Yongun went to Baekdam-sa Temple where he became a monk under Gim Yeon-gok. His master got through a Korean monk student from Japan the *Yinghuan zhilue* that Xu Jiyu (1795-1873) had written and published in the Qing Dynasty (1616-1912) in 1848. Xu Jiyu introduced the geography and history of the West in it.

On January 26, 1905, he was ordained by the preceptor Jeon Yeongje. Then he studied major Mahāyāna Buddhist texts such as the *Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna*, the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra*, the *Perfect Enlightenment Sūtra* and others under I Hagam. He seemed to access the *Yinbingshi wenji* (The Collected Works of Liang Qichao, 1873-1929), published in October 1902 and thereafter continuously republished it. Liang Qichao incorporated modern technology and science from the West and suggested to Chinese that they modernize their own cultures and civilizations. Liang Qichao was very interested in social evolutionism.

On November 17, Japan forced Korea to make an international treaty with it in which Korea conceded its rights of foreign affairs to Japan and became a protectorate nation. Japan made its Residency-General Office in Korea and actually ruled Korea. On December 20, Itō Hirofumi became the first Resident-General in Korea. Japan comprehensively began to rule Korea and five years later, completely annexed it in 1910.

In early 1906, being exposed to the new cultures from Xu Jiyu and Liang Qichao, he planned to travel to Siberia and tried to travel across the world to broaden his views. He went to Vladivostok, Russia, by ship from Wonsan, North Hamgyeong Province where several exiled Korean youngsters suspected him as a pro-Japanese monk and tried to kill him. He returned to Korea across the Dumang River and stayed at Seogwang-sa Temple in the County of Anbyeon, South Hamgyeong Province for a while at which he met senior monks Bak Hanyeong and Bak Yuun. He was admitted to the junior program of the first

---

<sup>33</sup> Gim Gwangsik, *Manhae Han Yongun pyeongjeon* (A Critical Biography of Han Yongun), extended version (2004. Seoul: Jangseung, 2007), 249-251.



modern Buddhist mission school named Myeongjin School, current Dongguk University, which progressive Buddhist leaders established in May at Wonheung-sa Temple in downtown Seoul in order to educate young monk students and modernize traditional and conservative Korean Buddhism.

On April 15, 1907, he entered the intensive Seon (Jpn., Zen; Chn., Chan) retreat session for the first time in Mubul Seon Center at Geonbong-sa Temple in Gangwon Province. He transmitted the Dharma lineage from Jeong Manhwa (d. 1918), a spiritual leader of the temple. Around February 1908, he began to study the *Huayan Sūtra* from Seo Wolhwa at Yujeom-sa Temple in Gangwon Province.

In 1908, when Japanese Sōtō Zen delegates visited Mt. Geumgang (Diamond) in Gangwon Province, senior monk Seo Jinha (1861-1926) arranged for him to visit Japan. Seo Jinha was the director of the monastic seminary at Boun-am Hermitage, Singye-sa Temple, a branch temple of Geonbong-sa Temple. He was admitted to Komazawa University that Sōtō Zen Sect founded at which he studied the Japanese language, Buddhist thoughts and Western philosophy. He exchanged his interest with Sōtō Zen monks. While in Japan, he formed a friendship with Choe Rin (1878-1958) and in early October, he came back to Korea. His experience in Japan broadened his view of Buddhism. He had also published twelve classical Chinese poems in the June, July, August and September issues of the official monthly magazine *Wayu* (Harmony) which the *wayu-kai* (Society for Harmony), an association of young Sōtō Zen monks, published.

By incorporating his travel experience to Japan, on December 10, 1908, he established Myeongjin Land Survey Teaching Institute at Wonheung-sa Temple in Seoul and became its director. He toured to lecture on the importance of land survey at various temples. He thought that even though Koreans lost their nation's land to Japan, they should protect their personal and temple properties.<sup>34</sup> He considered that the agricultural lands were very important to modernize Korean national economy in general and the temple properties and economy in particular. The institute had the three-month curriculum and educated students on land survey. In summer 1909, the institute was closed.

On July 30, 1909, he became an instructor in the monastic seminary at Pyohun-sa Temple in Gangwon Province and began to teach Buddhism at there. He modernized the traditional monastic curriculum and introduced modern educational system to the seminary. On October 26, 1909, An Junggeun (1879-1910) shot Itō Hirofumi at Harbin Station in Manchuria. Upon listening to the news, he wrote a poem and considered what he should do to modernize Korea in general and Korean Buddhism in particular and to be independent from the Japanese occupation.

In March 1910, he submitted a controversial memorandum to Gim Yunsik (1835-1922), the president of the Japanese puppet government's Consultative

---

<sup>34</sup> An Byeongjik, ed., *Han Yongun* (Seoul: Hangil-sa, 1979), 300.

Committee in which he suggested monks to decide whether they should marry or not. His suggestions on the introduction of married monastic system to traditional celibate monasticism in Korean Buddhism were very revolutionary. In April, I Min-u also presented a memorandum and requested the government to allow monks to marry. We can introduce Han Yongun's complete version of memorandum as follows:

I respectively believe that in the affairs of the human realm, there is nothing better than change and nothing worse than the absence of change. If they had been confined to fixed boundaries and did not know how to change, the people who inhabit the space between Heaven and Earth now would hardly be seen today. Heaven and Earth are good at changing, and that is how the myriad things emerge. The myriad things are also good at changing. They generate and generate new things endlessly. This endless generation, in combination with the proclivity towards change, means that the mysterious ways of evolution prosper daily. If we were to attempt to count the number of changes, we would not be able to complete this task, even with the best abacus and a span of one hundred years. Such a high ratio of changing things to unchanging things is the reason why the people of the world treasure change. Sometimes they change one thousand year-old designs, sometimes they change opinions that have been held for a generation. Sometimes days- or months-old things are changed. Even though the age of the things changed may differ, the fact that the stage of evolution has been reached remains same. Change is thus the absolute teaching of evolution. How can the things not change?

Is there any limit today to the things, which should be changed? I am going to present my suggestion about just one thing that I have a close personal relation to, and I hope to be fortunate enough to get a hearing. Investigation reveals that the monastic prohibition against marriage and procreation has been an unchanging rule for thousands of years (in Buddhism). How can the people be so stubborn? As this matter has no insignificant bearing upon issues of national policy, it cannot be simply left to the monks to decide for themselves. It is not possible to reduce all the great problems of today's world to a single problem, but if we pinpoint the foremost of them, it is the problem of increasing a country's population. I guess that the present number of monks and nuns in the country is approximately five to six thousands, and it remains unknown how much this number will increase in the future. If they are left under the existing system, without any critical reflection upon it, it will cause a great deal of problems for plans to boost our population. Anybody with above average intellectual capacity would rightly agonize over this issue morning and night. So why, in spite of this, has there still been no attempt to reform (the celibate monastic system)?

Buddhism is a great and harmonious teaching that does not prohibit anything. It simply introduced its ordinance as skillful means, out of concern for those sentient beings that have a low degree of Karmic capacity. But those people who do not understand this erroneously take them as unchanging 'golden rules'. They feel themselves overwhelmed by these rules and are unable to take a single step forward. In the past, Buddhism's influence upon

sentient beings was too weak and remote and for thousands of years no monk ever dared to say a word on this issue! How pitiful they were!

If we will be satisfied to see Buddhism disappear from this world, no action is required. But if not, wouldn't allowing monks and nuns to marry, bear children, extend the sphere of their influence and plant their flag in the arena of inter-religious competition be a great way to preserve the Buddhist religion? If the prohibition upon marriages is removed, it will be helpful in the public sphere by increasing the population, and useful in the private realm by preserving the religion. It will incur no damage. So why should we avoid implementing this measure? This prohibition has, from the very beginning, had nothing to do with the laws of the state, so there is no difficulty either in keeping or abolishing it. It is just a thousand year-old custom, which is being discussed in hundreds of ways, with mutual misgivings on all sides, because it is difficult to reform it overnight. There was once an intention to carry out such a reform, but some years have passed and it has not been done yet. The sun is setting now, the road left to travel is still long, and as I feel that no more delay is acceptable I dare to present my foolish remarks. I would consider myself fortunate if you were to give this matter some consideration. Of course, if these words will be of no help to today's development, you do not necessarily have to adopt my idea. But if there is something, however small, worth adopting here, it would be nice if it could be presented for governmental deliberation and then promulgated as a law giving the monks the freedom to choose whether to marry or not. If you were able to remove the obstacles to development in such a way, it would be extraordinarily beneficial both for the public good and private individuals.<sup>35</sup>

Even though Han Yongun tried to reform Korean Buddhism through the government, he did not get any measures on it, even any reply from the government. In June 1910, he returned to his residential temple named Baekdam-sa Temple on Mt. Seorak in Gangwon Province. He began to write the famous book entitled *Joseon bulgyo yusinnon* (Essays on the Restoration of Korean Buddhism) and suggested in it how Korean Buddhists should revolutionize Korean Buddhism. He also included the above memorandum in it.<sup>36</sup> After finishing the first draft of the book, he went to Pyohun-sa Temple on Mt. Geumgang in Gangwon Province. While in Pyohun-sa Temple, he got news regarding his home nation Korea's annexation to Japan on August 29, 1910.

In September 1910, he again submitted a memorandum to the Japanese Resident-General Terauchi Masatake in which he argued that the government should let monks choose whether they would marry or not. In the two memoranda, he argued that Korean Buddhism should adopt married priesthood and with the system, it could be secularized more easily and effectively than

---

<sup>35</sup> Ha Yongun, *Joseon bulgyo yusinnon* (Essays on the Restoration of Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Bulgyo seogwan, 1913), 63-65 and Vladimir Tikhonov and Owen Miller, trans., *Selected Writings of Han Yongun: From Social Darwinism to Socialism with a Buddhist Face* (London: Global Oriental, 2008), 111-113.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

traditional celibate monasticism. However, he relied on the Japanese government to implement his reformative suggestions. In two months, August and September, he toured to deliver lectures at temples in Jeolla Provinces, educated monks to revolutionize and popularize Buddhism and emphasized the importance of education to them. We can see the complete version of his second memorandum in *Essays on the Restoration of Korean Buddhism* as follows:

I respectfully suggest that, although the prohibition on marriage for monastics has been recognized as a Buddhist regulation for a long time, it does not conform to the realities of today, when revitalizing changes are taking place in all spheres. If the monastics continue to be prohibited from marrying and we do not remove this ban, it will be highly damaging for the policy of population growth, for the physiological aspect of life as defined by ethics, and for missionary efforts in the realm of religion. This point could be made by anybody so I do not think I have to go into the details, but I still believe the main argument has to be reiterated. When we consider Buddhism's doctrines, they represent such a profound, broad truth that marriage or its prohibition can hardly damage or benefit them. The Buddha wished simply that sentient beings would cast off their delusions and strive for enlightenment, reform the evil and do good things. However, since everyone's level of Karmic capacity is different, it is impossible to lead all people along one and the same way. That is why the Buddha had no choice but to preach about eliminating affections and cutting off desires in this world. But he also wished to assist in leading everybody on the path towards enlightenment in accordance with each person's likings and inclinations. Thus, the Buddhist regulation prohibiting marriages is a simple skillful means and nothing more. It is far from being Buddhism's ultimate truth. If this ban were to be removed, what harm would it do?

Moreover, the mutual desire between men and women is something shared by both the wise and the stupid. If a person is prohibited from marrying for life, it will produce evils, and these evils will constantly multiply. In reality, the Korean monks already know that it would be preferable to remove this ban. It is just difficult to reform overnight a custom that has been around for millennia, and the monks, their hearts full of fear and misgivings, are wasting years in hesitation. Out of the desire to have this ban removed by way of a royal decree, I have already memorialized (Gim Yunsik, president of) the former Consultative Committee on this matter in the third month of this year (1910). But no measures have been taken so far, and the fear and misgivings of the monks are only deepening. The numbers of them returning to the lay life are increasing daily and their missionary work is becoming increasingly atrophied. Why should we not remove the ban on marriages as soon as possible and in this way protect the Buddhist faith? If a large number of monks were allowed to change their ways, marry, and give birth to children, would it not have a great influence on politics, morals, and religion? Those are the reasons I dare to present you with my views, and I beg you, after due consideration, to remove the ban on monks' marriages by renovating a custom that has lasted for millennia. In governance, nothing is better than renovation. Although this

matter seems minor, it is indeed important. I hope you will take speedy measures and appeal to you with the utmost sincerity.<sup>37</sup>

In September, Hwang Hyeon (1855-1910), a famous Confucian in Gurye, South Jeolla Province, committed suicide and lamented the loss of his home nation to Japan. He wrote a poem in commemoration of Hwang Hyeon's suicide. On September 23, he became an instructor of the monastic seminary at Hwasan-sa Temple in the County of Jangdan, Gyeonggi Province. On December 8, after coming back to Baekdam-sa Temple from Hwasan-sa Temple, he finished the final draft of the *Joseon bulgyo yusin-non*.

On May 25, 1913, he published the nationwide renowned *Joseon bulgyo yusin-non*. Han Yongun wrote the book title on its front cover page with his beautiful calligraphy. The book, written in classical Chinese, discussed Korean Buddhism's reform and restoration in 80 pages and was composed of 17 chapters.<sup>38</sup> He incorporated Liang Qichao's social evolutionism and social reformative philosophy and developed his arguments in his major work. He distributed the book through the Central Propagation Center of Korean Buddhism's Seon Order. He strongly supported married monasticism in its 13<sup>th</sup> chapter entitled "Buddhist Future: Monastic Marriage" (pp. 58-66).

Even though the *Brahma Net Sūtra* and the *Sifen lu* (Fourfold Rules of Discipline), a vinaya text of Dharmaguptaka Sect and the authoritative vinaya text of Korean Buddhist monastics, clearly prohibit Buddhist monastics from marrying, he very freely and progressively, not literally and conservatively, interpreted the texts and adopted the *Huayan Sūtra* to theoretically support married monasticism. He listed four reasons why he theoretically backed up married monasticism as follows:

- (1) It is injurious to morality. I have heard that among the sins of humans the lack of filial piety is a great sin, while the failure to produce offspring is even greater because the sacrificial offerings to ancestors will be discontinued and the lineage will be severed. How can one forgive the sin

<sup>37</sup> Han Yongun, 65-66 and Tikhonov and Miller, trans., 113-114.

<sup>38</sup> The contents of the book *Joseon bulgyo yusin-non* (Seoul: Bulgyo seogwan, 1913) are as follows: "Preface" (pp. 1-2), "Contents" (pp. 1-2), "Ch. 1 Introduction" (pp. 1-3), "Ch. 2 Buddhism's Characteristics" (pp. 3-12), "Ch. 3 Buddhism's Principle" (pp. 12-15), "Ch. 4. Buddhist Restoration Should Begin from Destruction" (pp. 15-17), "Ch. 5 Monastic Education" (pp. 17-23), "Ch. 6 Seon Meditation" (pp. 23-27), "Ch. 7 Abolition of Chanting Centers" (pp. 27-31), "Ch. 8 Propagation" (pp. 31-35), "Ch. 9 Location of Temples" (pp. 36-43), "Ch. 10 Worship of Buddhist Images and Arts" (pp. 43-50), "Ch. 11 Various Buddhist Rituals" (pp. 50-53), "Ch. 12 Human Rights of Monks Should Begin from Production" (pp. 53-58), "Ch. 13 Buddhist Future: Monastic Marriage" (pp. 58-66), "Ch 14 Election of Abbots" (pp. 66-68), "Ch. 15 Unity of Monks" (pp. 68-75), "Ch. 16 Management of Temples" (pp. 75-77), and "Ch. 17 Conclusions" (pp. 77-79). Refer to I Wonseop, trans., *Joseon bulgyo yusin-non* (Seoul: Unju-sa, 1992). He discussed married monasticism in the 12<sup>th</sup> chapter.

of failing to continue one's personal bodily existence into innumerable generations of descendants, when it has innumerable ancestors before it? When a woman fails to take a husband and a man fails to take a wife, they succumb to incalculable sins. I do not feel I need to elaborate any more on this, as many people speak on this issue and the relevant passages may be found in both old and modern books.

- (2) It is injurious to the state. Today, racial nationalism is sweeping the whole world and all the politicians shout loudly about 'colonization, colonization!' Although the technologies of production and hygienic knowledge are developed further every day, they are still insufficient. Basically, a state consists of its people, and that is why the civilized states show the freedom to marry to all. That is why their populations are increasing at an unusually high rate and the easiness of evolution there is like a fire on the prairie. Why should they even consider stopping their citizens from marrying? If the brilliant politicians of the Western nations were to hear about the prohibition of marriage among our monks and nuns, they would surely be astonished and saddened by this and would regard it as an oddity. If we do not abolish this prohibition now, the right of the monastic community to establish such prohibitions will inevitably be limited by the law in the future and we will have to abolish it anyway, even if it is against our will.
- (3) It is injurious to missionary activities. Will we prevent monastics from getting married, or will we spread Buddhism around the world? From time immemorial, among all the myriad sentient things that have succeeded each other in an unbroken line, was there any that did not die but continued living forever? Of course not. The long-living (legendary) tree Dachun and the long-living (legendary) sage Peng Zu are all known to the world for their longevity. Some of these beings have counted eight thousand years as a single spring or five hundred years as a single autumn. But the morning mushrooms and summer cicada are all known to the world for their short spans of life. Some of these beings do not know the first and last days of a month, and some of them do not even know twilight and dawn. These are extreme examples of longevity and short life respectively, but the lifespan of all remaining myriad beings lies somewhere between these two poles, with the only difference being that they die a little earlier or later. Upon their deaths they become past; the process of being born and dying is their present; and those being born to live now are proceeding to their future. Past, present and future are simply the times of births and deaths. Thus if one dead being is not replaced by another living one, who can guarantee that all the moving and unmoving beings will still be visible in the world a century from now? If, once we have spread Buddhism throughout the world, we establish rules prohibiting marriages and stopping procreating, who will join the Buddhists to keep all these rules? There is hardly a temple which has not witnessed somebody who has returned to the lay life after joining the monastic order. Voluntary return to the lay world happens practically every day. What are the reasons for this? There may be many different reasons, but for the majority it is the issue of marriage. If seen from the viewpoint of dissemination of Buddhism, the prohibition of marriage for monastics entails much more harm than benefit. How will we control the harm it is doing in the future? It will be very difficult for

Buddhism to survive in this way. Buddhism, like the season of spring, likes life and dislikes death, likes the way of humanity and dislikes the ways of evil. But how is it possible to practice the teachings of the great sage without preserving the human race? Unless the prohibition against marriage is abolished, even the eloquence of Su Qin<sup>39</sup> and Zhang Yi<sup>40</sup> will be of no avail for Buddhist missionary work.

- (4) It is injurious to the enlightening transformation of sentient beings by Buddhism. There are innumerable human desires, but cravings for food and sex are common to the wise and the stupid, the intelligent and the foolish. The desires of one person are also innumerable, but again it is the cravings for food and sex that persist in joy and anger, sorrow and pleasure. To say that anybody born in a bodily form to this life of worldly dust, may be free of desire for food and sex is just either nonsense or empty flattery. If so, how can you practice the celibate life? Just being able to achieve a sexual life that is not disorderly is enough for one to be called a lofty gentleman. But in reality it is extremely difficult for everyone under Heaven to become a lofty gentleman. Thus, when the lust for food or sex casts off its restraints and reaches a climax, people tend to completely disregard their lives, as if they were worth nothing, and have no regrets about it later. The more you try to stop the water pouring down, the heavier the downpour is, and the harder you try to harness a runaway horse, the more violently it behaves! Cravings for food and sex are only further provoked when they are repressed. These are the normal human feelings of ordinary people. And in this world, where there are many people who are at a level below ordinary, how will it be possible to strife their desires with rules so that they give up even pursuing the shadow of enjoyment? Even if their desires were stifled and oppressed in this way, it would be only a formal, nominal compliance. A butterfly that lives through the winter becomes sick at heart longing for the flowers and a cuckoo goes mad if tied down to a willow tree after it has left its home valley. These things happen when desires suppressed for a long time reach a climax. When the carnal desires of humans are stemmed, the heart runs one thousand *li*.<sup>41</sup> The male lover coming to his woman with a dead roe deer wrapped in straw,<sup>42</sup> or the female lover crossing the Zhen river to meet with her love<sup>43</sup> have existed since antiquity. If we stubbornly cling to the prohibition of marriages, we will damage public morals and thwart the innermost wishes of the people, and what can be worse than that? I am thinking now about the history of Buddhism in the last years of the Goryeo Dynasty, when there were so many examples of Buddhism as a whole being put into disrepute by the lewdness of the monks. This is how

---

<sup>39</sup> Su Qin was the leader of vertical alliance of states from north to south to make war against the state of Qin during the Warring States period.

<sup>40</sup> Zhang Yi was the leader of horizontal alliance of states from east to west to make peace with Qin.

<sup>41</sup> One *li* is 0.4 kilometer.

<sup>42</sup> Refer to the poem entitled “Ye you si jun” (A Dead Deer in the Wild) in the second chapter, the first volume, *Shijing* (Classic of Odes).

<sup>43</sup> See the poem entitled “Qian chang” (Holding up the Lower Garments) in the seventh chapter, the first volume, *Shijing*.

deep the relation between the prohibition of marriages and enlightenment is.<sup>44</sup>

As seen above, Han Yongun strongly argued against celibate monasticism, advocated married monasticism and suggested Korean Buddhism make its monastics decide freely on the issue of marriage by themselves. He argued that we should not consider celibate monasticism as a permanent law but as a changeable one in Korean Buddhism based on the different historical and social contexts and, providing several historical examples, he explained why he memorialized imperial Japan to make Korean Buddhism accept married monasticism as follows:

Bigan made himself into a loyal subject of by dying in an attempt to remonstrate with the vicious last king of the Shang Dynasty (traditionally dated, 1134 BCE – 250 BCE) named Zhou, while Jizi attained the virtue of humaneness by continuing to live. The reason for the defeat of Zhi Bo's armies (of the state of Jin in the Spring and Autumn period by a coalition of other Jin nobles, headed by his enemy Zhao Xiangzi) was his emphasis on water in the preparation for battle, while the generals of the state of Wu successfully used the method of attacking with fire in order to defeat the armies of the state of Wei headed by Cao Cao at the Chibi River. Basically speaking, life is opposed to death, and water is opposed to fire, but the use of the two opposing poles may not be contradictory when the two oppositions are used appropriately. Thus, where is the contradiction if the ancients worshipped the Buddha by prohibiting marriage for monks while the peoples of today worship the Buddha by abolishing this prohibition? It just has to be timely, that is all. I have been noisily advocating this sort of reform in Buddhism, but since none would listen to me, I came to the conclusion that I must make use of political power to take my proposals forward. Recently I have twice sounded the appeal bell and lodged petitions with the authorities.<sup>45</sup>

He considered married monasticism as a socially natural morality and a modernized form of Buddhism and advocated married monasticism over traditional celibate monasticism which Korean Buddhism traditionally adopted from Buddhist vinaya texts. He tried to modernize Korean Buddhism through the power of Japanese imperialism in early 1910's. However, he became a strong critic against Japanese imperialism gradually. I cannot find any evidence that even though he became a leader of anti-Japanese independence movement, he criticized married monasticism like the theorists of the movement (1954-1970) who labeled married monks as pro-Japanese Korean monks and considered married monasticism as being originated from Japanese Buddhism.

His arguments on married monasticism were very neutral, positive and progressive unlike the movement's theorists who were very sectarian, political,

---

<sup>44</sup> Han Yongun, 59-62 and Tikhonov and Miller, trans., 106-109.

<sup>45</sup> Han Yongun, 63 and Tikhonov and Miller, trans., 110-111.



negative and conservative on the same issue. He interpreted married monasticism from a neutral perspective and considered it as a modernized and progressive form of Buddhist monasticism. However, the movement's activists tactically used Korean nationalist sentiments against Japanese imperialism and unconditionally labeled married monks as pro-Japanese Korean Buddhist monks and married monasticism of Korean Buddhism as a byproduct of Japanese Buddhism during Japanese occupation, 1910-1945.

### **3. Anti-Japanese Korean Buddhism**

#### **3.1. The March 1<sup>st</sup> Movement**

In August 1914, Han Yongun, who was also a resident monk and another key figure along with Baek Yongseong at the Propagation Center of Korean Seon Sect (Joseon seonjong pogyo-dang), organized the Society for Korean Buddhism (Joseon bulgyo-hoe). The society was created un-affiliate and independent from Korean Buddhism's major institutional organization, the association of the thirty parish head temples. However, because the abbots of parish head temples and their supporter, the Japanese colonial government, oppressed the society's activities, it could not survive. For this reason, Han Yongun changed the organization's name to the Buddhist League (Bulgyo dongmaeng-hoe), extending its membership to local young Buddhists and monks. The government in cooperation with the abbots again oppressed the progressive society.

In November 11, 1918, the 1<sup>st</sup> World War ended and on November 13, 39 activists for independence from imperial Japan, members of Junggwang-dan (Society of Double Brightness), including Yeo Jun (1862-1932), Gim Dongsam (1878-1937), Gim Jwajin (1889-1930), Sin Palgyun (d. 1924), Seo Il (1881-1921), Gim Gyusik (1881-1950), and I Dongnyeong (1869-1940), declared "Declaration for Korea's Independence" in Manchuria. On November 15, Yeo Unhyeong (1886-1947), leader of the Shanghai-based New Korea Youth Party met in Shanghai an envoy of the United States US President Thomas Woodrow Wilson (1856-1924), and submitted via the envoy his proposal on Korea's independence to the president. A US-based Korean organization for independence had also sent a request letter to the president and asked him to help with its independence. In December, the US-based three Korean activists for independence, i.e., I Seungman (1875-1965), Jeong Han-gyeong (b. 1891), and Min Chanhoo, were determined to Korea's delegates to the Paris Peace Conference held on January 18, 1919 and continued until to January 21, 1920, but they could not attend the conference because the United States prohibited them from leaving its border.

On December 15, 1918, religious leaders of Cheondo-gyo Religion, a nationalist new religion, i.e., Son Byeonghui (1861-1922), Gwon Dongjin

(1861-1947), O Sechang (1864-1953), Choe Rin and others, met at Sangchunwon outside of South Gate in Seoul and discussed how to get independence from Japan. On December 28, 500 Korean students attended the speech contest in Tokyo, discussed how to make an independent state and were arrested. On January 6, 1919, the Association for Korean Students in Tokyo discussed how to implement the declaration for independence at the Korean YMCA in Tokyo. On January 21, Emperor Gojong passed away at Deoksu Palace in Seoul. Around January, Gim Yoyeon, Gang Bong-u (1892-1970), Jeong Jaemyeon (1884-1962) and others, Korean activists for independence in the Jiandao (Kor., Gando) area, agreed that all Koreans in Jiandao should cooperate to get independence from Japan. The name “Jiandao” originated from the fact that the area between Korea and Qing China looks like an island.

In January, Korean student Song Gyebaek (1896-1920) who studied in Tokyo took to Seoul a copy of “Declaration for Independence” issued under the name of Youth Society for Korea’s Independence and delivered it to Hyeon Sang-yun (1893-1950). Choe Rin, Song Jin-u (1890-1945), Hyeon Sang-yun, Choe Namseon (1890-1957), and others met at Jung-ang School and passed resolutions in the meeting that former Korean government’s (1897-1910) political leaders prior to Japanese occupation (1910-1945), i.e., Bak Yeonghyo (1861-1939), Yun Yonggu (d. 1868), Han Gyuseol (1848-1930), Gim Yunsik and Yun Chiho (1864-1945), should be national representatives and Choe Namseon should draft “Declaration for Independence.”

On January 27, 1919, Han Yongun visited Choe Rin, a leader of Cheondo-gyo Religion and discussed how to be independent from Japan. While in Tokyo, he made friendship with him, so he could visit him. On February 1, the Shanghai-based New Korea Youth Party determined to send Gim Gysik to Paris, Jang Deoksu (1894-1947) to Japan, Gim Cheol (1886-1934) and Seo Byeongho (1885-1972) to Korea and Yeo Unhyeong to Russia and make Koreans guide independence movement in their respective nations. On February 7, Song Jin-u and Choe Rin planned to have massive street demonstrations for independence, agreed that non-religious organizations and Cheondo-gyo Religion should cooperate each other for independence, and sent Gim Dotae (1891-1956) and Jeong Nosik (1891-1965) to the Korean Christian leader I Seunghun (1864-1930) in Jeongju, North Pyeong-an Province. On February 8, six hundred Korean students met at Korean YMCA in Tokyo and announced the “Declaration for Independence.” On February 20, Han Yongun recommended to Choe Rin Baek Yongseong as a Buddhist representative. On February 21, Christian leaders I Seunghun, Bak Huido (1889-1952), O Giseon (1877-1946), and others met and discussed to cooperate with Cheondo-gyo Religion for independence. On February 22, student leaders met Bak Huido and decided to participate in the independence movement that religious leaders were currently organizing.

Han Yongun thought that he should include Confucian leaders as national representatives. He went to see Korean Confucian leader Gwak Jongseok (1846-

1919) in the County of Geochang, South Gyeongsang Province, got an approval from him and arrived in Seoul on February 24. Even though Han Yongun was later supposed to get Gwak Jongseok's stamp through his son, he could not get it because of a difficult situation, so Gwak Jongseok could not become a national representative in the March 1<sup>st</sup> Movement.

On February 20, 1919, while Han Yongun was preparing the March 1<sup>st</sup>, 1919 movement, he recommended his senior and close friend Baek Yongseong to Choe Rin, a leader of Cheondo-gyo Religion, as one of 33 national representatives. The new religion led the movement. Due to his personal friendship with Choe Rin whom he met while in Japan, Han Yongun became a key figure in organizing the movement. While Han Yongun was actively engaged in the March 1<sup>st</sup> Movement, he had since 1918 lived at 43 Gye-dong, Jongno-gu in Seoul. There he published the monthly magazine *Mind-only* (*Yusim*) and educated young Buddhists. Baek Yongseong also submitted his article(s) to the magazine.<sup>46</sup>

Later, Han Yongun moved to other cities to recruit national representatives of Buddhism in the March 1<sup>st</sup> Movement. He considered eminent Buddhist monks such as Song Mangong (1871-1946)<sup>47</sup> of Sudeok-sa Temple on Mt. Deoksung in the County of Yesan, South Chungcheong Province and Baek Chowol (1878-1944) of Yeongwon-sa Temple on Mt. Jiri in the County of Hamyang, South Gyeongsang Province. He also considered Jin Jineung of Hwaeom-sa Temple on Mt. Jiri in the County of Gurye, South Jeolla Province, Do Jinho of Ssanggye-sa Temple on Mt. Jiri in the County of Hadong, South Gyeongsang Province, O Seongwol of Beomeo-sa Temple on Mt. Geumjeong in Busan, and others. However, because they were widely dispersed, he found recruitment impossible in the short amount of time he had.

On February 24, he met Choe Rin. He revised "Declaration for Independence" that Choe Namseon drafted and added his own three articles of public pledge into it. Choe Namseon actually agreed to write the declaration with a condition that he would not participate in the movement. Criticizing Choe Namseon, Han Yongun insisted that he would draft it by himself. However, because Cheondo-gyo Religion, which led the movement, already requested Choe Namseon to draft the declaration, Han Yongun could not make its draft version.

The additional "Three Articles of a Public Pledge" are as follows: "First, today, we request our nation's righteousness, human rights, survival and prosperity, and we should manifest our spirit for freedom and should not stay in the sentiment of exclusivism. Second, even the last remaining Korean, even in the last instance, should clearly present our right opinion (on independence from Japan). Third, we should conduct actions in good order and make our assertions and attitudes be proper and right."

---

<sup>46</sup> Gim Gwangsik, 109.

<sup>47</sup> I Jeong, ed., 210-211.

Around February 27, Han Yongun visited Baek Yongseong at Daegak-sa Temple and explained the international and domestic politico-social situations, the movement's objectives and its preparatory processes. Han Yongun officially requested Baek Yongseong to join the movement as one of 33 national representatives. Baek Yongseong happily consented and gave his stamp to be used on the Declaration for Independence. On February 28, Han Yongun informed Baek Yongseong of the movement's venue and time.

On February 28 at three o'clock, one day prior to the March 1<sup>st</sup> Movement, he took three thousand copies of the "Declaration for Independence" and came back to his home in Gye-dong, Seoul, which was also used for the magazine *Yusim*'s Company. More than ten monk students of Jung-ang hangnim, current Dongguk University, including Sin Sang-wan (1891-1951), Gim Beomnin (1899-1964), Baek Seong-uk (1897-1981), Gim Gyuhyeon, Jeong Byeongheon, Gim Sangheon (1893-1945), O Taegeon (1897-1970), Gim Dongsin and Bak Min-o, listened to his eloquent speech and followed his directions. They concretely organized themselves how to participate in the movement.

On March 1 at one o'clock, he went to Taehwa-gwan Restaurant, a branch of Myeongwol-gwan. It was originally scheduled for them to announce the declaration at Pagoda Park, but he changed the meeting venue from Pagoda Park to Taehwa-gwan at the February 28 meeting. At two o'clock pm, 29 representatives of 33 arrived. They read the declaration and Choe Rin recommended Han Yongun to moderate the meeting. He moderated the announcement with his eloquent speeches. In the ceremony, he guided the attendees to give three cheers for Korea's independence from Japan. He also suggested other representatives that if they were arrested, they should have the following three action principles: "First, don't employ a lawyer; second, don't take private meals; and third, don't request bail for release." After the announcement ceremony, the Japanese police arrested and imprisoned all national representatives including him.

On March 1, concurrently, Korean masses gathered at Pagoda Park and began to demonstrate against imperial Japan to get independence. The massive demonstrations had continued for six months across the nation. 1,360,000 Koreans participated in the demonstrations, and 6,670 Koreans were killed, 14,600 persons were injured, and 52,730 peoples were imprisoned. At 2 o'clock pm on March 1, Baek Yongseong went to Taehwa-gwan Restaurant to meet the national representatives. There, Han Yongun delivered a welcoming speech, followed by three cheers for Korean independence. Immediately afterwards, Japanese police arrested the representatives and suppressed the movement. Baek Yongseong spent six months in a Japanese colonial police station and one and half a year in a Japanese colonial jail.

After the March 1<sup>st</sup> Movement, Koreans began to see the reality of colonization. On April 10-11, 1919, the exiled Korean government was established in Shanghai, China. It began to unite anti-Japanese Korean independence forces under its leadership. On one side, pro-Japanese Koreans

supported imperial Japan and as a result, received benefits. On the other, anti-Japanese Korean activists organized various independence movement activities and began to protest systematically against Japanese colonialism. Conflicts between pro-Japanese and anti-Japanese Koreans increased. Institutional Korean Buddhists increasingly became pro-Japanese and supported the colonial government's control of Korean Buddhism. As a result, they received favor. On the other hand, anti-Japanese Korean Buddhists began to feel Korean Buddhism should try to overturn the undemocratic Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples and gain autonomy. Conflicts between these groups grew.

On July 10, 1919, Han Yongun wrote the very famous essay entitled *Joseon dongnip ui seo* (Essay on Korea's Independence from Japan's Occupation) and submitted it to the director of the Seoul District Prosecutors' Office. He secretly gave the essay to his disciple I Chunseong (1891-1977) and I Chunseong delivered it to Gim Sangho, a monk-student independence activist. Gim Sangho and his close colleague Gim Beomnin printed and via secret route delivered it to the exiled Korean government in Shanghai. In the November 4, 1919 issue (issue # 25) of *Dongnip sinmun* (Newspaper for Independence) which the exiled Korean government published in Shanghai, it was included.

The contents are as follows<sup>48</sup>: "Ch. 1 Outline; Ch. 2 Motives for Declaration for Independence; 2.1. Ability of Koreans; 2.2. Changes of World's Political Situation; 2.3. Conditions for Korea's Autonomy; Ch. 3 Reasons for Declaration for Independence; 3.1. National Prides; 3.2. Thoughts on Father-Land; 3.3. Liberalism; 3.4. Duties towards World; Ch. 4 Politics of Japanese Governor-General Office; and Ch. 5 Confidence on Korea's Independence." As above, he crystallized in the essay his philosophical stances towards Korea's independence based upon liberty, equality and peace.

On August 9, 1919, he was convicted at the Seoul District Court and on September 30, 1920, he was sentenced to three years' imprisonment at the higher court. In 1920, the colonial government asked him to write the letter of penitence and it told him that if he accepts the offer, it would release him from the prison. However, he declined the offer and continued independence movement until his death in 1944, one year before independence from Japan in 1945.

### 3.2. Han Yongun

After the March 1<sup>st</sup>, 1919 Movement, Han Yongun guided young Buddhists to protest against Japanese imperialism and develop their anti-Japanese independence movement in 1920's and early 1930's. In May 1930, he was appointed as the spiritual leader of Mandang, an anti-Japanese underground

---

<sup>48</sup> The essay is included in I Giljin, trans., "Joseon dongnip e daehan gamsang ui gaeyo" (The Outline of Han Yongun's *Essay on Korea's Independence from Japan's Occupation*), in An Byeongjik, ed., *Han Yongun*, 175-189.

society, the members of which are young monks, including I Yongjo (b. 1900), Gim Beomnin, Choe Beomsul (1904-1979), Jo Untaek, Bak Changdu, Gang Jaeho, and Choe Bongsu, which advocated Korea's independence from Japan and reform movement in Korean Buddhism.

The brief historical background of Mandang is as follows: On March 17, 1928, Han Yong's sincere monk followers, i.e., Baek Seong-uk, Gim Beomnin, Do Jinho, and others hosted the Korean Buddhist Youth Conference at Gwakhwang-sa Temple in Seoul, reestablished Korean Buddhist Youth Association and tried to revitalize the movement for Buddhism's reform and Korea's independence from imperial Japan.

Young Korean Buddhists recognized that Japanese colonial government had individually controlled each parish head temples under the association system of the abbots of 31 parish head temples and had let each abbot have a paramount power at his respective parish. They also strongly suggested that they should set up Korean Buddhism's centralized order, independent from Japanese colonial government. In late 1920's, many enlightened young Korean Buddhists came back from studying advanced Buddhist Studies in foreign nations, two major social reform and national independence movement camps, socialists and nationalists, were united under the name of Singan-hoe, and closed Jung-ang hangnim was reopened with another name Jung-ang bulgyo jeonmun hakgyo (Central Buddhist Junior School). Young Buddhist progressives planned to reform Korean Buddhism.<sup>49</sup>

On November 11, 1928, 17 young Buddhist leaders met at Gwakhwang-sa Temple and discussed how to organize Korean Buddhism's national monastic conference at which they would pass Korean Buddhism's constitution and organize its central administration. On December 1, they concretized its plan, decided its agendas, determined the qualification of delegates, and elected preparatory committee members.

On January 3 – 5, 1929, they held the national monastic conference of Korean Buddhism's Order of Seon and Doctrinal Sects. It has a monumental significance in Korean Buddhism under the Japanese occupation period because Korean Buddhists tried to establish their order's central administration and concretely reform Korean Buddhism by themselves, not relying on Japanese colonial government. Han Yongun highly evaluated the conference in the new second issue of monthly magazine *Bulgyo*, published in April 1932.

In the conference, they passed its order's constitution constituting a preamble, 12 chapters and 31 articles and several laws such as the law of the assembly of patriarchs, the law of the order's assembly, the law of the order's central administration headquarters, the law of the committee of laws and regulations, the law of monastic affairs, and others. The conference participants elected seven patriarchs, i.e., Gim Hwan-eung (1847-1929), Seo Haedam (1862-1942), Bak Hanyeong, I Yongheo (1869-1930), Gim Dongseon (1856-1936),

---

<sup>49</sup> Gim Gwangsik, 174.

Gim Gyeong-un, and Bang Hanam (1876-1951); I Honseong (b. 1886) as the secretary of general affairs; Song Manam as the secretary of education affairs; and Hwang Gyeong-un as the secretary of financial affairs. They initiated its central administration. They determined to host the order's assembly each March.

Korean young Buddhists dispatched Do Jinho as a representative to the first Pan-Pacific Buddhist Youth Conference held on July 20 – 26, 1930. He distributed an article entitled “Korean Buddhism and her Position in the Cultural History of the Orient,” written by Choe Namseon and translated from Korean to English by Choe Bongsu.

In May 1930, four young Buddhist progressives, Jo Hagyu, Gim Beomnin, Gim Sangho, and I Yongjo, decided to initiate an underground society, and they recruited Jo Euntaek, Bak Changdu and Choe Bongsu in the second time and Bak Yeonghui (1892-1990), Bak Yunjin (1905-1950), Gang Yumun, Bak Geunseop, Han Seonghun, and Gim Haeyun, students of Jung-ang bulgyo jeonmun hakgyo, in the third time. Its key members includes Jo Hagyu, Gim Sangho, Gim Beomnin, I Yongjo, Jo Euntaek, Bak Changdu, Gang Jaeho, Choe Bongsu, Bak Yeonghui, Bak Yunjin, Gang Yumun, Bak Geunseop, Han Seonghun, Gim Haeyun, Seo Wonchul, Jang Dohwan, Jeong Sangjin, Heo Yeongho (1900-1952), Min Dongseon, Cha Sangmyeong (1895-1945), Jeong Maeng-il, I Ganggil, Choe Beomsul, Gim Gyeonghong, and Jo Jonghyeon (1904-1989).<sup>50</sup>

They named the underground society as Man-dang (Man Character's Party) by picking up the character Man 亼 from Manhae 亼海, the nickname of Han Yongun. Its general principles were the separation between religion and politics, the establishment of Korean Buddhism's independent administration and the popularization of Buddhism among the masses. Man-dang was an anti-Japanese underground party. Even though it appointed Han Yongun as its spiritual leader, it did not even report him its appointment and protected him from being persecuted from imperial Japanese government. Its members met regularly on third Sunday per month and discussed various topics related to the reform of Korean Buddhism.

In the 88<sup>th</sup> issue of monthly magazine *Bulgyo*, published in October 1931, Han Yongun wrote a long article entitled “Joseon bulgyo gaehyeogan” (Outlines of Korean Buddhism's Reforms). He succeeded the basic ideas of *Joseon bulgyo yusin-non* (Essays on the Restoration of Korean Buddhism) published in 1913, and revised them based on new political, religious and social situations in 1930's. Its contents comprised eight chapters as follows: “Ch. 1 Introduction; Ch. 2 Establishment of Korean Buddhism's Central Administration; Ch. 3 Abolition and Amalgamation of Temples; Ch. 4 Livelihood Protection of Buddhist Clerics; Ch. 5 Translation of Buddhist Texts; Ch. 6 Popularization of

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid, 182.

Buddhism; Ch. 7 Promotion of Seon (Praxis) and Doctrinal Teachings; and Ch. 8 Conclusions.”

He diagnosed Korean Buddhism as follows: Internally, Korean Buddhist monks were generally conservative, traditional, pre-modern, and ignorant, and the leaders of Korean Buddhism, abbots of the 31 parish head temples, were pro-Japanese and directly and indirectly blocked the reformation of Buddhism. And, externally, the Japanese colonial government intervened in Korean Buddhism through the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples without any legal problems, and anti-religious Communists, anarchists, nihilists and others became popular.

He considered Korean Buddhism as not being separated from Korean lives and cultures, and he contended that the reform of Korean Buddhism should precede that of the nation. He strongly recommended Buddhists to reform Buddhism without stop. He strongly criticized pro-Japanese abbots, the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples, and anti-religious persons and suggested Buddhists to form Buddhism and overcome the problems. He revised and developed the basic ideas of his earlier book *Essays of the Restoration of Korean Buddhism* in its chapters on “Abolition and Amalgamation of Temples,” “Translation of Buddhist Texts,” and “Promotion of Seon (Praxis) and Doctrinal Teachings.” Based on changed political and religious situations, he concretized some reformative ideas of the *Essay* in the later article’s chapters “Establishment of Korean Buddhism’s Central Administration,” “Livelihood Protection of Buddhist Clerics,” and “Popularization of Mass Buddhism.”

In the early 1920’s, progressive Buddhists tried to establish united Korean Buddhism’s central administration and did not succeed. In the late 1920’s, they retook and popularized it. He insisted that Korean Buddhism should have its central laws and regulations that all of its organizations should follow. He suggested that Korean Buddhists should centralize decentralized Buddhist organizations independently and not relying on Japanese colonial government, let the central administration appoint abbots, and make its constitution and regulations systematically applied to all Buddhists and temples across the Korean Peninsula. He also suggested that Korean Buddhism should establish its head temple and its central administration offices.

In the 1920’s, even though young Buddhist monks had studied Buddhism and/or other disciplines, mostly in Japan and/or in Korea, they could not get their positions in Korean Buddhism and had serious financial problems. He thought that Korean Buddhism should centralize temple properties, invest them to establish business corporations, and with profits from them, financially support young Buddhist clerics, and make them realize their ideals. According to his assertions, Buddhism should take care of them.

Han Yongun contended that Buddhists should apply Buddhism to this troubled society and popularize it in it. Buddhists should reform Buddhism to serve for struggling masses and guide the masses to the better happiness and welfare. He strongly recommended Buddhists to engage in social issues and to



activate them to an idealistic direction. He criticized hermitic Buddhists who just concentrated on their personal interests in secluded areas and highly evaluated altruistic Buddhists who dedicated themselves for the sake of other beings.

In late 1932, the members of the underground organization Man-dang decided to dissolve it by themselves. Some members violated a policy that the members should not become executives of Korean Buddhism's central administration headquarters office. Other members criticized the violators. There were conflicts between two sides in the underground society. They should consider whether or not the Mandang would be revealed to Japanese colonial authorities in the future in the conflicts. However, several years later, in 1938, even though the Mandang was already disorganized, the Japanese colonial government recognized the existed society of Mandang and it arrested and imprisoned its members over several times.

Even Han Yongun, generally considered a staunch nationalist, was not free from pro-Japanese activities after the Sino-Japanese War on July 7, 1937. The Japanese Government-General seriously oppressed anti-Japanese activities and comprehensively mobilized Koreans to support the war on the Korean Peninsula. He also wrote a preface to the *Bulgyo* (Buddhism) (new series) 7 (October 1, 1937), a monthly magazine, and supported the Sino-Japanese War. While communist Buddhists strongly opposed imperial Japan without compromise, he was not radical like them but moderate in handling the independence issue. He might have found that it would be very difficult to completely challenge the government's mandates, particularly after the war.

### 3.3. Various anti-Japanese activities

Some Korean Buddhists strongly opposed imperial Japan, became anti-Japanese, and developed the anti-Japanese independence movement in the colonial period. They politically developed their ideas on and activities for independence. These were progressive and sometimes radical Korean Buddhist activists against imperial Japan. There were two groups of these. One group was progressive Korean nationalists. Another group was radical Korean Communists. These subgroups sometimes cooperated and sometimes competed with each other to get hegemony in the movements. The first group concentrated on the independence of their nation from Japan. However, although the second group also emphasized independence from Japan, it also focused on class struggles between the rich, privileged class and the poor, under-trodden class.

The first group is Korean nationalists who advocated independence from Japan and reformed Korean Buddhism. As discussed in the above section, Han Yongun might represent this first group. He was a Buddhist reformer and an activist for the Korean movement for independence from the Japanese occupation as well as a very renowned poet in Korea. He is also called by his pen name, Manhae. He was a nationalist Buddhist leader and engaged in various Buddhist reform activities in the religious sector and in independence movement

at the social level. He was one of the most renowned leaders for independence and social reform movement not only in Korean Buddhism but also in the entire Korean society.

His major peacemaking activities are as follows: He wrote a famous book entitled *Joseon bulgyo yusinnon* (Essays on the Restoration of Korean Buddhism) and suggested Korean Buddhists to reform conservative and traditional Korean Buddhism. He expelled pro-Japanese monk leader I Hoegwang who tried to subordinate Korean Buddhism to Japanese Buddhism. He actively participated in the March 1<sup>st</sup>, 1919 Independence Movement as one of its key organizers. He guided Korean Buddhism's independence movement and was a spiritual leader of Korean Young Buddhist activists for Korea's independence and Buddhism's reform. He wrote various poems, articles, editorials, novels, and essays and popularized anti-Japanese movement among Koreans. He also worked for the Singan-hoe, a nationwide anti-Japanese organization and became the president of its Seoul chapter.

The second group is communist Buddhists who advocated independence movement and social reform movement and tried to reform society and Buddhism. It was also connected with the communists of other nations, particularly China and Russia and in a rare case, even with those of Japan. The Buddhist socialist activists actively participated in the independence movement in Korea and abroad.<sup>51</sup> Both groups endeavored to make their nation become independent from imperial Japan. Gim Seongsuk (1898-1969),<sup>52</sup> a Buddhist socialist activist, might represent the second group.

Gim Seongsuk's pen name is Unam, also known as Gim Changsuk, Gim Seongeom and Gim Yagwang. During the nationwide March 1<sup>st</sup>, 1919 Independence Movement, he circulated manifestos for independence to neighboring citizens along with his colleague monks. He actively attended the activities of the Korea's Labor Mutual-Aid Society and the Korea's Proletarian Union. While in China between 1923 and 1945, he organized many leftist anti-Japanese organizations and had various high posts even in exiled Korean government. Between 1945 and 1969, as a moderate socialist politician, he took measures to democratize South Korean government and peacefully unite Korean Korea.

On February 26-27, 1937, Japanese Governor-General Minami Jiro (1874-1955) hosted a meeting with abbots of 31 parish head temples in the 1<sup>st</sup> conference room with two agendas. Those were the methods of improving Korean Buddhism as the 1<sup>st</sup> agenda and the issues of Korean Buddhism's Central Administration and Jung-ang buljeon (Central Buddhist Junior College), current Dongguk University, as the 2<sup>nd</sup> agenda.

---

<sup>51</sup> Im Hyebong, "4.1 Bulgyo-gye chogi sahoe juui gyeyeol ui hang-il undong" (Korean Buddhist Socialists' Anti-Japanese Independence Movement), 207-220.

<sup>52</sup> The Association of Commemorative Services for Patriot Gim Seongsuk's Website, "Woonam's Life," <http://www.kimsungsuk.org/eng/index.asp> (accessed April 17, 2007) and Im Hyebong, 277-299.

Korean Buddhists endeavored to establish the head temple of Korean Buddhism independently without relying on Japanese colonial government and to let it appoint abbots and systematically manage Korean Buddhist temples across the nation. Korean Buddhism had never had its centralized governing body of Korean Buddhism that appointed abbots of 31 parish head temples and approved the appointments of abbots of their respective branch temples. Korean Buddhism was the decentralized organization. Each abbot of each parish head temple should respectively get approval from the Japanese colonial government and each parish abbot should petition the local provincial government to approve his appointment of his branch temple's abbots.

At the time, Abbot Fusan of Hirobumi-ji Temple, a Japanese Sōtō Zen missionary temple in Seoul, located at current Shilla Hotel, submitted to the Japanese Governor-General Office a petition in which he requested the office to make his temple as Korean Buddhism's head temple and to control Korean Buddhist temples' properties completely.<sup>53</sup>

On February 27, 1937, most of pro-Japanese abbots complimented to Governor-General Minami Jiro the Japanese Governor-General's policies on Buddhism. Only Song Mangong, abbot of Magok-sa Temple in South Chungcheong Province, strongly contended in front of him that Japanese colonial government Japanized Korean Buddhism and destroyed Korean Buddhism's traditional celibate monasticism, inherited from Śākyamuni Buddha himself, the founder of Buddhism. He also suggested the governor-general not to intervene in Korean Buddhism, but to let Korean Buddhism decide its religious affairs autonomously.

With the beginning of Sino-Japanese War on July 7, 1937, the Japanese colonial government seriously needed to control religious organizations on the Korean Peninsula and guide them to strongly support the war. Therefore, it reshuffled religious organizations and persecuted pseudo-religions. Properties of religious organizations were considered private, not public. If the government felt a religious organization contributed to public and national interests, it protected that organization. If not, it seriously persecuted it.

#### 4. Pro-Japanese Korean Buddhism

The majority of Korean Buddhist leaders in Japanese occupation had directly and indirectly served for Japanese imperialism. So, they responded positively to Japanese Imperialism, became pro-Japanese and supported Japan to very smoothly rule Korea. They were necessarily pro-Japanese. Without being pro-Japanese imperialism, they could not keep and promote their positions. Japan controlled Korean Buddhism through implementing the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples written in 1911, just one year after the annexation of

---

<sup>53</sup> Gang Seokju and Bak Gyeonghun, *Bulgyo geunse baengnyeon* (Modern Korean Buddhism during 100 Years), revised version (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 2002), 140.

Korea. Without the approval of the Japanese Governor-General's Office in Seoul, no Korean Buddhist could attain a high-ranking position. On behalf of Japan and for their own gain, they betrayed, suppressed, and sacrificed their compatriots.

I Jong-uk's (1884-1969)<sup>54</sup> pro-Japanese activities might represent this group of pro-Japanese Korean Buddhists. In the beginning, I Jong-uk was an anti-Japanese activist for independence and later, when he got a higher position in the clerical administration of Korean Buddhism, he became the representative pro-Japanese leader in Korean Buddhism. His activities are very ambiguous between pro- and anti-Japanese colonialism. Bak Huiseung<sup>55</sup> and the Association of I Jong-uk's Dharma Descendants<sup>56</sup> asserted that I Jong-uk's pro-Japanese actions were disguised ones. However, both of them should textually and historically prove their arguments. Im Hye bong strongly refuted their arguments in his recent book.<sup>57</sup> If they do not re-argue against Im Hye bong's detailed assertions, I Jong-uk should be a fervent pro-Japanese Buddhist leader.

After March 1<sup>st</sup>, 1919 Independence Movement, he joined the exiled government in Shanghai, had various positions in it and actively participated in independence movement. After he returned to Woljeong-sa Temple in 1923, he held high positions including its abbotship for twenty-five years, 1930 – 1955 at his temple and had high positions including the highest position in Korean Buddhism between 1941 and 1945 and between 1951 and 1954. Under the Japanese colonial period, he organized various pro-Japanese Buddhist activities, including prayers for victory, the encouragement of young Buddhists to become volunteer soldiers, a public lectures series to propagate Japanese imperialism, fundraising for supporting Japanese military forces, and so on.

Unlike I Jong-uk and active pro-Japanese Korean Buddhists, while some Koreans secretly supported the independence movement from Japan, they officially sided with the Japanese government. Even if they did not want to support Japan's occupation, they wanted to be successful in society. They secretly raised funds for independence and officially acted for Japan. While keeping their own conscience in their deep minds, they also were strongly eager to show their ambitions and succeed in the society under the Japanese colonial government.

---

<sup>54</sup> I Jeong, 273-274; Im Hye bong, 194-198; and the History Libration Campaign Center Homepage, "I Jong-uk," <http://bluecabin.com.ne.kr/split99/ljw3378.htm> (assessed May 1, 2007).

<sup>55</sup> Bak Huiseung, "Jiam I Jong-uk yeongu" (Research in Jiam I Jong-uk), MA thesis, Graduate School of Buddhist Studies, Dongguk University, 2001.

<sup>56</sup> Jiam Mundo-hoe (Association of I Jong-uk's Disciples), *Jiam hwasang pyeongjeon* (Critical Biography of I Jong-uk) (Seoul: Samjang-won, 1991).

<sup>57</sup> Im Hye bong's *Chinil seungnyeo baekpal-in: Kkeut naji anneun yeoksa ui mureum* (108 Pro-Japanese Korean Monks: Unanswered Historical Questions) (Seoul: Cheongnyeon-sa, 2005), 588-639 and *Chinil bulgyo-ron* (Researches in Pro-Japanese Colonial Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1993), 2: 473-508.

Gim Guha (1872-1965) might represent this model. While Gim Guha was abbot at his home temple Tongdo-sa Temple and had various high positions in Korean Buddhism's administration, he secretly donated a large amount of money to the fundraisers for Korea's independence movement. In late 1919, he signed Korean Monks' Declaration for Independence from Japanese occupation.<sup>58</sup> He publicly supported Japanese imperialism and kept his high positions.<sup>59</sup> If he opposed Japanese imperialism and the policies of Japanese Governor-General Office, he could not maintain his high positions. The abbots, regardless of parish headquarter temples and their branch temples, had to receive approval from Japanese colonial government.

The sympathizers and defenders of his pro-Japanese behaviors during Japan's occupation period assert that it was necessary for him to publicly appear to be a loyal abbot to the Japanese Governor-General's Office in Korea and Japanese Government and to secretly support the anti-Japanese independence movement activists and organizations. Otherwise, he could not have kept his abbotship and could not have financially supported activists in the independence movement.<sup>60</sup>

Gim Guha actively participated in founding the first modern Buddhist mission school named Myeongjin School in Seoul, current Dongguk University in 1906 and served as the school's vice principal and later its principal. In 1908, as one of 52 national Buddhist representatives, he organized the Secretariat Office of the Won Order of Korean Buddhism, the first modern order of Korean Buddhism, at Wonheung-sa Temple in Seoul, the head temple for Korean Buddhism.

Between 1911 and 1925, he was abbot of Tongdo-sa Temple. While Gim Guha had served as the abbot of Tongdo-sa Temple for 14 years, he had supported independence movement in secret and he had also actively participated in pro-Japanese government activities.<sup>61</sup> It would be impossible for Korean Buddhist leaders not to support Japanese imperialism during the Japanese occupation period, 1910-1945. The sympathizers and defenders of his pro-Japanese behaviors concluded that he was a guised pro-Japanese, not a real pro-Japanese.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Gang Seokju and Bak Gyeonghun, 158-164.

<sup>59</sup> Im Hyeobong, "I Hoegwang (1862-1933)," <http://bluecabin.com.ne.kr/split99/lhg3377.htm> (accessed May 19, 2007); and Im Hyeobong, "5-2 I Hoegwang," in *Chinil bulgyo-ron*, 2: 459-472.

<sup>60</sup> Tongdo-sa Temple, ed., *Guha daejongsa minjok bulgyo undong saryo-jip* (The Collection of Source Materials for Anti-Japanese Activities of Great Master Gim Guha), 5 vols (Yangsan: Tongdo-sa Temple, 2007).

<sup>61</sup> Im Hyeobong, "I Hoegwang (1862-1933)," <http://bluecabin.com.ne.kr/split99/lhg3377.htm> (accessed May 19, 2007); and Im Hyeobong, "5-2 I Hoegwang," in *Chinil bulgyo-ron* (Researches in Pro-Japanese Colonial Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1993), 2: 459-472.

<sup>62</sup> See Tongdo-sa Temple's edited source material book.

In April 1917, he was elected the third chairman of the Korean Buddhist Association of the Abbots of 30 Parish Head Temples. On August 31, 1917, he organized a visit program to Japan and took to Japan nine Korean Buddhist leaders, including I Hoegwang, Gang Daeryeon (1875-1942), Gwak Beopgyeong (b. 1877), and Gwon Sangno (1879-1965). Katō Kankaku, an official in the Department of Education Affairs of the Japanese Governor-General's Office, guided them and Hasekawa Yoshimichi (1850-1924), the second Governor-General, supported 300 yen. On September 8, while in travel in Japan, they visited the Governor-General's Tokyo office and by accident met the supervisor-general of political affairs, who recommended them to visit Ise Shinto Shrine, the holy place for Japanese State Shintoism, and gave him 100 yen.

On September 4, 1917, they were invited to the residential office of Terauchi Masatake, the 18<sup>th</sup> Japanese Prime Minister (r. 1916-1918) and the 1<sup>st</sup> Japanese Governor-General of Korea during 1910 - 1916. Gim Guha, the leader of the visit group, presented to him a really expensive silver incense burner which costs 150 yen at the time. On September 5, he visited the Prime Minister's Residential House and inquired after his wife's sickness. They also visited the mausoleum of former Emperor Meiji (1852-1912; r. 1869-1912) in Kyoto, welcomed the parade of Emperor Taishō (1879-1926; r. 1912-1926) at Ueno Station in Tokyo, and visited Ise Shinto Shrine and even the tomb of Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1536-1598), the invader to Korea.

In April 1920, the Japanese Governor-General's Office requested Gim Guha, Jeong Jaehwa and Jo Bongseung to establish the pro-Japanese organization entitled East Asian Buddhist Association. On March 5, 1937, he and Cha Sangmyeong of Beomeo-sa Temple became the executive members of the Committee for Making the Head Temple of Korean Buddhism, through which Korean Buddhists wanted to centralize and control Korean Buddhism. After the outbreak of (the second) Sino-Japanese War on July 7, 1937, when the Association of 31 Parish Head Temples decided to dispatch a group and to console Japanese Royal Military stationed in North China, Gim Guha attended the meeting as the representative from Tongdo-sa Temple.

Im Hyeobong concluded Gim Guha's activities as follows: He conducted pro-Japanese activities in his visit to Japan in 1917, anti-Japanese ones by secretly providing fund for independence movement after March 1<sup>st</sup> Movement in 1919 and pro-Japanese ones by making East Asian Buddhist Association in 1920 and afterwards.<sup>63</sup> However, the sympathizers and defenders of his pro-Japanese behaviors under Japan's occupation period asserted that he was necessary to publicly be a loyal abbot to the Japanese Governor-General's Office in Korea and Japanese Government and to secretly support anti-Japanese independence movement activists and organizations. If not so, he could not keep

---

<sup>63</sup> Im Hyeobong, *Ilje ha bulgyo-gye ui hang-il undong*, 170.

his abbotship and could not support independence movement activists financially.

I Jong-uk was a pro-Japanese Korean Buddhist. However, He was an activist for independence. In 1923, after he returned to Woljeong-sa Temple, he had served for Woljeong-sa in particular and Korean Buddhism in general. He cleared up the huge amount of debts in the temple after he endeavored to solve the problem for several years and protected the temple. In 1926, he became the office worker in the central administration of Korean Buddhism in Seoul. In 1927, he returned to Woljeong-sa Temple from Seoul and became the general manager at the temple. In 1930, he took office as its abbot.

Under the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples, the abbots of the 31 parish head temples should get approval from the Japanese Governor-General Office. He had been its abbot for twenty-five years, 1930 – 1955. In 1930, he was also elected to the chair in the order's Central Assembly. In 1932, he was elected to the director of general affairs in Korean Buddhism's Central Administrative Office (Gyomu-won) and administered the central administration of the 31 parish head temples.

In 1936, when Minami Jiro, the 7<sup>th</sup> Japanese Governor-General, was appointed, I Jong-uk welcomed him very much. In 1937, he led to establish the head office of Korean Buddhism with the support of the Association of 31 Parish Head Temples. Under the Japan's rule, nobody could become the highest administrator in Korean Buddhism without the support from Japanese Government-General. Around the beginning of Sino-Japanese War on July 7, 1937, he had visited the Japanese Governor-General Office twenty three times and during the first half of 1938, twelve times.

I Jong-uk became a serious pro-Japanese Buddhist leader and organized various pro-Japanese Buddhist activities, including the prayers for victory, the encouragement of young Buddhists to become volunteer soldiers, the public lectures series to propagate Japanese imperialism, the fundraising for supporting Japanese military forces, and so on. In 1941, he became the highest administrator, the secretary-general of the Jogye Order, and between 1941 and 1945, he had actually ruled Korean Buddhism across the Korean Peninsula.

From early 1930's, Korean Buddhism became a tool for Japan to colonize the Korean Peninsula and the majority of Korean Buddhist leaders were subject to be pro-Japanese Korean Buddhists. On September 18, 1931, the Japanese Empire invaded Manchuria and established a puppet government there. Japan benefited economically and geographically from its invasion of Manchuria. On July 7, 1937, Japan initiated a comprehensive war with China. On July 15, major pro-Japanese Buddhist leaders I Jong-uk, Im Seokjin (1892-1968), and Hwang Geumbong visited Joseon Shinto Shrine and attended a prayer ceremony for the success of Japan's imperialist ambitions. On July 25, each parish head temple hosted a special ceremony for Japan's prosperity and its military's endless success. In August, the Association of Buddhist Organizations in North

Gyeongsang Province fundraised 1,500 won for a fighter named “North Gyeongsang Province” after the association.

Just after the outbreak of Sino-Korean War on July 7, 1937, Korean Buddhists seriously increased pro-Japanese activities. We can introduce their various pro-Japanese activities only in August as follows: The Central Administration of Korean Buddhism hosted a prayer ceremony for Japan’s military success and public lectures for propaganda purposes on August 5, 1937. On August 6, the administration presided over a prayer ceremony at Buil-gwan Restaurant and public lectures for propaganda purposes. On August 7, Gwon Sangno attended a public lecture organized by the Japanese Governor-General’s Office as a Buddhist representative. He made a one-week tour lecture in North Gyeongsang Province and encouraged Koreans to assist Japan in its war effort. On August 11, the administration and the Center for Seon Studies hosted combined welcome and farewell meetings for soldiers. On August 13, representatives of Korean Buddhism discussed how to support the soldiers and their families. On August 20, the Association of Japanese Buddhist Sects in Korea hosted a memorial service for soldiers lost in North China at Hakubun-ji Temple in downtown Seoul.

In August 1937, the Central Administration mailed even its directions to all Korean Buddhist temples and propagation centers and requested all Korean monks and Buddhists to fully support the Japanese Imperial Military.<sup>64</sup> All Korean Buddhists were encouraged to fundraise for Japan’s military success and condole the wounded soldiers and the families of soldiers who participated in the war. All Buddhist monks were instructed to have memorial services for the soldiers to be reborn in paradise.

So, Korean parish temples and their respective branch temples conducted a great deal of fundraising for the support of the Sino-Japanese War begun on July 7, 1937.<sup>65</sup> For example, Jeondeung-sa Temple and its branch temples fundraised 165 won, Eunhae-sa Temple and its branch temples 113 won, Seongbul-sa Temple and its branch temples 42 won and more, and so on. Im Hwan-gyeong (1887-1983) donated 20 won, Jang Bohae 25 won, Gim Honhae 20 won, Gim Yeonghae 2 won, among others. Many individual temples and organizations raised funds for the Imperial Military. Jung-ang buljeon also raised 16 won among its faculty and staff.

On September 6, 1937, Jung-ang buljeon, current Dongguk University, held the second semester opening ceremony at 9 o’clock in the morning. At 9:30 am, its students, faculty and staff commemorated the Patriotism Day established by Japanese imperialists, hoisted the Japanese national flag, recited a royal edict from the Japanese Emperor, bowed to the direction of Japanese imperial palace, hosted public lectures on politics, and educated themselves to become loyal citizens of the Japanese Empire. At 2 o’clock in the afternoon,

---

<sup>64</sup> *Bulgyo sibo* 27 (October 1<sup>st</sup>, 1937): 7.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*



they visited and worshipped at Joseon Shinto Shrine which was considered the primary State Shinto Shrine in Korea.<sup>66</sup>

On November 2, 1937, the abbots of the 31 parish head temples<sup>67</sup> met in the auditorium of Jung-ang buljeon and decided to send three representatives to the front lines. They determined to raise 5,000 won for the Japanese war effort and 1,000 won for three representatives' travel expenses. They decided to divide the take of raising the 6,000 won among the 31 parish temples, so they assigned a certain amount to each parish temple. In the evening, at seven o'clock, they met in Gyeongseong (Seoul) Hotel and had an informal discussion on the construction of Taego-sa Temple, the new headquarters of Korean Buddhism planned to be built in Seoul.<sup>68</sup>

Around that time, they were constructing the main hall of Gwakhwang-sa Temple, then the headquarters of Korean Buddhism.<sup>69</sup> On February 18, 1937, the abbots of the parish head temples had a meeting in Seoul in which they emphasized the necessity of establishing the national headquarters of Korean Buddhism at its national level. On February 25, 1937, the abbots officially met and elected the 14 members of the drafting committee for this national temple's construction. This committee's members then met from February 26 to March 1, 1937. On March 5, the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Committee for Constructing Korean Buddhism's Head Temple was held. On May 5, they completely deconstructed the main hall, built in the traditional style, of Bocheon-gyo, a new nationalistic religion, in the County of Jeong-eup, North Jeolla Province in order to reconstruct it as the main hall of the head temple of Korean Buddhism in Seoul. The intention was to replace the Japanese style main hall of Gakhwang-sa Temple. On July 16, Korean Buddhists obtained approval for the main hall's construction from the Japanese colonial government. On October 11, they held the ceremony to install the ridgepole of the building.

In the middle of construction, on August 23, 1937, Bak Hanyeong, president of Jung-ang buljeon, Abbot Gim Jeongseop of Jeondeung-sa Temple, and Secretary I Yeong-u of the Department of Religious Affairs at Beomeo-sa Temple, along with Official Hong Seongmo of Japanese Governor-General's Office and Vice President Gim Gyeongju (b. 1896) of Jung-ang buljeon, visited the construction site of Gakhwang-sa Temple and took a group photo.<sup>70</sup>

One year after the Sino-Japanese War on July 7, 1937, on June 9, 1938, Bak Hanyeong visited the Central Administration and expressed his intention to resign from the presidency of the seminary.<sup>71</sup> On November 24, 1938, he

---

<sup>66</sup> Ibid, 8.

<sup>67</sup> Hwaecom-sa Temple in Gurye County, South Jeolla Province was added to the parish head temple in 1920. So, the system of the 31 parish head temples was completed.

<sup>68</sup> *Bulgyo sibo* 29 (December 1<sup>st</sup>, 1937): 5.

<sup>69</sup> Im Hyeobong, 36.

<sup>70</sup> *Bulgyo*, n.s., 8 (November 1<sup>st</sup>, 1937): 50.

<sup>71</sup> Im Hyeobong, 37.

officially resigned as president and Gim Gyeongju was approved as the acting president.<sup>72</sup> He might be reluctant to support imperial Japan which seriously required all of Korean Buddhist leaders to support it after the beginning of Sino-Japanese War. On December 21, he was appointed as professor emeritus.<sup>73</sup> On June 19, 1940, Jung-ang buljeon was named to Hyehwa jeonmun hakgyo and the Japanese pro-institutional Buddhist scholar Takahashi Toru became its president. On September 30, 1944, one year before liberation from Japan, the Japanese colonial government closed Hyehwa jeonmun hakgyo.

Late in the occupation period, the Japanese imperial government comprehensively mobilized all Korean and Japanese human and natural resources and seriously encouraged young Koreans to volunteer for the Japanese military. The measures imposed upon the Koreans during this time by Japan's occupation forces were seriously oppressive. However, Bak Hanyeong concentrated on teaching Buddhism to monk-students at the Traditional Buddhist Monastic Seminary in Daewon-am Hermitage, affiliated to Gaeun-sa Temple and did not directly engage in politics or other forms of social activism at all. He simply published a few writings during the most oppressive period. On the other hand, he did not actively participate in promoting Japan's imperialist agenda either.

As he did not only positively resist Japanese colonialism but he also did not publicly demand Korea's independence from Japan, he was totally different from Han Yongun and Gim Seongsuk, activists for the independence movement. Because he was not a vocal supporter of Japanese imperialism, we should also differentiate him from prominent pro-Japanese anti-peacemakers such as Gwon Sangno, Gim Taeheup (1899-1989), I Jong-uk, and others. If he had wanted to keep an important position in Korean Buddhist institutions, he should have been a pro-Japanese anti-peacemaker. Because he disliked participating in pro-Japanese imperial activities, he retired from official positions in the Korean Buddhist establishment.

## 5. The Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples

### 5.1. Korean Buddhist Temple properties

The Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples<sup>74</sup> proclaimed by the Office of the Japanese Governor-General in 1911 continued to influence the management

<sup>72</sup> *Ilgwang* 9 (March 16<sup>th</sup>, 1939): 44.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>74</sup> See Seok Boin & Seok Iljin, "Ilje sidae ui Bulgyo jeongchaek gwa Hanguk Bulgyo gyodan" (Japan's Policy on Korean Buddhism and the Korean Buddhist Order during Japan's Occupation Period), in *Sudara* (Sūtra) 10 (1995): 182-195; and Seok Wondon & Seok Dong-il, "Ilje-ha Bulgyo-gye ui chinil-e gwanhayeo" (Korean Buddhism's Pro-Japanese Attitude during Japan's Occupation Period), in *Sudara* 10 (1995): 196-213.

of Buddhist properties. The traditional temples still hold the rights to huge areas of land and forests. Most of the temples' income derived from agricultural lands, belonging to temples during the Japanese occupation period (1910-45).<sup>75</sup> The management of temple properties became an urgent issue for Korean Buddhists even immediately after the Joseon Dynasty opened up the nation to foreign nations. Korean Buddhism, which was weakened and became feeble during the severe persecution of the Joseon Dynasty, could not sustain the impact of foreign religious influences, Western Christianity and Japanese Buddhism, supported by foreign nations.

Korean Buddhist intellectuals tried to modernize Korean Buddhists by establishing modernized schools. They appropriated the temple properties to establish modern schools in an improper way. Some monastics also appropriated the temple properties for their private interest by selling the lands. Korean Buddhism lost a lot of the temple properties at the time.<sup>76</sup> So, the Korean government designated the Wonheung-sa Temple as the head temple of Korean Buddhism on January 25, 1902 after establishing it near the palace in Seoul. The government founded the Office for Management of Temples and Shrines as an administrative sub-unit of the Royal Court Administration at the Wonheung-sa Temple in July, 1902. The office issued the ordinance of temples with 36 articles.

According to the ordinance, the office proclaimed the Wonheung-sa Temple as the national headquarters of Korean Buddhism and appointed sixteen temples as the provincial headquarters, each of which represents some area across the Korean Peninsula. For instance, first, Bongeun-sa Temple represents the left area of the Gyeonggi Province; second, Bongseon-sa Temple the right area of the Gyeonggi Province; third, Yongju-sa Temple the southern part of the Gyeonggi Province; fourth, Magok-sa Temple the South Chungcheong Province; fifth, Beopju-sa Temple the North Chungcheong Province; sixth, Songgwang-sa Temple the South Jeolla Province; seventh, Geumsan-sa Temple the North Jeolla Province; eighth, Haein-sa Temple the right area of the Gyeongsang Province; ninth, Donghwa-sa Temple the left area of the Gyeongsang Province;

---

<sup>75</sup> See '2.2. Ilje sidae sachal toji ui byeoncheon' (The Transformation of Korean Buddhist Temple Lands during Japan's Occupation Period) (76-83) in Gim Eungcheol, "Bulgyo sachal budongsan ui siltae wa hwalyong bang-an" (The Status Quo of Korean Buddhist Real Estates and Some Ways to Use Them) (69-112), in the *Hanguk Bulgyo sawon gyeongje hwalseong-hwa bang-an* (Some Ways to Vitalize Korean Buddhist Temple Economy), the proceedings of an academic seminar, held by the Institute for Korean Buddhist Social Science, the Central Saṅgha University on November 20, 1996.

<sup>76</sup> See '2. Sachal jaesan gwa sachallyeong' (Korean Buddhist Temple Properties and the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples ) (pp. 150-157) in Gim Gwangsik, "Baek Yongseong Seunim gwa Ilje-ha ui sachal jaesan sachallyeong" (Ven. Baek Yongseong, Korean Buddhist Temple Properties and Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples during Japan's Occupation Period) in the *Daegak sasang* (Maha Bodhi Thought) 4 (2001): 147-187.

tenth, Tongdo-sa Temple the southern part of the Gyeongsang Province; eleventh, Woljeong-sa Temple the southern part of Gangwon Province; twelfth, Yujeom-sa Temple the northern part of Gangwon Province; thirteenth, Seogwang-sa Temple the southern part of the Hamgyeong Province; fourteenth, Gwiju-sa Temple the northern part of the Hamgyeong Province; fifteenth, Bohyeon-sa Temple the Pyeong-an Province; and sixteenth, Singwang-sa Temple the Hwanghae Province. Later, the office added ten temples to the provincial head temples, which became the origin of the system of Korean Buddhist parish head.

If we look at the preface to the detailed explanations on the ordinance, issued in 1902, we can see that the government was aware of how seriously the perverted monastics had appropriated the temple properties. We can also understand very easily that the ordinance was essentially made by the government to protect the temple properties. The Articles 25-7 of the detailed explanations prescribe the examination of temple lands and forests and the mandating of a record in order to thoroughly manage the temple properties. A copy of the record on each temple properties should be kept in the temple, the provincial head temple and the national head temple respectively.

Some monastics, represented by I Bodam (b. 1859) of Bongwon-sa Temple in Seoul, made a request to the government in 1903 that temple properties should be managed independently of the government's control. The Office for the Management of Temples and Shrines was abolished and the position of Wonheung-sa Temple as the national headquarters of Korean Buddhism was lost in 1904. The management of the temple properties was not much improved because of the short duration of the office.

Japan established a puppet government in Korea in 1905. The Japanese puppet government announced the ordinance on the management of Korean temples and allowed Japanese temples and organizations to manage Korean temples in 1906. The measurement legalized Japanese Buddhist influences on Korean Buddhism. Many Korean temples were entrusted to Japanese organizations.

To fund modern schools, the Buddhist leaders sold temple properties. This caused Korean Buddhism to lose a lot of temple properties.<sup>77</sup> The thirteen Buddhist monastic representatives, representing thirteen provinces, established the Organization for Research on Buddhism at the Wonheung-sa Temple, created the thirteen provincial chapters, assigning each chapter in each province, and elected Hong Wolcho (1858-1934) as the president on the 19<sup>th</sup> day of February in 1906. The organization founded a school named Myeongjin (Principal: I Bodam), current Dongguk University, at Wonheung-sa Temple on May 8, 1906. Na Cheongho (1875-1934) and others taught students at Bongeun-sa Temple independent of the group. Many modern schools were founded in the provincial temples.

---

<sup>77</sup> See footnote # 4 in Gim Gwangsik, 152.

The following is a list of modern schools before 1910 in which Japan annexed the Korean territory: Haein-sa Temple established the Myeonglip School in 1906; Yongju-sa Temple the Myeonghwa School in 1906; Geonbong-sa Temple the Bongmyeong School in 1906; Beomeo-sa Temple the Myeongjeong School in 1906; Seogwang-sa Temple the Seogwang-sa Elementary School in 1906; Daeheung-sa Temple the Daeheung Elementary School in 1906; Daeseung-sa Temple the Gyeongheung School along with Gimnyong-sa, Namjang-sa, Yongmun-sa, Myeongbong-sa and Gyeongheung-sa Temples in 1907; Wibong-sa Temple the Bongik School in 1907; and Hwaecom-sa Temple the Simmyeong School along with Cheoneun-sa, Tae-an-sa, and Gwaneum-sa Temples in 1909.<sup>78</sup>

The education department of the Japanese puppet government issued an official order on monastic education and the protection of the temple properties on March 6, 1907. The department of internal affairs issued orders to examine the properties of shrines and temples comprehensively on February 1, 1908. The department also issued an official order for twelve province offices to protect the local temple properties in July 1908. According to the official order, some monastics appropriated the land in the name of educational purposes and sold it out for the sake of their own personal interests so that the majority of monastics complained about the loss of the temple properties. The central government strongly recommended that local officials should protect temple properties in order to contain the complaints by the majority of monastics about the loss of the temple properties.<sup>79</sup>

## 5.2. The Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples

With the government's request, Japanese scholars, Sekino Tadashi (1867-1935), Watanabe Toru (1878-1967) and others, investigated the historical remains on the Korean Peninsula and were near completion of their investigation by the end of 1909. Watanabe Toru was involved in making the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples in 1911 and was a key figure in the management of temple properties even in 1920's.

The following "Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples" was approved by Japanese Governor-General on May 29 and proclaimed on June 3, 1911 after Japan officially annexed Korea on August 29, 1910. An enforcement ordinance that comprised the eight articles was announced on July 8 and was enforced

---

<sup>78</sup> Refer to the list of modern schools from 1906 to 1927 in the Education Board of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, ed., *Jogye jongsu: Geun-hyeondae pyeon* (The History of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism: Modern and Present Periods) (Seoul: Jogye-jong chulpan-sa, 2001), 69.

<sup>79</sup> For the content of the official order, refer to the July 29, 1908 issue of the daily newspaper *Hwangseong sinmun* and the July 30, 1908 issue of the daily newspaper *Daehan maeil sinbo*.

from September 1, 1911. The “Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples,” proclaimed by the Japanese Government-General in 1911, is as follows:

- Article 1: When one merges, moves, abolishes a temple or temples, one should get permissions from the Japanese Governor-General. When one changes the temple’s location and/or name, one should also get permissions from the Japanese Governor-General.
- Article 2: If one cannot get permission from a local governor, one cannot use the temples for any other purposes except for the transmission of Buddhism, the propagation of Buddhist teaching, the performance of Buddhist rituals and the monastic residential quarters.
- Article 3: After each parish head temple makes articles on relations between the head temple and the branch temples, the monastic ordinance, the ritualistic manuals and other miscellaneous ones, one should get permission to implement them from the Governor-General.
- Article 4: The abbot represents a temple. One is supposed to manage temple properties, monastic business and religious affairs.
- Article 5: One cannot sell any temple properties such as land, forest, buildings, Buddha images, stone architects, old manuscripts, old calligraphies and paintings and other precious materials without permission from the Governor-General.
- Article 6: The penalty for violating one of the above articles is subject to imprisonment for more than two years or a fine of less than 500 yen.
- Article 7: The Governor-General shall make the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples in addition to the above six articles if needed.

A Supplementary Provision: The Governor-General shall determine the date to enforce these regulations.<sup>80</sup>

The enforcement ordinance also established the parish system of Korean Buddhism prescribing relations between the 30 parish head temples and the respective branch temples. The 30 head temples obtained an approval of their articles from the Governor-General’s Office after they modeled the Haein-sa Temple’s articles, which granted the abbots many privileged rights to manage the temple properties. The 30 head temples are as follows:

- Four Temples in Gyeonggi Province: Bongeun-sa Temple, Bongseon-sa Temple, Yongju-sa Temple and Jeondeung-sa Temple;
- Five Temples in North Gyeongsang Province: Donghwa-sa Temple, Eunhae-sa Temple, Goun-sa Temple, Gimyong-sa Temple and Girim-sa Temple;
- Three Temples in South Gyeongsang Province: Haein-sa Temple, Tongdo-sa Temple and Beomeo-sa Temple;

---

<sup>80</sup> Seo Jeongdae, ed., *Jongdan beomnyeong-jip* (The Collection of the Regulations and Rules of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism), revised edition (Seoul: Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, 2001), 797-799.

Four Temples in South Jeolla Province: Daeheung-sa Temple, Baegyang-sa Temple, Songgwang-sa Temple and Seonam-sa Temple;

Two Temples in North Jeolla Province: Wibong-sa Temple and Boseok-sa Temple;

One Temple in South Chungcheong Province: Magok-sa Temple;

One Temple in North Chungcheong Province: Beopju-sa Temple;

Three Temples in Gangwon Province: Geonbong-sa Temple, Yujeom-sa Temple and Woljeong-sa Temple;

Two Temples in Hwanghae Province: Paeyeop-sa Temple and Seongbul-sa Temple;

Two Temples in South Pyeong-an Province: Yeongmyeong-sa Temple and Beopheung-sa Temple;

One Temple in North Pyeong-an Province: Bohyeon-sa Temple; and

Two Temples in South Hamgyeong Province: Seogwang-sa Temple and Gwiju-sa Temple.

Hwaeom-sa Temple in South Jeolla Province was added to the parish head temple in 1920. So, the system of the 31 parish head temples was completed. The fourth and fifth articles of the ordinance state the management of temple properties is under the responsibility of each temple's abbot. The abbot should receive supervision from the Japanese Governor-General. The Japanese Governor-General Office made the law to control Korean Buddhism through the abbots of the parish main temples to the greatest extent. The seventh article of the enforcement ordinance states that the abbot should submit all of financial data of the temple's movable properties and real estate to the Japanese Governor-General Office in five months after inauguration and should report to the same office in five days if the change of the temple properties takes place. The third article of the ordinance proscribes that each parish head temple's articles should be approved by the Governor-General.

The Governor-General Office also issued the Ordinance of Confucian Centers in 1911 and the Ordinance of Christian Churches in 1915 and put them under the control of the Japanese Governor-General in 1915. Unlike Korean religious centers, the Governor-General Office promulgated special ordinance to protect Japanese Buddhist temples and Shinto shrines in 1915. The Governor-General Office supervised the drafting of the articles of parish head temples and drove Korean Buddhists to include Japanese traditional holidays not related with Buddhism and the memorial days of previous Japanese emperors in temple rituals in order to be loyal to Japan as colonial subjects.

The parish system paved ways for the Japanese Governor-General to rule Korean Buddhism very smoothly. To effectively rule Korean Buddhism, the Japanese government included the parish system under the bureaucratic hierarchy. The Governor-General was able to approve the abbot of each parish head temple and the local governor the abbot of each branch temple. The abbot of each parish head temple could appoint the abbots of the branch temples. The monastic power was absolutely centered on the temple abbots through alienating normal monks.

The viable candidate for abbotship was one who showed strong loyalty to the Governor-General. Without the approval of Japan's Governor-General it was impossible for an individual to secure the numerous privileges of being an abbot. Abbots had the absolute right to sell and manage temple properties. Abbots voluntarily helped Japan rule the Korean Peninsula in order to secure and preserve their positions from the Japanese occupation forces. Their loyalty to Japan was their ticket to fame, good positions and economic prosperity.

### **5.3. The ordinance's aftereffects**

After proclaiming the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples, the Japanese Governor-General Office concretized them in many ways. For example, the secretary of state affairs ordered the province governors to examine the monastic members and their curriculum vitae on August 17, 1911 and to propagate the main purport of the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples. Based upon the ordinance, the government began to approve the abbot of each parish head temple from November 17, 1911 and to permit the articles and bylaws of each parish head temple and the assignment of some branch temples to it from September 2, 1912. The Governor-General Office promulgated the scope of the Korean monastic hierarchy on September 19, 1911 and the exemplary explanations on how to obtain the monastic hierarchical titles on March 8, 1912.

The abbots of the 30 parish head temples met to make the united temple articles on June 17-22, 1912. The minister of the department of internal affairs issued a directive on how to give permission for people who want to cut the trees in the temple forests and/or sites on August 12, a directive on how to regulate the temple's stamp and that of its abbot on September 26, 1912, and an official order not to take the leaves from the temple forests on December 28, 1912. Each year, the Governor-General Office examined the status quo of Korean Buddhism, including the number of monastics, laymen, missionaries and temples in detail since 1912. The government issued a decree on the management of monastic registrations in 1916.

In the 1910's, the Governor-General Office arranged for abbots and Buddhist leaders to observe the advanced systems of Japanese temples, to meet with the emperor and to have special meetings with the Governor-General very frequently in order to receive favor from them. From August 31 to September 24, 1917, a group of Buddhist leaders including Gim Guha, I Hoegwang, Gang Daeryeon, Na Cheongho, Gwak Beopgyeong (b. 1877), Gim Yonggok, I Jiyeong, Gim Sangsuk, and Gwon Sangno, visited Japan and examined the advanced systems of temples.

Even though Japan made the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples and smoothly controlled Korean Buddhists, Korean monastics and Buddhists appreciated its control of Buddhist properties. They thought that the Governor-General Office's control protected Korean Buddhist temple properties from being sold and lost. Moreover, Japan's good treatment of Korean Buddhism



contrasted with that received from the government during the Joseon Dynasty, which persecuted Buddhism and even prohibited Buddhist monastics from going into the cities. Naturally, this made Korean Buddhists and monastics appreciate Japan and its Governor-General Office.<sup>81</sup>

The Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples shifted the relations between the parish head temple and its branch temples from a religious dimension to the government's administrative one. That is, the ordinance changed relations between Buddhist temples and between the government's administrative units and Korean Buddhist monastic ones into the system of bureaucratic hierarchy. The monastic power was centered on the abbot of each parish head temple in all aspects. Before the ordinance, each abbot was generally recommended in the general assembly of each temple's all monastic members according to Korean monastic tradition. Afterwards, the relation between the abbot and the temple monastic members became bureaucratic. Basically, the temples were put under the effective control of the Japanese government.

However, in the late 1910's, Korean Buddhists began to be aware of the Japanese Governor-General Office's real intention and to strongly protest against its occupation of the Korean Peninsula. For example, on August 21, 1918, the Ullambana Ceremonial Day, Gim Yeon-il, a monk of Beopjeong-sa Temple on Jeju Island, delivered in front of more than 30 devotees a public speech in which he predicted that a Buddhist emperor would appear and recover the status of the independence of Korea. He suggested that Korean Buddhists kill Japanese officials and kick out Japanese traders. He declared himself to be the Buddhist emperor. He appointed high military officials and made an armed uprising with four hundred devotees. On October 5, 1918, two monks Jeong Guryong and Gang Minsu participated in the uprising. They burned Japanese offices, hit Japanese residents and cut the electric lines. Also, there was an article in the June 5, 1918 issue of the daily newspaper *Maeil sinbo*, which reported the abbots' privatization of temple properties. However, the cases of the abbots' privatization had not been reported before the article.

On March 1, 1919, Korean people declared independence from Japan and massively demonstrated throughout the nation to take it back from Japan. After the March 1<sup>st</sup> Movement, young Korean Buddhist leaders began to seriously realize the negative aspects of the ordinance and Japanese imperialism in Korean Buddhism and tried to solve the problems of Korean Buddhism from a stance of independence, not relying on the occupation forces.

On November 15, 1919 in Shanghai, China, twelve monks, representatives of the Federation of Korean Buddhist Monks, including Gim Gyeongsan, O Seongwol and Gim Guha, declared the manifesto for independence from Japan under assumed names, in which they demanded traditional Korean monasticism

---

<sup>81</sup> Refer to "2.1.2. Ilje ui jonggyo jeongchaek gwa sachallyeong" (Japan's Policy on Korean Religion and the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples) in the Education Board of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, ed., 59-63.

to be recovered from Japanized Buddhism. The manifesto followed the famous declaration for independence from Japan declared on March 1, 1919. It was distributed to Europe and Korean Peninsula. We cannot identify most of the monks for now. Even so, two identified monks, O Seongwol and Gim Guha, of them ironically married later.<sup>82</sup>

It was printed and distributed in three languages, Korean, Chinese and English. Gim Gysik, ambassador plenipotentiary to the conference, took it to the International Conference for Peace, held in Paris. The whole version of Korean Buddhist Monks' Declaration for Independence, included in the March 1, 1920 issue of the Shanghai edition of the daily newspaper *Dongnip sinmun*,<sup>83</sup> is as follows:

Several thousand Korean monks on behalf of twenty million Korean compatriots and world (citizens) should completely negate Japanese rule on Korea Peninsula and declare its independence from Japanese occupation. Equality and compassion are Buddhism's basic ethics. Anyone who opposes them is the enemy of Buddhism. So, even though Japanese look like to believe in Buddhist teachings, they are addicted to invasionism and militarism, trample down world peace by establishing often anonymous masters, use only violence, invade and destruct neighboring nations which accept the benefits of education, and maltreated their colonial citizens. Two million Koreans seriously grieve from Japanese colonial government's abusive treatments. Especially, since March 1, 1919, Koreans have properly demanded their independence from Japan with extremely peaceful methods. Japan, however, has increased its tyrannical rule against colonial Koreans. Japan's crime must be serious. We, Korean Buddhist monks, cannot keep silent and remain as mere onlookers.

When 33 national representatives presented the Declaration for Independence in the nationwide March 1<sup>st</sup>, 1919 Movement, two monks Han Yongun and Baek Yongseong of our Buddhists participated in the movement as national representatives. Since the movement, so many Buddhists dedicated their bodies and moneys for their nation's independence from Japan. Japan has never regretted its previous bad behaviors. Because it increased the number of policemen, dispatched the more military soldiers, developed oppressive political measures, used our enemies in improper ways and tried to enlarge the evils and the sufferings of 20 million Koreans, we (Buddhists) could not endure Japan's brutal measures. When injustice overwhelmed justice and all citizens suffered from extreme distress, eminent monks and leaders of our Buddhism have taken weapons and fought against enemies. How should not we Korean Buddhists follow the path that previous Buddhist leaders have done?

Two thousand years ago, Buddhist teaching was transmitted to the Korean Peninsula. Across the Korean history, except the Joseon Dynasty that persecuted Buddhism, all dynasties have protected and developed Buddhism.

---

<sup>82</sup> See Gim Gwangsik, "Jeonghwa undong ui jeon-gae gwajeong gwa seonggyeok" (The Development and Character of Purification Buddhist Movement), in Song Wolju, et al., *Gyodan jeonghwa undong gwa Jogye-jong ui oneul* (Purification Buddhist Movement and Current Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Seonu Doryang Press, 2001), 70.

<sup>83</sup> S. 2.1.860-861.

With the patronage of Korean dynasties, we cannot find out any case in other Buddhist nations like that Korean Buddhism has flourished and been prosperous. Korean Buddhism actually guided Japanese Buddhism with the Buddha's friendliness and compassion. We Buddhists can see clear historical facts that during the Japanese ruler Toyotomi Hideyoshi's (1536-1598) invasions in 1592 and in 1597, in each of which the number of soldiers were around 200,000, and other emergent situations, eminent Buddhist monks and myriad lay Buddhists sacrificed their bodies and protected their nations in Korea. Those patriotic actions are none other than the duties that Buddhists should do as citizens because the state has held strong connections to Buddhism. Since Japan annexed Korea through violent and merciless ways (in 1910), it completely ignored Korean history, tradition and culture and tried to eliminate Koreans with the Japanese cultural policies and oppressive measures. Our Korean Buddhism also became victimized and lost its freedom that it had secured through the state's protections for 2,000 years since its introduction. The unique traditions handed down from our eminent Korean Buddhist patriarchs became eliminated and glorious Korean Buddhism was thrown down to miserable situations of destruction.

Therefore, we Buddhists stood up. To accomplish liberty and independence of Korea as Korean citizens (in general), and to save Korean Buddhism of having glorious two-thousand-year history from being Japanized as Korean Buddhists (in particular), our 7,000 Korean monastics stood up in unity. Who can block our vow of protecting nation by sacrificing even our lives and our courage of respecting justice and sacrificing even our lives? We who united and stood up will march even by dropping blood even in wars until to the accomplishment of the great vows.

Dated November 15, 1919 (The first year of Great Korea)

Representatives of the Federation of Korean Buddhist Monks: O Mangwang, I Beobin, Gim Chwisan, Gang Pungdam, Choe Gyeongpa, Bak Beomnin, An Hosan, O Dong-il, Ji Gyeongsan, Jeong Unbong, Bae Sangu, (and) Gim Dongho<sup>84</sup>

On May 12, 1920, some student leaders of Jung-ang hangnim, modern Dongguk University, dispatched notices nationwide to convene the Korean Buddhist Youth Association's Conference. On June 6, they formed the general assembly for projectors and elected provisional executive committee members on the university campus. On June 9, the projectors made the association's articles and bylaws on the campus and on June 26, they held a founding ceremony at the Gwakhwang-sa Temple at which several hundred young Buddhists attended from across the nation and elected the association officers. In October, they held public lectures in many areas to propagate their purport.

According to the founding prospectus, they proposed to experience the Buddha's original spirit centered on saving sentient beings in the world; to establish reasonable religious systems at the administrative level to revive the

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

radiant culture of the Three Kingdoms period; and to overcome the structural problems prevalent in Buddhism and not flexible to accept new information and knowledge, massively coming from outside. They clearly revealed that they established the association to reform the current problematic system.

On December 15, 1920, the association held a preparatory meeting to organize a reform committee with local chapter leaders. The next day, it established the committee and adopted a memorial with eight items to the office of the association of thirty parish head temples. In the memorial, they clearly refuted the system of letting the abbots of the thirty parish head temples monopolize the temples' management.<sup>85</sup> Instead, they suggested all temple affairs should be decided democratically and based on public opinion. They proposed to unify a financial management system of Korean Buddhist temples under the control of the association's office and to have six secretaries under the association's chairman, who would be in charge of six parts: (1) proceedings, (2) general affairs, (3) finance, (4) education, (5) propagation and (6) justice.

#### **5.4. Movements to abolish the ordinance**

After the March 1<sup>st</sup>, 1919 Movement, young Korean Buddhists developed their own philosophy and methods on how to make Korean Buddhism independent from Japanese imperialism. As a result, on June 26, 1920, they founded the Korean Buddhist Youth Association at Gwakhwang-sa Temple in Seoul. Progressive student monks of Jung-ang hangnim, followers of Han Yongun, actively participated in organizing the association. In January 1921, the Korean Buddhist Reform Organization, affiliated with the Korean Buddhist Youth Association, was established. In its prospectus, the organization stated its desire to reform the management of temple properties by the abbots of the thirty parish head temples because the abbots appropriated temple properties and monopolized temple power and management in favor of the ruling Japanese Governor-General Office.

On December 13, 1921, four incorporators, represented by Gim Beopgwang, encouraged local young Buddhists to affiliate so that more than 1,000 persons joined. On December 21, the organization was established at the Korean Buddhist Youth Association Center, adopting articles and bylaws and electing officers. On January 3, 1922, the members of the Korean Buddhist Reform Organization attended the general meeting for the abbots of the thirty parish head temples and asked that the meeting should be for all Korean monastics, not only for abbots. Some abbots agreed with their suggestion and some disagreed with them. Some abbots withdrew from the association of the thirty abbots.

---

<sup>85</sup> See '3. Sachal jaesan ui hoengnyeong, maegak gwa juji jeonhoeng' (The Abbots' Appropriation and Monopolization of Korean Buddhist Temple Properties) in Gim Gwangsik, 157-174.

On January 6, the thirty abbots accepted the organization's suggestion and changed the meeting's title from the general meeting for the abbots of the association of the thirty parish head temples to that for all Korean monastics. On January 7, the participants in the general assembly for all of the Korean monastics decided to abolish the articles and bylaws of the association of the thirty parish head temples, which guaranteed the thirty abbots to monopolize the power in the Buddhist society. They agreed to establish Korean Buddhism's Central Secretariat Office (Chongmu-won) in order to unite all of the Korean Buddhist organizations and to have under the office two departments: the department of theoretical affairs in charge of education and propagation and the department of business affairs in charge of finance and administration.

On March 24, more than 150 members of the Korean Buddhist Reform Organization held a general assembly at Gwakhwang-sa Temple and discussed how to make a proposal on Buddhist reform to the Governor-General Office, to solidify the foundation of the Central Secretariat Office and to concentrate on education and propagation.

On March 26, around 100 monastic members of the organization, including Gang Sinchang, Gim Sangho and Jeong Maeng-il, hosted a public lecture and criticized pro-Japanese abbots. The group put a drum on the back of the most representative pro-Japanese Buddhist leader Gang Daeryeon, abbot of Yongju-sa Temple, one of the parish head temples and beat it as they marched through downtown Seoul from South Gate to East Gate via Jongno Street. They also carried a flag on which was written the phrase, "Gang Daeryeon, the great Māra of Korean Buddhism, should be kicked out." The Jongno Police Department dispatched officers, who broke up the demonstration and detained five leaders. Three days later, on March 29, sixteen leaders, including Gang Sinchang, Gim Sangho, Jeong Maeng-il, Yang Muhong, Gim Jijun, were imprisoned.

On April 19, the 2,284 members of the Korean Buddhist Reform Organization signed a long proposal for abandonment of the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples and submitted it to the Governor-General Office. They demanded the separation of religion and politics and the abolishment of the system of the thirty parish head temples.

In an editorial of the May 31, 1922 issue of *Donga Daily Newspaper*, entitled "Bulgyo gaesin e daehayeo" (On Buddhism's Restoration), Han Yongun strongly urged Korean Buddhists to abolish the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples, the bureaucratized system of Korean Buddhism between the parish head temples and their respective branch temples and the appointment of the abbots by Japanese colonial government. He furthermore requested Korean Buddhists to make autonomous Korean Buddhism's central administration and let them be independent from Japanese colonial government's control. In the second issue of *Dongmyeong* (Brightness of the East) published on January 7, 1923, he interviewed with its reporter and sincerely argued that Korean Buddhism should be independent from Japanese Governor-General Office's policies on Buddhism and if not, Korean Buddhism could not develop.

Some parish abbots sided with young Buddhist monks and other parish abbots with the policies of Japanese Governor-General Office. They fought against each other to take legitimacy and hegemony. On January 7, 1922, based on the suggestions from Korean Buddhist Reform Organization, the participants to the general assembly for all of the Korean monastics decided to abolish the articles and bylaws of the association of the thirty parish head temples, which guaranteed the thirty abbots to monopolize the power in the Buddhist society. Ten parish head temples, i.e., Tongdo-sa Temple, Beomeo-sa Temple, Haein-sa Temple, Seogwang-sa Temple, Baegyang-sa Temple, Wibong-sa Temple, Bongseon-sa Temple, Songgwang-sa Temple, Girim-sa Temple, and Geonbong-sa Temple, agreed with their resolutions and broke away from the association and established in Gwakhwang-sa Temple a new anti-Japanese central administration of Korean Buddhism entitled Korean Buddhism's Order of Seon and Doctrinal Sects and elected Abbot Gwak Beopgyeong of Wibong-sa Temple as its acting secretary-general.

On January 10, 1922, other pro-Japanese parish abbots met and asserted that they would keep the association and elected Hong Poryong as its acting president and on May 29, they established a pro-Japanese central administration of Korean Buddhism entitled Korean Buddhism's Order of Seon and Doctrinal Sects. On October 15, 1922, with direct and/or indirect supports from Japanese Governor-General Office, the abbots, belonged to the pro-Japanese central administration office of Korean Buddhism, established its foundation and got an approval from Japanese colonial government. Only four parish head temples, i.e., Tongdo-sa Temple, Beomeo-sa Temple, Songgwang-sa Temple and Seogwang Temple, remained as the anti-Japanese central administration of Korean Buddhism. On March 22, 1924, the pro-Japanese central administration of Korean Buddhism absorbed the four anti-Japanese parish temples and completely restored the association system of the 30 parish head temples.

On January 6, 1923, the Korean Buddhist Reform Organization held the second general assembly and decided to submit a proposal once more for the Governor-General to abandon the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples. In May, the organization actually proposed that the Governor-General Office should abolish the ordinance. On January 18, 1923, even some conservative abbots of the association of the thirty parish head temples, including Tongdo-sa Temple, Beomeo-sa Temple, and Songgwang-sa Temple, complained about the Governor-General Office's intervention into the association meetings.

On January 7, 1924, Korean Buddhist Youth Association changed from the group leadership system to the unitary leadership, tried to revitalize its movement momentum, and elected Han Yongun as its president. However, due to strong interventions by the colonial government, the association lost its movement momentum. Even though the organization actively pursued the nullification of the ordinance in early 1920's, its activities could not succeed because the abbots, supported by the government authority and the Japanese Governor-General Office, persecuted it. So, in 1924, the Korean Buddhist Youth

Association and its affiliate, the Korean Buddhist Reform Organization, were disbanded.

## 6. Arguments between married and celibate monasticism

### 6.1. Historical background

With the opening of Korean borders to foreign nations, Korean Buddhists were exposed to Japanese Buddhism, which allowed Korean Buddhist priests to marry. As time passed, Japanese Buddhist influence on Korean Buddhism increased in all areas. According to the January 30, 1907 issue of the daily newspaper *Maeil sinbo*, Go Yeongpyo proposed Buddhist monastics to accept marriage and to increase population in his public speech at the Bongwon-sa Temple and Gim Heungso argued against his suggestion.<sup>86</sup> The newspaper reported arguments on married monasticism between them.

In December, 1908, Gang Hongdu sent a petition for the Japanese puppet government to allow monastic marriage and in March<sup>87</sup> and September, 1910, Han Yongun petitioned the government twice to allow freedom for monastics to choose marriage. I Min-u also petitioned the cabinet of the government to permit monastic marriage in April, 1910.<sup>88</sup> Some daily newspapers<sup>89</sup> reported that the Japanese puppet government was supposed to issue an ordinance to allow monastic marriage around May in 1910. However, this did not happen. On August 29, 1910, Japan annexed Korea and established the Japanese Governor-General Office.

There is no statement on the monastic marriage system in the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples of 1911. On May 28, 1912, the thirty abbots of the association of the thirty parish head temples met to unite the articles and bylaws of the thirty parish head temples. They decided not to allow married monks to get any positions in temples, not to give full ordination to married monks and not to permit their wives and children to live in temples. They strictly prohibited monastics from making marriage and eating meat.

Since the March 1<sup>st</sup>, 1919 Movement, many Korean temples dispatched a lot of monastics to engage in advanced Buddhist Studies in Japan. While they were studying, just after they finished studying and just before and after coming back to their homeland, they were married with the serious influence from Japanese Buddhism. After coming back to Korea, they were assigned to their

<sup>86</sup> See the January 30, 1907 issue of *Maeil sinbo*, S.2.1.149.

<sup>87</sup> See the March 29, 1910 issue of *Hwangseong sinmun*, S.2.1.239.

<sup>88</sup> See the April 26, 1910 issue of *Hwangseong sinmun*, S.2.1.244.

<sup>89</sup> Refer to the May 17, 1910 issue of *Daehan maeil sinbo* and *Hwangseong sinmun*, S.2.1.248.

original temples. The young married monastics who had studied in Japan protested against the misconducts of the abbots and the senior monastics, their monopolization of temple properties and their blocking of Buddhist reformative measures. The conservative senior monastic group criticized the young married monastic group in terms of their marriage.

In November 1919, just after the March 1<sup>st</sup>, 1919 Movement, Gang Daeryeon, the abbot of Yongju-sa Temple and a representative pro-Japanese Korean Buddhist leader, submitted his written opinion on the development of Korean Buddhist organizations in nine items to the Japanese Governor-General Saitō Minoru (1858-1936), positively evaluated married monasticism, and asked the governor to popularize married monks and to improve international marriages between Korean monks and Japanese noble daughters and between Korean noble daughters and Japanese monks on the Korean Peninsula.<sup>90</sup>

A person under the pen name of Si Ilseong submitted an article entitled “Joseon Bulgyo cheongnyeon jegun ege” (To Young Korean Buddhists) in the July 4, 1920 issue of *Dong-a ilbo* and suggested young Korean Buddhists not to adopt married monasticism, to put on Western clothes, to wear their hair long and to eat meat but to preserve original Buddhist precepts of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism, to shave their heads and to wear monastic robes.<sup>91</sup> He also suggested to them not to justify married monasticism of Buddhism by adopting the model of Martin Luther (1483-1546) who initiated the married priesthood of Protestant Christianity.

We can easily see in the monthly announcement section of the *Bulgyo* (Buddhism)’s 4<sup>th</sup> issue (October 15, 1924) how popular it was for Korean monks who studied Buddhism in Japan to become married, “We are allowed to present our ideas without restriction nowadays. Even though we did not financially support monks who studied Buddhism and other disciplines for several years in Japan, we strongly anticipated them to do their jobs very well. Even so, immediately after they graduated from their schools in Japan and returned to their nation, they took wives. Even though they studied Buddhism and respected noble scholars in the beginning, they became degenerate and married. So, their masters disliked educating disciples in Buddhism abroad.” (pp. 60-61).

Around 1925, the married group became prevalent. Some married monastics who studied in Japan tried to change the articles and bylaws of each parish head temple to which they belonged in order to get the abbotship at some head temples, represented by Yongju-sa Temple. On October 16, 1925, some abbots of the association of the thirty parish head temples requested to change their articles and bylaws in order to allow for married monks to become abbots. Some abbots strongly objected to their suggestions so that they could not change them successfully.

---

<sup>90</sup> Gang Daeryeon, “Bulgyo gigwan hwakjang uigyeon-seo” (A Written Opinion on the Development of Korean Buddhist Organizations), in *Joseon bulgyo chongbo* 20 (March 20, 1920): 1-10.

<sup>91</sup> S.1.1.43.



Korean Buddhism traditionally followed celibate monasticism prescribed in the regulations of each temple that married monks should not become the abbots. However, as the number of married monks increased, they pushed to revise the regulations in 1925. On October 16, 1925, the Association of the Thirty Parish Head Temples held a general meeting and discussed how to revise the temple regulations on the qualification of abbot candidates. Abbots of Beomeo-sa Temple, Haein-sa Temple and Seogwang-sa Temple strongly opposed the revision of the temple regulations and could not make it possible.

However, in May 1926, the Government-General issued official instructions to provincial governors, stating that they should direct the provincial head temples and their branch temples to change the temple articles and bylaws, making it possible for married monks to become abbots. The office pushed the head temples to revise their regulations. In October, the Government-General granted this. In November, more than ten parish head temples revised their laws and the Government-General approved them.

The Japanese Government-General could control married abbots and Korean Buddhism very easily and effectively because the government could supervise them legally. If they were not loyal to the government, they would lose the jobs on which their families depended. Married monks competed for good positions and privatized temple properties as much as possible. The monastic marriage system made Japanese control of Korean Buddhism be more effective, damaged the independence of Korean Buddhism and led to the loss of numerous temple properties.<sup>92</sup>

## 6.2. Baek Yongseong (1864-1940)

Under this circumstance, in May 1926, along with 127 monastics, Baek Yongseong submitted a memorandum, requesting the Japanese Governor-General Saitō Minoru in Korea and the Secretary of Internal Affairs of Japanese Government in Tōkyō to prohibit Korean monastics from marriage and eating meat. 127 monks, including Korean Buddhist leaders such as Abbot I Daejeon of the Seogwang-sa Temple in the County of Anbyeon, South Hamgyeong Province and Abbot O Hoejin of Haein-sa Temple in the County of Hapcheon, South Gyeongsang Province, signed the memorandum.<sup>93</sup> In his first

---

<sup>92</sup> See “4. Daecheoseung ui bopyeon-hwa wa sachal jaejeong” (The Generalization of Married Monks of Korean Buddhism and the Korean Buddhist Temple Finances) in Gim Gwangsik, *Hanguk geundae bulgyo ui hyeonsil insik* (Understanding of Society in Modern Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1998), 174-182.

<sup>93</sup> There is a detailed information on Baek Yongseong's first memorandum in the newspaper article “Baegyeo seungnyeo yeonmyeong euro beomgye saenghwal geumji jinjeong” (More Than 100 Monks Submitted a Memorandum (to the Government) and Requested (the Government) to Prohibit Korean Monks from Marriage and Non-vegetarianism), in the May 19, 1926 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.59. In the article, Baek

memorandum, Baek Yongseong argued that the marriage monastic system was a main reason for Korean Buddhist monasticism's deterioration.<sup>94</sup> The whole version of his first memorandum is as follows:

To His Excellency Japanese Governor-General Saitō Minoru,

For almost three thousand years since the Buddha came to this mundane world, we have never heard that monks could have taken wives and eaten meats. Nowadays, the religiously satanic persons tainted with five desires destroy Buddhist teachings, take wives, eat meat, violate precepts, and finally demonize temples. They completely abolish Seon practice, Pure Land Buddhism's chanting, and textual research. So, all gods really lament current Korean Buddhism's seriously corrupted reality and the guardian deities of the State are angry at it. The Buddha divided his followers into four groups, of which two groups are monks and nuns and other two groups are laymen and laywomen. The monastic monks and nuns, comprising two groups, should be prohibited from marriage and eating meats, concentrate on mind cultivation, comprehend all of Buddhist teachings, transmit them to later generations, understand all phenomena's impermanence, be detached from delusion, and realize (Buddha) nature and finally accomplish Buddhahood. The lay men and women, consisting of other two groups, should marry and have children, raise them, host memorial services for their ancestors with filial piety, dedicate themselves to various fields of industry, follow justice, practice reasonable actions, implement polite manners, keep trust, and preserve benevolence. They also should provide happiness to others with their kindness, remove sufferings from others with their compassion, and take the Bodhisattva precepts. If (monks) are married and live in society, they should be lay Buddhists. If a monk takes a wife, he should be removed from the temple and be disrobed based on monastic rules. However, Korean monks take wives and eat meats, pollute pure temples, and completely abolish Seon centers, chanting centers and monastic seminaries. We should consider those married monks to Buddhism's great enemies. It can be likened just as an insect originates from and destroys a nutshell. Just as the insects nesting in a lion eat the lion's flesh and finally kill the lion, monks originate from the Buddha's teachings and destroy the Buddha.

Monks have the duties that they should keep monastic precepts and cultivate their minds. How can they revise the articles and bylaws of temples and allow married monastics to become their abbots? Moreover, how can they petition the revised articles and bylaws to Japanese colonial government and ask it to approve them? We cannot express the shames with our mouths. We

---

Yongseong was described as the abbot of Beomeo-sa Temple in Busan. I think that it was wrong information on Baek Yongseong.

<sup>94</sup> I Cheolgyo and Gim Gwangsik, comps., *Hanguk geun hyeondae Bulgyo jaryo jeonjip*, vol. 68: *Bulgyo jeonghwa bunjaeng jaryo* (Source Materials of Modern and Contemporary Buddhism, vol. 68: Source Materials of Purification Buddhist Movement) (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1996), 262-263 and Ha Dongsan, comp. and Gim Taeheup, ed., *Yongseong seonsa eorok* (Seon Master Baek Yongseong's Analects) (Seoul: Samjang yeokhoe, 1941), 2: 26-27. There are some differences between two versions. I used *Seon Master Baek Yongseong's Analects* for translation here.

should prohibit them from revising them. If we do not keep them from it, we will produce an undesirable problem in the future. We should remove married monks and married abbots (from the temples), observe current serious problems (which originated from married monasticism), and not let (the married monasticism) be the future's serious lamentations. Monks should keep the (celibate) precepts inherited from Buddhas and patriarchs. The *Fourfold Rules of Discipline*, a vinaya text of Dharmaguptaka Sect, that Korean Buddhism has considered an authoritative monastic discipline text, describes how seriously monks should preserve celibate monkhood, so all Korean Buddhists should know how important the celibate precepts for monks are. If there are not lay Buddhists, we do not need to discuss married monks. Because there are lay Buddhists, there are celibate monks. Married monks and their non-vegetarianism should not be allowed. We strongly request you to consider our memorandum's (main ideas).

Dated May 1926

Signatures affixed for 127 representatives including Baek Yongseong who represent 4,000 celibate Korean monks<sup>95</sup>

The monthly magazine *Joseon bulgyo* introduced the complete version of his memorandum in its 27<sup>th</sup> issue, published on July 11, 1926. The Japanese colonial government disagreed with Baek Yongseong, contending that it could not reject Korean Buddhism's voluntary requests to revise the articles and bylaws of each parish head temple and its branch temples and to allow married monks to become the abbots. Even though Korean Buddhists debated against and in favor of married monasticism, the majority of abbots of the parish head temples kept silent and reluctantly accepted married monasticism.

The pro-Japanese *Joseon bulgyo* is the official monthly magazine for Joseon bulgyo-dan (Society for Propagating Buddhism in Korea) that Japanese Buddhist sects active in Korea sponsored and established. The editor and publisher was Nakamura Kentaro. The society published the magazine from the 1<sup>st</sup> issue (May 11, 1924) to the 121<sup>st</sup> issue (June 1, 1936). It published the magazine from the 1<sup>st</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> issues in the mixed form of the Korean and Japanese languages and from the 13<sup>th</sup> issue only in the Japanese language. Pro-Japanese Korean leaders such as I Yunyong (1854-1939), Han Changsu (1862-1921), Gwon Junghyeon (1854-1934), I Wanyong (1858-1926) and Bak Yeonghyo and Japanese leaders actively participated in the society and educated Korean Buddhists to become pro-Japanese Koreans.<sup>96</sup>

In September 1926, sided with Koreans who opposed married monasticism, Baek Yongseong sent another letter to the Japanese Governor-General Saitō

---

<sup>95</sup> I Cheolgyo and Gim Gwangsik, comps., 68: 262-263 and Ha Dongsan, comp., 2: 26-27. There are some differences between two versions. I used *Seon Master Baek Yongseong's Works* for translation.

<sup>96</sup> I Cheolgyo and Gim Gwangsik, comps., 68: 19-21.

Minoru in Seoul and the Secretary of Internal Affairs of the Japanese Government in Tōkyō. Continuing the spirit of the first memorandum, he expressed his ideas in concrete terms in the second memorandum. For example, he stated that because it was difficult for Korean monks to recover the non-marriage monastic system completely, it would be realistic for them to divide monkhood into two groups, married priests and unmarried monks. He requested the government to assign at least some parish head temples to unmarried monks<sup>97</sup> in his second memorandum.<sup>98</sup> The complete version of his second memorandum is as follows:

Buddhism classifies Buddhists in four groups, (1) unmarried monks, (2) unmarried nuns, (3) lay men and (4) lay women. Lay Buddhists, consisting of the third and fourth groups, should receive five cardinal precepts, practice pure ethics, and have their occupations for living. Therefore, the *Huayan Sūtra* says, “Bodhisattvas should be satisfied with their wives, and they should not appeal to other wives and concubines.” The *sūtra* even says, “Even though Bodhisattvas have their wives, they should not be attached to them.” The two groups of lay Buddhists are allowed to have only one wife or one husband. (Some says that if his wife cannot produce children, he is allowed to get a concubine.) The two groups of monastics are nuns and monks. Monks should receive and preserve 250 precepts and nuns 348 precepts. The precepts are prescribed in the vinaya texts. They also should get (Mahāyāna Buddhism’s) ten major precepts and forty eight minor ones (listed in the *Brahma Net Sūtra*). If they receive above-mentioned precepts, they should not take wives and husbands and eat meats at all. If (a monk) gets a relationship with a lady, he will be kicked out from a temple and will be forced to disrobe. Therefore, the *Fourfold Rules of Discipline* says, “Although a monk puts his penis into the mouth of poisoned snakes, he should not put it into a lady’s vagina.” The *Lengyan jing* (Skt., *Śūraṅgama-Sūtra*) says, “If you cultivate concentration, you should transcend defilements. If you do not remove wavering mind, you could not overcome defilements. Even though you are wise and constantly develop meditation, you are subject to fall down to evil paths. The *Fourfold Rules of Discipline* says, “If a monk marries, he is supposed to disrobe permanently.” The case can be likened just as a person who cuts off his head cannot be revived at all. Nowadays, Korean monks who took wives and ate meat transformed pure temples to satanic polluted ones and did not want to keep celibate monastic duties. I really lament current Korean Buddhism’s corrupted reality.

If monks accept marriage system and non-vegetarianism, how can we differentiate them from laypersons? I strongly request you to prohibit monks

<sup>97</sup> See Gim Gwangsik, “1926 nyeon bulgyo-gye ui daecheo sigyung-non gwa Baek Yongseong ui geonbaekseo” (Baek Yongseong’s Memoranda and Married and Non-vegetarian Monasticism in 1926), in his *Hanguk geundae bulgyo ui hyeonsil insik*, 177-215.

<sup>98</sup> I Cheolgyo and Gim Gwangsik, comps., 68: 263-265; and Ha Dongsan, comp., 2: 27-28. There are also some differences between two versions. I used *Seon Master Baek Yongseong’s Analects* for translation.

from taking marriage monasticism and non-vegetarianism. If not, please make married monks return their 250 monk precepts (to their vinaya and tonsure masters), let them disrobe, and cause them to be laypersons. For now, because married and non-vegetarian monks control temples and isolate (celibate Seon) practitioners and elderly monks, several thousands of (celibate monks) cannot secure temples and centers to stay. I hope that they should have places to live. I strongly request Your Excellencies to prohibit married and non-vegetarian monks from living in temples. If not, please arrange at least several parish head temples for unmarried and vegetarian monks and let them cultivate their minds and practice Seon without problems.<sup>99</sup>

Like above, referring to the *Huayan*, *Śūramgama* and *Brahma Net Sūtra* and the *Fourfold Rules of Discipline*, he criticized Japanese policies on Korean Buddhism. He concluded in it that Japanese colonial government should prohibit monks from taking non-vegetarianism and married monasticism. He strongly suggested in it that if the government cannot eliminate married monasticism in Korean Buddhism, it should give at least several parish head temples to celibate monks and let them recover Korean Buddhism's traditional celibate monasticism at least in the given temples.<sup>100</sup>

Although Baek Yongseong twice submitted memoranda to the Japanese colonial government in Seoul and the Japanese government in Tōkyō in May and September 1926, more than ten parish head temples of the thirty-one parish head temples revised their temple articles and bylaws and allowed married monks to become abbots in late 1926. Because he was disappointed at Korean Buddhism's reactions, he did not expect a favorable outcome. True to expectations, he did not receive support from the majority of Korean monks in trying to recover celibate monasticism and vegetarianism in Korean Buddhism.

In 1927, he officially established a new religion named "Great Enlightenment Religion" (Daegak-gyo) and disconnected his affiliation to traditional Korean Buddhism. He abandoned his monk registers registered at two temples Haein-sa Temple and Beomeo-sa Temple. He sent content-certified letters to the two temples from which he wanted to disconnect. He used the name "Great Enlightenment" (Daegak) from 1922 in such cases as Daegak Religion and Daegak Church.<sup>101</sup> In 1921, he moved the Society for Translation of the Buddhist Tripitaka from Gahoe-dong to 2 Bongik-dong, Jongno-gu, downtown Seoul. In 1922, for the first time he used term "Great Enlightenment Religion" on the Buddha's birthday at the newly moved Daegak-sa Temple and used to call the temple as Daegak Church. He also called the Buddha as the Great Enlightenment in the first version of *Record of Eight Stages in the Buddha's Biography* published on September 8, 1922 at Daegak Church.

---

<sup>99</sup> Ibid.

<sup>100</sup> Gim Gwangsik, *Yongseong*, 166-167.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid, 182-184.

In 1927, he systematized the doctrine of the Great Enlightenment Religion in *Origin of Great Enlightenment Religion (Daegak-gyo wollyu)* and its religion's rituals and belief systems in *Rituals of Great Enlightenment Religion (Daegak-gyo uisik)*, a handbook for Buddhist ritual services such as worship, offering, prayer, marriage, memorial and funeral services. He included in the ritual manual many modernized songs that he composed for the masses and propagated the new religion to his believers. He incorporated western musical techniques and made the songs. He learned the techniques from a Chinese layperson with whom he met while traveling to China. He wanted to perform the rituals completely in Korean.

The married monastics who studied in Japan needed good positions, including abbotship, to support their families financially and pushed the temples to allow for the married monks to become abbots with strong support from Japan's Governor-General Office in mid 1920's. They were seriously eager to secure financial support for their families and hoped to privatize the temples' finances for themselves and their families. The government also needed them who were well trained in Buddhism in Japan and would support its policies. When the government allowed married monks to marry and to become abbots, they needed to be loyal to the government to continuously keep the privileged positions.

### 6.3. Bak Hanyeong (1870-1948)

Like Baek Yongseong, Bak Hanyeong criticized married monasticism and strongly advocated celibate monasticism. However, unlike Baek Yongseong who actively protested against married monasticism and strongly opposed the Japanese Government-General's policy, Bak Hanyeong attempted to publish a text book on vinaya entitled *Gyehak yakjeon* (Introduction to Vinaya), educate monk students at Jung-ang buljeon, and preserve celibate monasticism in Korean Buddhism in 1926.<sup>102</sup> Even though both Baek Yongseong and Bak Hanyeong criticized married monasticism made official on April 25, 1872 by Emperor Meiji and popularized in the middle of 1920's during the colonial period, 1910-1945, both were different in dealing with the issue.

The *Gyehak yakjeon* constituted three chapters. Its first chapter outlined vinaya and its historical backgrounds,<sup>103</sup> its second chapter detailed vinaya by introducing novice monastic precepts, full monastic precepts, Bodhisattva

---

<sup>102</sup> Gim Hyotan annotated and translated *Gyehak yakjeon* (Introduction to Vinaya) (Seoul: Dongguk yeokgyeong-won, 2000). She also appended an article to her annotated and translated book and explained the text and its meanings in the article "Seokjeon Bak Hanyeong ui *Gyehak yakjeon* gwa yeoksa-jeok seonggyeok" (Bak Hanyeong's *Gyehak yakjeon* (Introduction to Vinaya) and its Historical Connotation), 205-245.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid, 21-66.

precepts, and the four major offenses of the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra*,<sup>104</sup> a Chinese origin,<sup>105</sup> and its third chapter concluded the book by citing the concluding verse of the *Brahma Net Sūtra*,<sup>106</sup> a major text of Mahāyāna Bodhisattva precepts. He outlined the aforementioned sets of precepts from various textual sources in the book.<sup>107</sup> He cited the concluding verse of the *Brahma Net Sūtra* and placed stress on the benefit of preserving precepts in his book's concluding part.<sup>108</sup>

Bak Hanyeong literally and extensively introduced the four major offenses from the sixth fascicle<sup>109</sup> of *Śūraṅgama Sūtra*, i.e., (1) having sexual relations, (2) killing beings, (3) stealing, and (4) lying<sup>110</sup> and commented on the precepts in his book.<sup>111</sup> He arranged a large portion and introduced the four precepts from the scripture and his comments on them in the main body of his book.<sup>112</sup> He strongly took the scriptural evidences of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism from the scripture's first and second precepts. He conservatively and literally interpreted the precepts and loyally accepted the traditionally-adopted celibate monasticism and vegetarianism unlike Han Yongun who very progressively and freely interpreted the precepts and justified married monasticism and non-vegetarianism.

We can infer two major objectives of the movement, celibate monasticism and non-vegetarianism, from the first and second major offences of the scripture. The *Brahma Net Sūtra*, generally accepted as a major text on Mahāyāna Bodhisattva precepts in East Asian Buddhism, introduced four major Bodhisattva precepts in the following sequence, (1) no killing, (2) no stealing, (3) no sexual relations, and (4) no lying. The *Fourfold Rules of Discipline* of the Dharmagupta sect (of Indian Buddhism) in 60 fascicles for the authoritative text of the full monastic ordination outlined the precepts in the following sequence, (1) no sexual relations, (2) no stealing, (3) no killing, and (4) no lying. The *Fourfold Rules of Discipline* more strongly backed up celibate monasticism than the *Brahma Net Sūtra*.

He preferred the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* to the *Brahma Net Sūtra* and the *Fourfold Rules of Discipline* because the former scripture more strongly emphasized celibate monasticism and non-vegetarianism than the latter ones. By referring to the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra*, he strengthened and attempted to restore the tradition of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism in Korean Buddhism

<sup>104</sup> T.19.945.105b24-155b4.

<sup>105</sup> Gim Hyotan, 67-148.

<sup>106</sup> T.24.1484.1009c1010a21.

<sup>107</sup> Gim Hyotan, 149-151.

<sup>108</sup> T.24.1484.1009c19-1010a21, Gim Hyotan, 149-151, 203-204, and Shigeru Osuka, trans., *The Very Mahayana Buddhist Ethics: Introduction and Translation of the Fan-wan-ching* (Tokyo: Chuo University Press, 2005), 123-124.

<sup>109</sup> T.19.945.128b12-132c26.

<sup>110</sup> Gim Hyotan, 220.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid, 115-140.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid.

Japanized during the colonial period. So, he seriously focused on the scripture's first precept for backing up celibate monasticism and its second precept for supporting vegetarianism and attempted to revitalize traditional monasticism based on the two precepts. He cited the first precept from the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* and theoretically supported celibate monasticism as follows:

Ānanda, how can we define the precept as the control of our minds? If all sentient beings living in the six realms of existence are not obscene, they will not take the cycle of birth and death. You are supposed to cultivate concentration and remove defilements. If you do not remove your lewd mind, you cannot remove defilements. Even though you accumulate wisdom and enter deep meditation, if you do not remove sexual desire, you will be born as a demon in next life. You will be a king of demons in the best case, a subject of the king in the intermediate one and a maid of the king in the lowest one. Each demon says that he already obtained supreme enlightenment. After my death, the demons will prosper in the age of the end of the dharma, crave by sexual desire, pretend to be teachers, guide all sentient beings to fall prey to passion, and let them lose the path to enlightenment. If you want to guide sentient beings to cultivate concentration, you should remove their sexual desire. This is the first definite and purified injunction presented by all Buddhas of three periods.

Therefore, Ānanda, if you do not remove sexual desire but practice meditation, It is like figuring you boil sands and make steamed rice. Why? You are not able to make steamed rice with sands at all. If you crave with sexual desire, even though you contend that you already obtained the fruit of enlightenment, you are not able to accomplish enlightenment based on the sexual desire. If you have sexual desire, you are supposed to transmigrate from here to there. How can you obtain the Buddha's enlightenment? Only after you completely remove sexual desire in your mind and body, you are possible to obtain the Buddha's enlightenment. If someone says like me, he is supposed to teach sentient beings like the Buddha. If not, he is supposed to teach them like Pāpīyān, the demon king.<sup>113</sup>

As seen above, the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* required all monks not to crave with sexual desire but to seek for enlightenment. It prioritized the precept of prohibiting monks from making sexual actions and marriages to other major precepts such as no killing, no stealing and no lying. Bak Hanyeong extensively commented on the above-cited passage and emphasized celibate monasticism.<sup>114</sup> He cited the second precept of non-killing from the scripture and theoretically advocated vegetarianism as follows:

Ānanda, if all sentient beings of the six realms of existence do not have killing minds, they will not take the cycle of birth and death. You are supposed to cultivate concentration and remove defilements. If you do not remove your

<sup>113</sup> T.19.945.131c16-132a2 and Gim Hyotan, 118, 122.

<sup>114</sup> Gim Hyotan, 118-125.



killing minds, you are not able to remove defilements. Even though you accumulate wisdom and enter deep meditation, if you remove your killing minds, you are supposed to be born as a demon in the next life. You will be a king of demons in the best case, a flying demon-spirit or a demon general in the intermediate one and a demon-spirit residing on earth in the lowest one. Each demon says that he already obtained supreme enlightenment. After my death, the demons will prosper in the age of the end of the dharma and they will say to themselves that they eat meat and take a path to enlightenment.

Ānanda, I allowed monks to eat five kinds of pure meat. Because I transformed plants and vegetables to the meat based on my miraculous power, it did not originally have life. Because the land of Brahmans was hot and wet and had a lot of sands and rocks, I could not easily plant and cultivate vegetables and plants in the land. Because I transformed them to meats and called them meats based on my compassion and miraculous power, you could eat them. How can sentient beings eat meat as Buddhists after my death? You should know that even though meat-eating persons say that they open their mind and obtain concentration, they are no more than demon-spirits residing on earth. If they produce karma effects, they will transmigrate in the cycle of birth and death. We cannot define them as the Buddha's disciples. They will not stop to kill and eat each other. How can they transcend the three realms (of the desire realm, the form realm and the formless realm)? You should guide sentient beings not to kill beings but to cultivate concentration. This is the first definite and purified injunction presented by all Buddhas of three periods.

Therefore, Ānanda, if anyone kills beings and practices meditation, he is like a person who blocks his ears, shouts loudly and lets other persons not to hear his shout. The more we hide, the more we reveal. Monks, pure or common, and Bodhisattvas do not tramp live plants when they walk on the fields. How can they pull up them? How can they who profess themselves as compassionate persons eat the blood and meat of sentient beings and be fed up with them?

Ānanda, if a monk does not put on cotton clothes, silk clothes, leather shoes and woolen clothes and does not consume milk and dairy products, he is a sincere Buddhist and will be born in the three realms again. If he puts on and eats a part of his flesh, he is supposed to make karma effects. So, because people eat the crops planted and cultivated on the land, he cannot take his feet from the land. If monks do not eat and put a part of their flesh from their minds, we can tell that they might liberate themselves from bondage. If we accept and preserve this precept of no killing, we can say that we might follow the Buddha's words. If not, we can say that we follow the words of Pāpiyān, the demon king.<sup>115</sup>

As seen above, the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* required all monks not to kill sentient beings but to preserve vegetarianism. He extensively commented on the above-cited passage and emphasized vegetarianism.<sup>116</sup> The five types of pure meat constitute (1) the meat that they have not seen to be slaughtered for their meals, (2) the meat that they have not heard to be butchered for their meals, (3) the

<sup>115</sup> T.19.945.132a3-29 and Gim Hyotan, 126-127, 129-130.

<sup>116</sup> Gim Hyotan, 126-132.

meat that they have not suspected to be killed for their meals, (4) the meat of a naturally died animal, and (5) the meat of an animal that the birds left behind after eating. The scripture actively and extensively interpreted non-killing precept and suggested Buddhists not to eat meat.

#### 6.4. Various different opinions

*Joseon bulgyo* arranged the series of a special section on Korean Buddhism's married monasticism and non-vegetarianism in its three consecutive issues, i.e., the 27<sup>th</sup> issue (July 11, 1926), pp. 2-33, the 28<sup>th</sup> issue (August 11, 1926), pp. 13-27, and the 29<sup>th</sup> issue (September 11, 1926), pp. 18-25 and extensively discussed the issues. 27 persons submitted their articles to its three serial issues in total. We can group those in three according to their arguments: the agreeing group, the disagreeing group, and the neutral group. Japanese Buddhists who submitted their opinions to the monthly magazine generally supported the issues and Korean Buddhists who published their articles in it generally opposed them. The reporter of the special section had a note on why he arranged the series as follows:

The issue of Korean Buddhism's married monasticism and non-vegetarianism became distinct after married monks could become abbots through the revision of each parish head temple and its branch temples. Regarding the issue, some monks and laypersons agreed with married monasticism and non-vegetarianism and some disagreed with them. For example, the group of Baek Yongseong and his followers developed the strong antagonistic movement against the issue and recently made the issue to be controversial among the intellectuals on the Korean Peninsula. It actually seems like a crisis in Korean Buddhism. This fall, I introduce its cons and pros in a special section. I also introduce various views of the leaders of Japanese Buddhist sects and various perspectives of the Japanese colonial government's administrators in religion. I believe that this special section on the issue might be helpful to the readers.<sup>117</sup>

Nakamura Sanshō, editor of *Joseon bulgyo*, introduced the current issue regarding married monasticism and non-vegetarianism in its 27<sup>th</sup> issue (July 11, 1926).<sup>118</sup> Even though Korean Buddhism did not legally and traditionally allow married monks, married Korean monks who studied Buddhism in Japan attempted to legalize and make official married monasticism in 1925 in order to become abbots of parish head temples and receive their approval from the Japanese Government-General. Baek Yongseong and his followers opposed their arguments and petitioned the Government-General not to allow married monasticism and non-vegetarianism in 1926.

<sup>117</sup> *Joseon bulgyo* 27 (July 11, 1926): 2.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, 2-8.

He also introduced a historical background of married monasticism in Japan. Shinran (1173-1262), the founder of Pure Land Shin Sect, initiated married monasticism and non-vegetarianism in Japanese Buddhism. After Emperor Meiji made married monasticism and non-vegetarianism official on April 25, 1872, all Japanese Buddhist sects officially adopted married monasticism and non-vegetarianism. Korean Buddhism accepted and popularized married monasticism and non-vegetarianism from Japanese Buddhism during the Japanese occupation.

He arranged a section for the controversial issues of married monasticism and non-vegetarianism among Korean Buddhists in the three issues of *Joseon bulgyo*. He wanted to include different opinions by various contributors on the issues in the monthly magazine. The contributors discussed the issues from different angles. For example, some argued that because the issues were personal, not institutional, the government should not intervene in them. Some referred to Buddhist texts, conservatively defined precepts and defended traditional celibate monasticism and vegetarianism. Some theoretically advocated married monasticism and meat eating, adopting the concept of desire and society and contending that Buddhists could not get away from desire and society. Some considered married monasticism and meat eating as a modernized form.

If we adopted the institutional paradigm of ecumenism and sectarianism, the advocates of married monasticism were ecumenical because they wanted to include married monks and celibate monks together in a same order. They argued that Korean Buddhism should allow each monk to choose his marriage status, ecumenically accepting celibate monks and married monks in its united order. However, the supporters of celibate monks were sectarian because they wanted to exclude married monks from Korean Buddhism. They contended that Korean Buddhism should preserve traditional celibate monasticism and remove married monks in its united order.

Because both sides fought against each other and attempted to persuade their counterparts, I think we can utilize the paradigm of ecumenism and sectarianism and analyze the arguments between married and unmarried monasticism in the middle of 1920's. The same paradigm was loyally succeeded by the supporters and opponents of the movement in 1954-1970. While the supporters of the movement were sectarian because they attempted to remove married monks from Korean Buddhism and establish celibate monasticism of Korean Buddhism, the opponents of the movement were ecumenical because they wanted to include married monks and celibate monks in the same order.

The arguments on married monasticism and non-vegetarianism in the middle of 1920's and in the movement were based on orthopraxy, not orthodoxy. While opponents of married monasticism and non-vegetarianism referred to vinaya texts, not doctrinal texts, and conservatively and literally interpreted precepts, advocates of married monasticism and non-vegetarianism also referred to praxis texts and freely and progressively interpreted precepts. Both sides

argued against their counterparts and attempted to convince their arguments to them. They developed their arguments based on the different interpretations of orthopraxy (monasticism).

Even one of the leading daily newspapers *Dong-a ilbo* strongly voiced up for married monasticism and non-vegetarianism in its May 2, 1926 editorial entitled “Korean Buddhists should Accept Married Monasticism and Non-vegetarianism in Accordance with Human Nature” and suggested Korean Buddhists to accept them and to modernize Korean Buddhism. It sided with the advocates of non-vegetarianism and married monasticism and supported them to Japanize Korean Buddhism. *Joseon bulgyo* translated the editorial in Japanese and introduced the Japanese translation as a case of backing up married monasticism and non-vegetarianism in its 27<sup>th</sup> issue as follows:

## 1

I heard that one group of Korean Buddhists submitted a memorandum to the Japanese Governor-General Office. (According to its saying), Buddhist monks should not eat meat and take wives. They argued that non-vegetarianism and married monasticism prove the degeneration of Buddhism. They might believe that the decline of current Korean Buddhism originated from non-vegetarianism and married monasticism. They might conjecture that the future prosperity of Korean Buddhism comes from celibate monasticism and vegetarianism.

## 2

As far as Buddhism is a religion, it should make human beings to be prosperous, not to be destructive. Of course, in reality, in some case, because a nation believed in a religion, it was destroyed. At least, because a religion had its long history, regardless of its real and concrete situation, the original objectives of a religion is to make efforts to flourish human society, not to destroy it. We do not need to think it complicatedly. To eat meat is necessary for the nutrition of human beings. Marriage is a natural practice of the human primordial instinct for the prosperity of a human species. No marriage means for us to stop the posterity of human beings and to deteriorate physiologically the human beings, and for the descendants not to succeed to their ancestors. No marriage seems like the destruction of the human race. Some religious believers cannot escape the misfortune. *If the success and decline of Buddhism are based on married monasticism and non-vegetarianism, we should definitely say that the success of Buddhism in the human world hastens the human destruction.* If this religion continues to survive, it should have the problems and sickness greater than the abovementioned problems in Korea.

## 3

Most modern religions are not existent based on the punishment of self-destruction and a hell. We should connect human characters such as the thought, emotion and actions of human beings spring from themselves to great universe and call the universe as a god. We should let religious persons experience the

inspiration of the great Buddha, cause them to understand the original intention that the Buddha leads, make them to realize it, and finally let them cleanse, purify and cultivate the original instinct. Therefore, we should affirm a definition that “Religion is not based on the punishment of authority, a law, and a hell, but on freedom, justice and love.”

## 4

Viewed from the aforementioned meanings, Buddhists in our society currently do not volunteer to hasten self-destruction but go forward to the future and try to improve present situations. They should change unreasonable conventional doctrines and principles and should make actions in accordance with human nature and religious objectives. We could not expect that they do not improve but inherit unreasonable conventional doctrines and principles. In actuality, *we should suspect that Korean Buddhism as a current religion provides some benefit to the masses. Seen from any perspective, I think that if Korean Buddhists use all properties that current Korean Buddhist temples have for education and social business without wasting them, they can clearly have limitless effects.* Korean Buddhists discuss the topics of non-vegetarianism and married monasticism from their ignorance. The subjects that they explained are the side issues. However, because the topics that they discussed are importantly connected to human nature, I briefly pointed out their senseless arguments.<sup>119</sup>

As above, the *Dong-a ilbo* strongly suggested that Korean Buddhists should accept Japanized married monasticism and non-vegetarianism, arguing that marriage and non-vegetarianism are based on human nature. Even though advocates for married monasticism and non-vegetarianism approached the topics from various standpoints, the daily newspaper presented a case on how to argue against traditional Korean Buddhism’s celibate monasticism and vegetarianism and to defend newly adopted Japanese Buddhism’s married monasticism and non-vegetarianism.

*Joseon bulgyo* included the article by Yu Man-gyeom (1889-1944), head of the section of religion of the department of education in the Japanese Government-General, in its 17<sup>th</sup> issue. The article explained the Japanese colonial government’s official perspective on two issues, non-vegetarianism and married monasticism. According to the article, the government does not like to intervene in the issues, but follows Korean Buddhist requests and approves the revision of the articles and bylaws of the parish head temples and their branch temples in which married monks can become temple abbots. However, we can easily notice that the government indirectly backs up married monasticism and non-vegetarianism derived from Japanese Buddhism. The whole version of the article is as follows:

**The government just listens to the voices of Korean Buddhist monks**

---

<sup>119</sup> Ibid, 29-30.

Because married monasticism and non-vegetarianism destroy the foundation of Korean Buddhist tradition inherited from ancient times, those are the tremendously important issues. It seems that if we observe current Korean Buddhist monks, many of them became polluted and chaotic and destroyed married monasticism. Seen from Buddhism's cultivation of mind, Buddhist monks should preserve the vinaya of celibate monasticism. However, observed from the administrative standpoint, because the majority of Korean Buddhist monks already raised a question about celibate monasticism, accepted it, and wanted to revise the articles and bylaws of the parish head temples and their branch temples, the government should accept their wish of revising the temple laws without oppressing it. In sum, because people have freedom in belief and the religious rules are nothing but moral ones, the government should not strictly impose the law in implementing the religious rules. As far as each sect does not offend against public morals, it can freely change whatever rules they have. Therefore, because Korean Buddhist monks wanted to revise the laws and the revision of the laws did not violate public morality, the government should listen to their voices and accept their demands. When they consider married monasticism of Korean Buddhist monks, the government should not oppress and their request and should not encourage it.

#### **The transition of a period and the life of religious persons**

Let us change a topic a little bit. For instance, I think that if we look at other religions such as Christianity, and if we refer to other Buddhist sects such as Pure Land Shin Buddhism, even though Christianity and Shin Buddhism do not have strict vinaya precepts of vegetarianism and celibate monasticism, they very well cultivate human minds and allude to civilize them in society. Even though they do not admit their wives, they should accept their children because the children are not guilty in their being born and they should take care of the children on their humanitarian and social responsibilities. We can discuss married monasticism not from the religious perspective but the humanistic one. If a monk actually has his wife, he is a hypocrite and pretends to preserve the precept of celibacy. I think that if they made official their actual marital status and adjust themselves to the normal persons, they can develop Buddhism. We can think that religious persons should abandon strict discipline and concentrate on social cultivation. Even though we think so, because Buddhism has various precepts, Buddhists strictly preserve them, differentiate their lives from the secular world, and guide secular persons (to the holy lives). Because religious persons carry out a sublime mission here, they should wish it to the utmost. Buddhists should really follow the rules that the founder of Buddhism defined. If not, is it the secularization or the change of a period? Because in accordance with the change of a period, various ways of thinking are different, diverse issues originated. Therefore, I think various methods of change should be introduced here.

#### **The moral monks who strictly preserve precepts obtain the better respect**

Non-vegetarianism and married monasticism became the popular wishes of general Korean Buddhist monks. Even though they change the rules, they might not violate good morals and manners. From the government's perspective, the change of the rules is nothing but the rules that Buddhist monks themselves

transformed. Concretely speaking, Korean Buddhism traditionally allows only celibate monks to become temple abbots. However, it currently revised the rules of the parish head temples and their branch temples and allowed married monks to become the abbots. *You might think that the government encouraged married monasticism. I think that because jades and stones are mixed, we should differentiate jades from stones, therefore, we should respect the celibate monks who strictly keep precepts.* If a married monk has an additional lover, we should criticize him. Because Korean Buddhism currently revised the temple articles and bylaws, Korean Buddhist monks can marry without any problems. If many married monks have other lovers and popularize the custom, we should criticize them as corrupt persons. If so, people might consider them as unwholesome monks in society.

#### **Korean Buddhist monks should be disillusioned**

*Korean Buddhist monks should improve their conduct and dignity. Because temples have their properties, Korean Buddhist monks are easily addicted to material pleasure and they used to forget their duty as religious persons. Korean Buddhists should change their attitude. To design Buddhism's development, they should have progressive thinking. If they are secluded in mountains and they just consider the recollection of Buddhist scriptures as the best things, the Buddhist teachings are like dead objects. Therefore, if we greatly reflect the above case in here, first, Buddhists should make objectives in Buddhist organizations, guide mundane human minds in society, and increase the number of Buddhists. Even though it looks like easy for us to consider the above objectives of Buddhism, it is very difficult for us to implement them in Korean Buddhism. Because Korean Buddhism has considerable properties, it seems like easy for us to propagate Buddhism. It should be the second and third in its priority. The most primary and needed thing that Korean Buddhism should consider is the education of Buddhists. I think that if Korean Buddhism implements this strategy, it cannot lose any competition with other religions. I pay attention to how much it focuses (on the education of Buddhists) and I really hope Buddhists to greatly develop Buddhism in the future.*<sup>120</sup>

Even though Korean Buddhists who submitted their articles for publication in the *Joseon bulgyo* generally opposed married monasticism and non-vegetarianism, we can see in the monthly magazine some of Korean Buddhists supported the issue. For example, I Honseong considered that he did not need to comment on the memorandum to the Japanese Governor-General Saitō Minoru signed by 127 monks including Baek Yongseong. He also thought that they did not need to submit it to the Japanese Governor-General because precepts such as no-marriage and vegetarianism were totally personal, not public and contended that married monasticism was not directly related with the future of Korean Buddhism. He indirectly indicated we Korean Buddhists could popularize Buddhism among the masses through married monasticism.<sup>121</sup>

<sup>120</sup> Ibid, 31-32.

<sup>121</sup> *Joseon bulgyo* 27 (July 11, 1926): 13-14.

Hong Jinhyeok radically interpreted precepts and advocated married monasticism and meat eating and strongly criticized Baek Yongseong and his followers who conservatively interpreted precepts and followed unmarried monasticism and vegetarianism.<sup>122</sup> He discussed and advocated non-vegetarianism and married monasticism in the following four items: (1) A human instinct has never been changed from the primitive times; (2) a human body is the source of action and value; (3) monastics are the members of a human society; and (4) Buddhism should be a teaching for humans, not other beings. Because he has anthropocentrism, he centered his arguments on humans.

He argued that monks should follow human instinct and if monks keep celibate monastic tradition, it will not be natural for them to live. He positively evaluated physical desire and argued that physical desire ultimately caused human beings to develop their sciences and cultures. He questioned how humans could develop themselves without having desires. He defined celibate monasticism and vegetarianism as not corresponding to human nature and being outdated. He highly evaluated the functions of body and strongly criticized overemphasis on mind that traditional celibate monks did. He suggested that monasticism should not be separated from a secular society. He contended that meats were necessary for the good nutrition and health of humans. He strongly suggested Korean Buddhists to accept married monasticism and non-vegetarianism and to modernize and popularize Korean Buddhism among the masses.

Unlike I Honseong and Hong Jinhyeok, the monthly magazine *Bulgyo* (Buddhism) included a letter to a master by a disciple monk (at Haein-sa Temple) on Mt. Gaya in its 23<sup>rd</sup> issue (May 1, 1926). The author critically introduced how popularly Korean monks who studied in Japan became married in the middle of 1920's, "It is generally told that if a master educates a disciple, he becomes married. Even though a lot of monks studied in Tokyo and came back to their nation of Korea since long times ago, none of them was unmarried."<sup>123</sup>

Im Haebong positively evaluated Japanese Buddhism which supported Korean Buddhism and removed the persecution of Buddhism by the Confucian Joseon Dynasty but negatively argued that married monasticism and non-vegetarianism of Japanese Buddhism polluted and devaluated the Buddhist monastic precepts of no-marriage and no-killing.<sup>124</sup> Gim Songwol,<sup>125</sup> An Seogyeon,<sup>126</sup> Gu Manhwa,<sup>127</sup> Seok Sigyeong,<sup>128</sup> Gim Yeonheo · Bak Daegyul,<sup>129</sup>

<sup>122</sup> Ibid, 20-22.

<sup>123</sup> Gaya sanin (A monk of Mt. Gaya), "Baeun mangdeok (1)" (Ingratitude (the First Letter)), in *Bulgyo* 32 (May 1, 1926): 31.

<sup>124</sup> *Joseon bulgyo* 27 (July 11, 1926): 11-12.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid, 15-17.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid, 24-27.

<sup>127</sup> *Joseon bulgyo* 28 (August 11, 1926): 19.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid, 19-20.



Jeon Ilwon,<sup>130</sup> O Gwansu,<sup>131</sup> Han Jongsu,<sup>132</sup> Gang Taesu,<sup>133</sup> Bak Bogak<sup>134</sup> and Seok Yeongho<sup>135</sup> also claimed that Korean Buddhism should not accept married monasticism but preserve celibate monasticism.

Of them, Im Haebong, Gim Songwol, Seok Sigyeong, O Gwansu, Han Jongsuk, Gan Taesu and Seok Yeongho strongly criticized married monasticism and clearly suggested Korean Buddhists not to accept married monasticism. (Seok) Yeongho conservatively and literally interpreted precepts and strongly advocated celibate monasticism and vegetarianism and vehemently criticized married monasticism and meatism in the monthly magazine *Joseon bulgyo*'s four issues.<sup>136</sup>

However, even though An Seogyeon, Gu Manhwa, Gim Yeonheo · Bak Daegyū, and Bak Bogak also opposed married monasticism, they were moderate and realistic to handle the issue. Because Korean Buddhists had difficulties in removing married monks in Korean Buddhism and its temples, some moderate Korean monks realistically attempted to find out some solutions.

For example, An Seogyeon suggested Korean Buddhists to group monks in three, (1) pure monks who keep the precepts of no-marriage and no-killing, (2) common monks who take wives and eat meat, and (3) quasi-monks. He contended Korean Buddhists should let the first group of monks take charge of Korean Buddhism and its temples, allow the second and third groups of monks to take wives and eat meat and utilize them for Korean Buddhism and its temples.<sup>137</sup>

Gu Manhwa and Bak Bogak strongly negated married monasticism and did not agree with the Japanese government who attempted to allow and make official married monasticism in Korean Buddhism. Even so, if Korean Buddhism was necessary to accept married monasticism, they suggested Korean Buddhists to assign some parish head temples for married monks and celibate monks respectively and let them manage their assigned temples.<sup>138</sup>

Even though Gim Yeonheo · Bak Daegyū strongly advocated celibate monasticism, he attempted to moderately and realistically solve prevalent married monasticism in Korean Buddhism. He suggested how to solve the problem in the following seven items: (1) Seon monks should aim at practicing

---

<sup>129</sup> Ibid, 23-24.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid, 25-26.

<sup>131</sup> *Joseon bulgyo* 29 (September 11, 1926): 18-20.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid, 20.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid, 20-21.

<sup>134</sup> *Joseon bulgyo* 32 (December 11, 1926): 18.

<sup>135</sup> *Joseon bulgyo* 28 (August 11, 1926): 16-18, *Joseon bulgyo* 29: 21-24, *Joseon bulgyo* 31 (November 11, 1926): 30-31, and *Joseon bulgyo* 32 (December 11, 1926): 10.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid.

<sup>137</sup> *Joseon bulgyo* 27 (July 11, 1926): 26.

<sup>138</sup> *Joseon bulgyo* 28 (August 11, 1926): 19 and *Joseon bulgyo* 32 (December 11, 1926): 18.

Seon Buddhism, accomplishing Buddhahood by manifesting the Buddha nature, and saving sentient beings by propagating Buddhism; (2) doctrinal monks should aim at propagating Buddhism and saving sentient beings; (3) because the majority of Chan and doctrinal monks are currently married and eat meat, we should assign them to take care of missionary works and if they do not make missionary works, we should remove them in Korean Buddhism; (4) if a monk does shameful conduct, we should punish him and if a monk does unjust behaviors, we should eternally kick out him from Korean Buddhism; (5) Seon monks should practice Seon in a mountain temple with celibate monks and doctrinal monks should meet people and propagate Buddhism in cities; (6) we should train international Buddhist missionaries in the both traditions of Seon and doctrine and let them educate people in the traditions of foreign nations; and (7) we should establish nursing homes and save senior and unhealthy monks.<sup>139</sup>

Gim Byeogong submitted an article entitled “Joseon bulgyo giu-ron” (Groundless Apprehension of Korean Buddhism) to the 32<sup>nd</sup> issue (February 1, 1927) and the 33<sup>rd</sup> issue (March 1, 1927) of the monthly magazine *Bulgyo* (Buddhism), discussed Korean Buddhism and suggested Korean monastics to reform Korean Buddhism under several items such as organizations, business, a foundation, temples, education, propagation and so on. He strongly encouraged Korean monastics to study Buddhism and other disciplines in Japan and other advanced nations and to minimize side effects of education from their nations. He indicated them not to learn Buddhism and other subjects for their own profits and not to follow married monasticism of Japanese Buddhism.<sup>140</sup>

Gim Gyeongju realistically discussed the living of monks in his article entitled “Seungnyeo ui saenghwal munje” (On the Living of Monks) in the monthly magazine *Bulgyo*’s 100<sup>th</sup> issue (October 1, 1932), pp. 43-51. He discussed in the article the topic in five items such as (1) monastic life, (2) propagation, (3) education, (4) administration, and (5) labor and farming. Because Korean Buddhism adopted married monasticism and non-vegetarianism, married monks were supposed to have their own houses and properties. He contended that because they should have regular income sources to financially support their family, they could not go about asking for alms on street.

Even though Korean Buddhism needed more money for financially supporting married monks, some married monks followed the trend of the times and luxuriously spent a lot of money for their living and clothes. Even so, he suggested Buddhism to make married monks to secure their stable livelihood and let them propagate Buddhism among the masses. If Korean Buddhism did not have monks, nobody could maintain temples. If we did not have monks, none could propagate Buddhism. He argued that if we Korean Buddhists could

<sup>139</sup> *Joseon bulgyo* 28 (August 11, 1926): 24.

<sup>140</sup> Gim Byeogong, “Joseon bulgyo giu-ron (sok)” (Groundless Apprehension of Korean Buddhism (Sequel)), in *Bulgyo* 33 (March 1, 1927): 22-23.

not secure the stable livelihood of married monks, we could not guarantee the future of Korean Buddhism.

I Yongjo, a reformist, submitted an article entitled “Wigi e jingmyeonhan Joseon bulgyo ui wonin gochal” (Critical Review of the Causes of Korean Buddhism’s Crisis) to the 100<sup>th</sup> issue (October 1, 1932) and the combined 101<sup>st</sup> and 102<sup>nd</sup> issue (December 1, 1932) of the *Bulgyo* under the pen name of Mong Jeongsaeng and strongly criticized married monks and especially married abbots. He diagnosed Korean Buddhism’s crisis and concluded that it originated from three major reasons, disharmony, abbots and married monks. He extensively discussed and seriously criticized married monasticism in a section of the article<sup>141</sup> as follows:

Three internal causes of Korean Buddhism’s crisis are the poison of disharmony, that of abbots and that of married monks. The internal cause which we should review most seriously is that of married monks. The poison which we should mostly closely review is the poison of married monks. Many reviewed the two poisons of disharmony and abbots. I might be a first person who publicly discussed the poison of married monks. It might be true that many Buddhists received stress from married monks and might think how much married monks impacted on monasticism.<sup>142</sup>

He generally analyzed in his article that married monks needed to financially support their families and seriously impacted the temple economy. He contended that temples could not invest their limited income to educate monks, make Buddhists and their organizations participate in social activities, and propagate and develop Buddhism in society. He argued that married monks needed to secure the position of abbots, monopolized temple economy and financially supported their family. Married monks used to fight against each other to take the abbot position.

He diagnosed the two poisons of disharmony and abbots originated from married monasticism and married monks ultimately caused Korean Buddhism to be degenerate. He suggested that Buddhists should attempt to recover celibate monasticism as possible as they could even though they could not succeed in doing that. He thought that Korean Buddhists could develop Korean Buddhism based on the strict application of celibate monasticism and the strong practice of Buddhism.

Like I Yongjo, I Unheo (1892-1980), an eminent student of Bak Hanyeong, very critically discussed the poison of married monks. He argued that married monks used to utilize their position as a main means to earn money and to support their family but did not dedicate themselves to actively propagate

---

<sup>141</sup> I Yongjo (Mong Jeongsaeng), “Wigi e jingmyeonhan Joseon bulgyo ui wonin gochal (sok)” (Critical Review of the Causes of Korean Buddhism’s Crisis (Sequel)), in *Bulgyo* 101 (December 1, 1932)– 102: 26-28.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid, 26.

Buddhism in society. He contended that even though married monks pretended to protect and preserve their temples, they were not much interested in their temples but in their family. He very negatively analyzed the poison of married monks from the economic aspect of temples.<sup>143</sup>

They, including two eminent monks Baek Yongseong and Bak Hanyeong, criticized married monks from three aspects, (1) traditional celibate monasticism of Korean Buddhism, (2) the original teaching of vinaya and (3) the economical aspect of temples. They suggested Korean Buddhists to protect celibate monasticism of traditional Korean Buddhism from Japanized Korean Buddhism, recover original Buddhist monasticism prescribed in vinaya texts from degenerate Japanese Buddhism, and keep celibate monasticism not to lose temple economy from the financial support of married monks and their family.

## 7. The Center for Seon Studies

Some Korean Buddhist monastics did not like to engage in sensitive social and political issues, but they dedicated themselves to religious practices during the Japanese occupation period. They revitalized traditional Seon (Chn., Chan; Jpn., Zen) praxis and propagated it to the public in the period. The Seon praxis tradition became weakened during the Joseon Dynasty, which adopted Neo-Confucianism as the state ideology, persecuted Buddhism, and confiscated temple properties. Japanese Buddhists did not focus much on Seon practice in Korea. Korean Seon practitioners intensively practiced Seon Buddhism in many Seon centers, affiliated with various Buddhist monasteries, across the nation.

This group advocated the tradition of celibate monasticism, which Korean Buddhism inherited from Indian Buddhism and Śākyamuni Buddha, the founder of Buddhism. They also practiced vegetarianism, which originated from Chinese Buddhist tradition long ago. After the introduction of Japanese Buddhism to Korea, married monasticism and non-vegetarianism became popular and prevailed. Some Korean Buddhists, although a few in number, advocated Korean Buddhism's traditional unmarried monasticism and vegetarianism which Korean Buddhists had preserved throughout its history. They established the Center for Seon Studies in Seoul and hoped to centralize their demands. The Center for Seon Studies became the headquarters for Korean Seon practitioners for preserving the Korean Buddhist tradition.

They moderately reacted against Japanese imperialism by doing so in terms of a religious perspective. This is in contrast to Korean Buddhists, who vehemently and radically reacted against Japanese colonialism in terms of its political and social dimension. If we look closer, even though they appeared to

---

<sup>143</sup> I Unheo, "Jonggyo wa jonggyo-in eul nonhaya hagin ui gakseong eul chokham" (Encouragement of Monk Students to Realize Current Religious Issues Based on Discussion of the Roles of Religion and Religious Men), in *Hongbeobu* (Missionary Buddhists) 1 (March, 1938): 16.

be transcendental, they indirectly and passively reacted against Japanese Buddhism on a smaller scale and Japanese Imperialism on a larger scale. Even so, they did not positively and actively participate in anti-Japanese activities but indirectly and passively attempted to recover celibate monasticism and vegetarianism from Korean Buddhism Japanized during the Japan's colonial rule.

Because they did not actively participate in anti-Japanese activities, they were not radical like anti-Japanese Korean nationalists and communists but moderate in dealing with the independence. Because they also did not actively support pro-Japanese activists, we are hard to categorize them as pro-Japanese. While both pro-Japanese and anti-Japanese Buddhist leaders engaged themselves to social activities, the participants in the center's activities were basically a-social Buddhists. In conclusion, they did not directly and actively participate in anti-Japanese independence activities during the colonial period but actively and positively practiced Seon Buddhism, an individual, not social, oriented tradition.

After liberation from Japan on August 15, 1945, the center's leaders began to initiate and guide the movement with the government's strong support. They, mostly celibate monks, dexterously labeled themselves as anti-Japanese activists and married monks as pro-Japanese ones. Even though the majority of married monks were not free from pro-Japanese activities in the colonial period, married monks, not celibate Seon practitioners, being very individualistic, mainly participated in anti-Japanese activities. Even so, the movement's activists successfully advertized married monks as pro-Japanese and unmarried monks as anti-Japanese, received strong support from Koreans based on nationalistic sentiment, accomplished the movement, and finally removed married monks from the order.

In 1920, just one year after the 1919 March 1<sup>st</sup> Movement, Korean Seon Buddhism's leaders such as Gim Namjeon (1868-1936),<sup>144</sup> Gang Dobong, and Gim Seokdu<sup>145</sup> initiated a project for founding a Seon center in Seoul in order to revive Korean traditional Seon Buddhism and to overcome Japanized Korean Buddhism.<sup>146</sup> Based on the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples, Japanese legally ruled Korean Buddhism. The Japanese colonial government allowed

---

<sup>144</sup> I Jeong, ed., 30-31.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid, 134.

<sup>146</sup> See '2. Recent Korean Sŏn Masters' (241-257) in Mok Jeong-bae, "Buddhism in Modern Korea," in The Korean Buddhist Research Institute, ed., *The History and Culture of Buddhism in Korea* (Seoul: Dongguk University Press, 1993), 219-261 and also Mok Jeongbae, "Yeoksa pyeon, Geun-hyeondae" (Korean Buddhist History – Modern and Contemporary Times), in Hanguk bulgyo chongnam pyeonjip wiwon-hoe (The Editing Committee of the Comprehensive Collection of Source Materials of Contemporary Korean Buddhism), ed., *Hanguk bulgyo chongnam* (The Comprehensive Collection of Source Materials of Contemporary Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Daehan bulgyo jinheungwon, 1993), 102-106.

married monks in Korean Buddhism's traditional celibate monasticism and furthermore approved married monks as leaders and abbots. The married monks followed Japanese Buddhism's non-vegetarianism, contrary to the long tradition in Korean Buddhism.

They put the Korean-Chinese character *won* 院 in the title of Seonhak-won (Center for Seon Studies) without putting the Korean-Chinese characters *sa* 寺 or *am* 庵, both of which mean temple. If the center has the characters *sa* or *am* in its religious institution's title, it should be controlled by the Japanese Governor-General Office's Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples. They established the center to manage it independently of the Japanese control in the colonial period.<sup>147</sup>

In May 1921, they held a ceremony of Bodhisattva precepts to raise money for establishing the Center for Seon Studies at the Propagation Center of Seogwang-sa Temple in Seoul. Gim Namjeon donated 2000 yen, Gang Dobong 1500 yen, Gim Seokdu 2000 yen and O Seongwol, abbot of Beomeo-sa Temple, promised to donate money received from renting out the Propagation Center of Beomeo-sa Temple in Seoul.

The leaders for establishing the Center for Seon Studies were eminent Korean Seon practitioners. These included Gim Namjeon of Beomeo-sa Temple in Busan; Gang Dobong of Seogwang-sa Temple in the County of Anbyeon, South Hamgyeong Province; Gim Seokdu of Beomeo-sa Temple; Han Seolje of Gwiju-sa Temple in the County of Hamju, South Hamgyeong Province; Song Mangong of Sudeok-sa Temple in the County of Yesan, South Chungcheong Province; O Seongwol of Beomeo-sa Temple; and others.<sup>148</sup> They began to construct the center on August 10, 1921 and completed the construction on November 30, 1921 at 40 Anguk-dong, Jongno-gu, located in downtown Seoul.

The Center for Seon Studies inherited the tradition from the Central Propagation Center of the Imje Seon Sect and the Central Propagation Center of Korean Seon Order. Baek Yongseong was the founding director of the Central Propagation Center of the Korean Seon Order, established on May 26, 1912. He led the center with his junior and close colleague Han Yongun. When the buildings of the Central Propagation Center were demolished, the center's materials were used for the construction of the Center for Seon Studies. When the Central Propagation Center had financial difficulties, Beomeo-sa Temple financially supported the center so that the monks belonging to Beomeo-sa

<sup>147</sup> See the Education Board of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, ed., *op. cit.*, 98.

<sup>148</sup> I Neunghwa enlisted eminent Seon leaders in Korean Buddhism. Those are I Nampa, Jang Bomyeong, O Seongwol, Yun Yeongbong, Bang Hanam, Baek Yongseong, Gim Jesan (1862-1930), Gang Dobong, Gim Eunghae, Gim Namjeon, Sin Hyewol (1862-1937), Bak Seongwol, Yang Honheo, Song Mangong, Jeon Suwol (1855-1928), and others. See his book, *op. cit.*, 128-132. He also mentioned Baek Yongseong as a Seon leader along with Bang Hanam, Baek Hangmyeong, and others in his article "Joseon bulgyo ui samsidae" (Three Periods in Joseon Buddhism), *Bulgyo* 31 (January 1, 1927): 6-11.

Temple participated in the center's activities.<sup>149</sup> They also later participated in establishing the Center for Seon Studies.

The Center for Seon Studies consisted of two buildings, a main hall furnished with two big rooms and a residential hall. Beomeo-sa Temple and the donors including former court ladies supported its construction costs. The following article about the ceremony for raising the building framework for the Center for Seon Studies, dated October 4, 1921, explains why and how the center was established. The incorporators of the center considered Korean Buddhism of the time degenerated and requested Korean Buddhists to recover their institutions such as celibacy and to revitalize Seon Buddhism.<sup>150</sup>

On two days, March 30 and April 1, 1922, 82 monastics, including O Seongwol, Baek Hangmyeong (1867-1929), Hwang Yongeum, and Song Mangong, established the Seon Practitioners' Association as an affiliate organization of the Center for Seon Studies at the center. They transmitted the Korean traditional Seon tradition and kept the celibate monastic system in the colonial period. The association accepted only unmarried monastics as its members.

The Seon Practitioners' Association had its headquarters at the Center for Seon Studies in Anguk-dong and had three departments in its head office, the Department of General Affairs, the Department of Seon Practice and the Department of Finance. It also had local branches at nineteen temples including Mangwol-sa Temple, Jeonghye-sa Temple, Jikji-sa Temple, Baegyang-sa Temple, Beomeo-sa Temple, Bulyeong-sa Temple, Geonbong-sa Temple, Mahayeon-sa Temple, Jangan-sa Temple, Woljeong-sa Temple, Gaesim-sa Temple, Tongdo-sa Temple, Singye-sa Temple, Namjang-sa Temple, Seogwang-sa Temple, Seonam-sa Temple, Cheoneun-sa Temple, Yonghwa-sa Temple and Haein-sa Temple.

On November 3, 1922, the association had their second special general assembly at the Center of Seon Studies and elected Gi Seokho as the acting chairman. On March 29, 1923, the association held the second regular general assembly at the center and elected Gang Dobong as the director of the Department of Seon Practice. On March 15, 1924, the association hosted the third special general assembly at the center and elected Han Yongun as the acting chairman.

In November 1924, the association held the fourth special general assembly at the Center for Seon Studies and the center also established the Female Seon Practitioners' Association and built up the Center Building for Laywomen in front of the monastic residential quarters. On November 15, the association convened the third regular general assembly at the Center for Seon Studies.

<sup>149</sup> Gim Gwangsik, *Yongseong*, 137.

<sup>150</sup> See Min Dogwang, ed., *Hanguk bulgyo seungdan jeonghwa-sa* (The History of Purification Buddhist Movement in Korean Buddhist Monastic Order) (Gyeongju: Hanguk bulgyo seungdan jeonghwa-sa pyeonchan wiwon-hoe, 1996), 18-19.

In 1924, the center had serious financial problems and temporarily moved its headquarters of the Seon Practitioners' Association, an affiliate to the Center for Seon Studies, which the center founded on March 30 - April 1, 1922, to Jikji-sa Temple in the County of Gimcheon, North Gyeongsang Province. The association transmitted traditional Korean Seon Buddhism and kept celibate monasticism and vegetarianism in the colonial period. The association accepted only unmarried monastics as its members.

Even though the Center for Seon Studies and its affiliate, Seon Practitioners' Association aimed at inheriting the authoritative Dharmic lineage from Śākyamuni Buddha and previous patriarchs, purifying Korean Buddhism from the Japanese Buddhist monastic marriage and saving sentient beings in trouble, they struggled with financial problems. At the time, married abbots managed the temples and excluded celibate Seon practitioners. The unmarried Seon practitioners had difficulty in finding temples in which to meditate. In May 1926, the Center for Seon Studies was finally transferred to the Propagation Center of Beomeo-sa Temple due to serious financial need.

In May 1926, due to serious financial problems, the Center for Seon Studies became the Seoul Propagation Center of Beomeo-sa Temple. On January 21, 1931, Gim Jeongeum (1900-1961) reopened the Center for Seon Studies. He accumulated wealth through his acupuncture and oriental medicine practice and using those funds, assembled and supported Seon practitioners who meditated at the center. The center had a regular retreat session for monastics and laymen and invited eminent Seon masters, Song Mangong, Gim Namjeon, Baek Yongseong and others to deliver special lectures on Seon so that it extended the popularity among the lay and monastic groups.

On March 14, 1931, Seon practitioners held the National Conference for Korean Seon Buddhist Practitioners at the Center for Seon Studies and demanded that the government and the association of the 31 parish head temples designate some temples at which unmarried Seon practitioners could live and cultivate their minds. On October 6, the center established its official yearly magazine *Seonwon* (Seon Garden), which included some news on local Seon centers, and it played a central role in uniting local centers under its arms.

On October 15 by the lunar calendar (November 24), 1931, after the one-week intensive prayer period for Kṣitigarbha Bodhisattva begun from November 18, the center began the winter intensive meditation retreat. During the seven-day intensive prayer period, Gim Taeheup lectured on the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*. On the beginning day of the winter intensive meditation, lunar October 15, they hosted a special service and a special lecture by an eminent Chan master at 7 o'clock in the evening. The center appointed Baek Yongseong as spiritual leader. According to the daily schedule, practitioners meditated from 4:00 to 7:00 am, from 9:00 to 11:00 am, from 2:00 to 4:00 pm, and from 7:00 to 9:00 pm. During the intensive retreat, participants were advised to remain silent in the main hall, the meditation hall for female Seon practitioners and the meditation hall for



male Seon practitioners. If needed, they should meet and talk in the center's office. During the meditation period, nobody could make noises anywhere.

According the third issue of *Seonwon* (August 16, 1932), there were 19 Seon centers among 1,338 temples and Seon practitioners numbered 238 among 6,792 monastics (5712 monks and 1080 nuns) in Korea in 1933. Afterwards, the numbers of Seon centers and practitioners increased. However, the number of unmarried monastics became very few. In August 1933, the center applied for establishing the foundation "Korean Buddhist Seon Research Institute" to resolve financial problems institutionally and to improve living and practicing environment for the practitioners. On December 5, 1934, the government approved. Its director was O Seongwol, its advisor Gim Gyeong-un, its president Song Mangong, its vice president Bang Hanam, its standing trustees Gim Jeogeum, O Seongwol and Gim Namjeon and its inspectors Yun Seoho and I Tan-ong.

On January 5, 1935, the Seon practitioners, belonging to the Center for Seon Studies, declared the Constitution of Korean Buddhist Seon Sect and recommended Song Mangong as its representative patriarch and Sin Hyewol (1862-1937), Jeon Suwol (1855-1928)<sup>151</sup> and Bang Hanam to its patriarchs. On March 7 and 8, 1935, they held the national conference for Seon practitioners at the Korean Buddhist Seon Research Institute, made its articles and bylaws and elected a patriarch, a director, some trustees and some representatives. It tried to establish the independent Seon Sect as the united institution for Seon centers and practitioners. Since then, the Center for Seon Studies has been called the Central Seon Center and considered the representative national Seon center.

For the manifesto they issued dated March 7, 1935, we can understand how seriously they considered Korean Seon Buddhism and that they were trying to recover its traditions. They proposed that they should preserve proper Seon teachings and not stray from the teachings. They strongly declared they would maintain and revitalize Korean Seon Buddhism from its degenerated state and preserve celibate monasticism of traditional Korean Buddhism.<sup>152</sup>

On March 13, 1935, the Seon practitioners held the 3<sup>rd</sup> national conference and by demanding of the assembly of Korean Buddhism's Central Administrative Office (Gyomu-won) that there should some temples for the unmarried monastics to practice Seon meditation, passed a resolution to guarantee the ability for practitioners to concentrate on their practice. On March 23, 1938, they convened the national conference for Seon practitioners at the Korean Buddhist Seon Research Institute, entitled "The Regular Seon Conference for Korean Buddhist Seon Sect." By demanding some temples

<sup>151</sup> I Jeong, ed., 221.

<sup>152</sup> Gim Gwangsik, "Ha Dongsan ui bulgyo jeonghwa" (Ha Dongsan's Purification Buddhist Movement), in the Research Institute of the History of Korean Buddhist Orders (Director: Im Deoksan) and Gim Gwangsik, eds., *Beomeo-sa wa bulgyo jeonghwa undong* (Beomeo-sa Temple and Purification Buddhist Movement) (Busan: Yeonggwang doseo, 2008), 573-574.

appropriated for them to concentrate in Seon meditation, they asked the Central Administrative Office to establish a Seon center for the novice Seon practitioners at the Mahayeon Temple on Mt. Geumgang and to secure the praxis centers for celibate monastics on five mountains such as Mt. Jiri, Mt. Gaya, Mt. Odae, Mt. Geumgang and Mt. Myohyang, which rejected their request. They also discussed the issues of the Seon practitioners' health and social welfare.

Even though they used the title "Seon Sect," they actually belonged to the Central Administrative Office and didn't have an independent sect. However, they aimed to establish an independent sect concentrating on Seon practice and to keep the monastic celibate precept by disagreeing with the current Korean Buddhist headquarters, heavily influenced by the married monasticism of Japanese Buddhism.

On February 26, 1941, they held a preaching meeting of eminent monastics. Forty celibate eminent monastics, including I Unheo, I Cheongdam (1902-1971), Song Mangong, Bak Hanyeong, I Hyobong (1888-1966) and Ha Dongsan (1890-1965), attended the meeting.<sup>153</sup> The laymen donated monastic robes to them. The series of preaching continued for ten days. During that time, they lectured on the *Brahmā Net Sūtra*, the most important vinaya text in Mahāyāna Buddhism and emphasized the vinaya, and on the *Sūtra of the Deathbed Injunction*. They hosted a preaching series that explained the central tenets of Korean Seon Buddhism. Laypersons donated monastic robes.

After the gathering, they hosted the conference for Seon practitioners at the Center for Korean Studies and discussed various issues.<sup>154</sup> They organized celibate monks and established the Beomhaeng-dan Organization to commemorate the preaching series and stressed the importance of vinaya and Seon practice in Korean Buddhism.<sup>155</sup> After the preaching, they also held the second regular meeting of the Korean Buddhist Seon Sect<sup>156</sup> and tried to popularize Seon practice and preserve the celibate tradition of Korean Buddhism.

In October, 1942, at the Center for Seon Studies, eight monks, including Han Yongun, O Seongwol and Song Mangong, initiated the publication project of *The Collected Works of Gyeongheo*. Song Gyeongheo (1849-1912) revitalized Seon practice in Modern Korean Buddhism after the long persecution period of Joseon Dynasty. Most modern Korean Seon masters practiced Seon under him and/or belonged to his dharma lineage. All modern Korean Seon practitioners were strongly influenced by him directly or indirectly. They considered him the spiritual leader of Seon Buddhism. Including eight senior initiators, more than forty Seon masters participated in the publication project in order to propagate traditional Korean Seon Buddhism.

---

<sup>153</sup> *Bulgyo sibo* 69 (April 15): 7.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>156</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

Even though the activists of the Center for Seon Studies attempted to recover Korean Seon Buddhist tradition and preserve celibate monasticism and vegetarianism in its early stage, they began to cooperate with and support the policies of the Japanese colonial government, raised funds and collected materials for imperial Japan's military from the beginning of Sino-Japanese War on July 7, 1937. They attended various welcoming and farewell meetings for soldiers. They welcomed soldiers coming from battles and cheered up them going to the battle front. They also operated a free consultation office and suggested Korean Buddhists to change their Korean family names to Japanese family names. They also became cooperative with privileged monks who actually controlled and managed Korean Buddhism under the guidance of the Japanese Government-General.<sup>157</sup>

The center's leaders were not free from pro-Japanese activities but directly and indirectly supported the Japanese colonial government's policies. It was natural that they were not supposed to actively protest against the government and the established group of Korean Buddhism in the colonial period. Even though they had, in the center's early stage, antagonistic attitudes against married monks who actually managed Korean Buddhism as abbots of the parish head temples, they became cooperative with them to secure financial supports from them. Some leaders of the center also became the key leaders of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism established by privileged married monks in 1941 with the support and guidance of the colonial government. For example, Bang Hanam, one of the center's key leaders, was enthroned as the order's supreme patriarch and Song Mangong, Gim Gyeongsan and Song Manam, other three key leaders of the center, were also appointed its advisors.<sup>158</sup>

Even so, the majority of eminent monks who actively participated in the activities of the Center for Seon Studies, including Seol Seogu (1875-1958), I Hyobong, Ha Dongsan, Jeong Geum-o (1896-1968), Yun Goam (1899-1988) and I Cheongdam, became the key leaders of the movement, 1954-1970 and attempted to recover Seon and celibate monasticism from Korean Buddhism Japanized during the Japanese colonial rule, 1910-1945. So, they loyally inherited the spirit of the Center for Seon Studies and successfully recovered the Seon and celibate monastic tradition in Korean Buddhism. They sectarianistically removed married monks from the Jogye Order and completely made it as a sectarian order only for celibate monks upon the completion of the movement. In 1970, removed married monks established another religious institution for themselves they named the Taego Order.

The leaders of celibate monks tactically and cleverly hid their cooperation with the established married monks of Korean Buddhism and the Japanese colonial government, simply generalized married monks as being pro-Japanese

---

<sup>157</sup> Gim Sunseok, *Ilje sidae joseon chongdok-bu ui bulgyo jeongchaek gwa bulgyo ui daeeung* (Japanese Government-General's Policies on Korean Buddhism and Korean Buddhism's Reactions) (Seoul: Gyeongin munhwa-sa, 2004), 146-147.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid, 147.

Buddhists and propagated the movement from the nationalist perspectives among the Korean public. Koreans strongly supported the movement from their nationalist sentiments. The categorization of celibate monks as being anti-Japanese and of married monks as being pro-Japanese was wrong and was not based on historical facts because all Korean Buddhists, regardless of married or unmarried monks, were not free from pro-Japanese activities. They utilized nationalism and received strong support from the Korean public and Buddhists and adopted orthopraxy (precepts) of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism from vinaya texts and theoretically backed up the movement.

## 8. The foundation of Jogye Order

On April 23, 1941, the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, the head temple of which was Taego-sa Temple, modern Jogye-sa Temple, was established.<sup>159</sup> The Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism has continued as the representative and dominating Korean Buddhist order to present. The Government-General Office approved the articles and bylaws of Taego-sa Temple and effectively and legally controlled all Korean temples and monastics through the order's headquarters. The office needed a central administrative and secretariat body of Korean Buddhism, bureaucratized and managed Korean Buddhist temples and monastics through the body and attempted to guide Korean Buddhists to the victory of battles and wars.

Even though progressive Korean Buddhists also attempted to establish their central and united administrative body, effectively develop Korean Buddhism and manage Korean Buddhist temples and monastics continuously from early 1920's, they did not succeed in abolishing the parish system, separating religion from politics, securing autonomous rights, and establishing a central administrative body of Korean Buddhism until 1941. However, because the colonial Japanese government strongly needed a central administrative body of Korean Buddhism for effectively controlling Korean Buddhism, Korean Buddhists were able to establish and officially founded the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism with the strong support and guidance of the Japanese Government-General in 1941.

The Association of the 31 Parish Head Temples held a meeting in August 1935 and passed a resolution in it that it would establish a central administrative body and its head temple for Korean Buddhism. It also organized a committee for establishing its administrative office and its head temple. The association hosted a working-level meeting and concretely discussed how to secure the budget to establish a main hall of the head temple on February 23, 1937. Two

---

<sup>159</sup> See "2.3.2. Jogye-jong ui seongnip gwa jeon-gae" (The Establishment of Jogye Order and its Development) in the Education Board of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, ed., 126-129.

days later, it also held a meeting for 31 abbots and abbots discussed a plan how to establish the central administration of Korean Buddhism on February 25.

The Japanese Government-General convened a meeting for abbots of 31 parish head temples and requested them to devise and submit the laws and regulations related to the head temple of Korean Buddhism on February 26 – 27, 1937. Based on the approval of the Government-General, Korean Buddhists hosted the first meeting at the committee for constructing the head temple of Korean Buddhism and appointed I Jong-uk, Im Seokjin and Cha Sangmyeong as the its executive members, Cha Sangmyeong and Gim Guha as its standing executive members, and Gim Gyeongsan as its advisor on March 5 – 6.

On May 5, they deconstructed the main hall, built in the traditional style, of Bocheon-gyo, a new nationalistic religion, in the County of Jeong-eup, North Jeolla Province in order to reconstruct it as the main hall of the head temple of Korean Buddhism in Seoul. They intended to replace the Japanese-style main hall of Gakhwang-sa Temple. On July 16, Korean Buddhists obtain approval for the main hall's construction from the Japanese colonial government and on July 27, they began to construct the building. On October 11, 1937, they held the ceremony to install the ridgepole of the building. On October 25, 1938, they hosted the inauguration ceremony for the completion of the main hall after the construction of one year and eight months.

On October 26, 1938, the association of 31 parish head temples convened a meeting and organized a provisional committee for handling the issues such as the settlement of the head temple's name and the approval of the temple's articles and bylaws from the Government-General. On May 22, 1939, Korean Buddhists officially petitioned the Government-General to use Taego-sa Temple as the head temple's name. The government approved them to use the name for the head temple. On November 28, 1940, the government convened a meeting of the association and passed a resolution in it that they should change the order's name from Korean Buddhism's Order of Seon and Doctrinal Sects to the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism.

On December 9, Korean Buddhists submitted the "Articles of Taego-sa Temple, the Head Temple of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism" (Joseon bulgyo Jogye-jong chongbonsan Taegosa-beop) to the government for approval. On April 23, 1941 the government revised the Enforcement Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples and approved the Articles of Taego-sa Temple. On May 1, the Jogye Order implemented the Articles of Taego-sa Temple. On June 5, the order held the order's first central assembly, elected Bang Hanam as the first patriarch and next day began the religious affairs administration. On June 23, it petitioned the government to approve the position for Bang Hanam and on August 4, the government complied.

On September 18, it declared six advisors on the religious affairs: Gim Gyeongsan, Gim Guha, Gang Daeryeon, Song Mangong, Song Manam and Jang Seoksang (1872-1947). On September 29, it petitioned the government to approve I Jong-uk as its secretary-general. On October 3, the government

approved. In October, the order appointed several secretaries, that is, Gim Beomnyong (1891-1969) for the General Affairs Department, Im Seokjin (1892-1968) for the Religious Affairs Department, Bak Wonchan for the Finance Department and Heo Yeongho for the Secretariat Department.

With the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War on July 7, 1937 and of the Pacific War begun upon Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, imperial Japan comprehensively drove Koreans to participate in and guided Korean Buddhists to extensively support the wars. Upon its guidance, the Jogye Order actively supported imperial Japan and its military. It encouraged Korean Buddhists to spiritually and materially support the wars, suggested young Korean Buddhists to volunteer for military service, requested Korean Buddhists to change their family names to Japanese family names, recommended them to give up their Korean cultures and thoughts and accept Japanese cultures and thoughts, and asked them to proudly become the citizens of a Japanese emperor.

The Jogye Order was a combined religious body of married priests and unmarried Seon monastics. The unsuitable union began to be broken up after the liberation from Japan on August 15, 1945. By conservatively interpreting vinaya and precepts (orthopraxy), celibate monks developed the movement, 1954-1970, and completely purified the Jogye Order from married monasticism and non-vegetarianism completely influenced by Japanese Buddhism. Removed married monks officially established a new order named Taego Order for themselves in 1970. So, Korean Buddhists institutionally completed the movement in 1970.

The Japanese Government-General made official the establishment of Jogye Order in 1941, the ecumenical order consisting of married and unmarried monks and the central body of Korean Buddhism, and effectively controlled all of the Korean Buddhist temples and organizations through the order's headquarters. Upon the liberation of Korea from Japan in 1945, celibate monks initiated the movement based on President I Seungman's first presidential message on May 20, 1954 and the movement ended up with the government's approval of a new order named Taego Order for married monks, making the established Jogye Order a sectarian order of only unmarried monks.

Because the Jogye Order allowed married monks in the order from 1941 to 1970, it was institutionally ecumenical during the period. Because it institutionally removed married monks from it in 1970, it was institutionally sectarian from 1970 to present. After unmarried monks obtained the order's hegemony, married monks attempted to officially partition the established Jogye Order in two, making each order respectively represent each side. So, married monks separated themselves from the Jogye Order and officially established their own sectarian Taego Order for themselves in 1970. The current Taego Order is more institutionally ecumenical than the current Jogye Order. Unlike the sectarian Jogye Order which does not allow the marriage of monks at all, the marriage of monks is not mandatory but optional in the Taego Order.

## **PART IV**

### **POST-COLONIAL KOREAN BUDDHISM, 1945-1954: THE MOVEMENT'S SPROUT**

#### **1. Institutional discrimination against Buddhism**

Korea was liberated from Japanese occupation on August 15, 1945. On September 7, 1945, the US government established the US military government in South Korea, which was ended with the establishment of the Republic of Korea on August 15, 1948. During the three years between 1945 and 1948, the US military government discriminated against Buddhism and traditional religions in favor of their own religion, Christianity.<sup>1</sup> Based upon the US military government's discriminative policies, Korean Buddhists had difficulty removing Japanese Buddhist influences.

First, the US military government recognized Buddhism, Protestantism and Catholicism and failed to recognize Korean traditional religions such as Cheondo Religion, Jeungsan Religion and other new religions. This policy violated the separation between state and religion, which is clearly included in the US constitution. The measure, imposed by the US military government, discriminated against Korean traditional religions by recognizing and giving

---

<sup>1</sup> See Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, ed., *Jogye jongsae: Geun-hyeondae pyeon* (The History of Korean Buddhist Jogye Order: Modern and Present Periods) (Seoul: Jogye-jong chulpan-sa, 2001), 172-174.

political favors to Christianity, even though the number of Christian believers was only around 3 percent of the South Korean population at that time.

Second, the US military government abolished national holidays that Japan had included during its occupation period, recognizing only Christmas as a national holiday and even excluding the Buddha's birthday.

Third, the US military government gave favor to Christianity. For example, Christians could propagate their teachings through the Seoul Radio Broadcasting Station beginning in March, 1947. The station had actually been the public radio station under Japanese rule. Following the pro-Christianity policy of the US military government, I Seungman's (1875-1965) regime approved the establishment of the Christian Radio Broadcasting Station in December 1954. The regime also established the military chaplain system for only Christianity, including its two major traditions, Protestantism and Catholicism, which was made under the US military's strong influence in 1951 during the Korean War, 1950-1953.

Fourth, the Christians requested the US military government to prohibit official government events and activities on Sundays, such as elections, state examinations, and so on. Even the first national election was supposed to be held on Sunday, May 9. However, due to the intervention of Christianity, the election was held on May 10, a Monday. Even Mr. I Seungman, first president of the ROK, took an oath to God at the first presidential inauguration ceremony on August 15, 1948.

Fifth, the South Korean Interim Parliament on August 8, 1947 unanimously passed a resolution that four regulations, including the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples, made by Japan's Occupational Forces to control Korean Buddhism, should be abolished and it passed a substitute regulation, the Law of Provisional Protection of Buddhist Temple Properties which states Japanese Buddhist properties should belong to Korean Buddhists.

However, on October 29, 1947, the US military government rejected the Korean Buddhist demand that Japanese Buddhist properties should belong to Korean Buddhism after independence. It did not abolish the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples, and it also did not approve the Law of Provisional Protection of Buddhist Temple Properties.

Sixth, the US military government gave great favor to the Christians in its administrative posts. Even though the ratio of Christians in the South Korean population was 3 percent, the percentage of Christians among Korean chief ministers of the administration was 54 percent and the percentage of Christians in the first cabinet of I Seungman's regime was 42 percent.

## **2. Activities to de-Japanize Korean Buddhism**

Immediately after getting independence from Japan on August 15, 1945, Secretary-General I Jong-uk (1884-1969) resigned his post with his cabinet members of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism on August 17, 1945.



Progressive Buddhist leaders visited Taego-sa Temple, the order's head temple, modern Jogye-sa Temple, discussed how to take over its administration on August 19. The thirty-five monks organized the Preparatory Committee for the Reform of Korean Buddhism on August 21. They took over its administration and issued a public statement with retiring executives on August 22.<sup>2</sup>

The preparatory committee members were elected as follows. The chair was Gim Beomnin (1899-1964); the members of the subcommittee of general affairs were Yu Yeop, O Sigwon, Jeong Duseok (b. 1906) and Bak Yunjin (1905-1950); the chair of the sub-committee of planning was Gim Jeogeum (1900-1961); and the advisors were Song Mangong (1871-1946), Song Manam (1876-1957), Seol Seogu (1875-1958), Gim Guha (1872-1965), Gim Gyeongsan, Baek Gyeongha, Jang Seoksang (1872-1947), Gang Dobong and Gim Sangwol. The key figures of the committee were the chair, the members of the subcommittee of general affairs and the chair of the subcommittee of planning, and the committee politically arranged the advisors to promote its organization's position.

Gim Beomnin was the actual leader of progressive Buddhists. He belonged to Beomeo-sa Temple in Busan and after distributing the declaration manifestoes for independence from Japan on March 1, 1919 in Seoul, he led the demonstration march for independence at Beomeo-sa Temple. He actively participated in exiled Korean government in Shanghai, China. He studied Buddhism in France and came back to Korea in which he made endeavors to reform Korean Buddhism in the order's central administrative units and to be independent from Japanese occupation. He was a member of the secret underground political party entitled "Mandang," the leader of which was Han Yongun (1879-1944), the famous independence movement leader. He also educated monks at monastic seminaries, affiliated with Dasol-sa Temple and Beomeo-sa Temple.

The preparatory committee dispatched their representatives to the parish head temples for them to distribute the purport of the national monastic conference and to encourage the each parish's monastic representatives to attend the conference actively. It elected the twenty-four members of the subcommittee of planning and let them prepare the conference and its agendas. It thoroughly prepared to pass the reformative measures at the conference.

The preparatory committee held the national monastic conference on September 22 – 23 at Taego-sa Temple. Below are the 79 representatives from the 27 parish head temples among the 31 parish head temples except the 4 parish

---

<sup>2</sup> Gim Gwangsik extensively discussed the activities of the Preparatory Committee for the Reform of Korean Buddhism in his articles, "8. 15 haebang gwa jeon-guk seungnyeo daehoe" (The Liberation from Japan on August 15, 1945 and the National Monastic Conference), in *Hanguk hyeondae bulgyo-sa yeongu* (Research in the History of Contemporary Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Bulgyo sidae-sa, 2006), 15-35; and "8.15 undong gwa bulgyo-gye ui donghyang" (The Liberation from Japan on August 15, 1945 and Buddhist Reactions), in *Bulgyo-sa yeongu* (Journal of the History of Buddhism) 1 (Dec. 1996): 131-161.

head temples.<sup>3</sup> Of the 79 delegates, 60 representatives attended and 19 delegates were absent. The 4 parish head temples which did not send their own delegates were Paeyeop-sa Temple and Seongbul-sa Temple in Hwanghae Province and Yeongmyeong-sa Temple and Beopheung-sa Temple in South Pyeongan Province, all of which were located in North Korea. There might have been problems for the conference organizers to communicate with the parish head temples in North Korea because of possible political and transportation reasons.<sup>4</sup> The Soviet Union and the United States divided the Korean Peninsula into two Koreas, South Korea and North Korea, along the 38<sup>th</sup> north parallel line on August 15, 1945.

Bongeun-sa Temple: Gim Yeon-eung, Na Byeonggi, I Dongjo, Bak Junghyeon,  
I Jong-ik (1912-1991), Cheon Duwon, Gim Eullyeong  
Jeondeung-sa Temple: Jang Dosik, Gwak Munchang  
Yongju-sa Temple: Yun Hosun, Jo Manhae  
Beopju-sa Temple: Jeong Gihwan, Bak Dongil  
Magok-sa Temple: Han Bosun, Gim Mangi, Hong Jeongsik, Jin Sangil, Hwang  
Taeho  
Wibong-sa Temple: Yu Jaehwan, Gim Jaesu, Gim Huiseok, Seo Sanggi  
Boseok-sa Temple: Gim Seongnong  
Daeheung-sa Temple: Bak Yeonghui (1892-1990), I Jijun  
Baegyang-sa Temple: Bak Jangjo, I Seoong (1912-2003), Gim Seonghwan  
Songgwang-sa Temple: I Sunhong, Jeong Nagyeong, Gim Yeongchan  
Hwaeom-sa Temple: Gim Jeongwon, Gim Suil  
Donghwa-sa Temple: Gim Yongtaek, Bak Haksi  
Eunhae-sa Temple: Cha Eungjun, Ha Yunsil  
Goun-sa Temple: Gim Gwangmun, Seo Jaegyun  
Gimyong-sa Temple: Choe Munseok, Yu Seokgyu, Gwon Gyehan  
Girim-sa Temple: Gim Gyosang  
Haein-sa Temple: Gim Osan, I Deokjin, Choe Yeonghwan, Choe Bosan, Bak  
Geunseop, Bak Daljun, Byeon Wolju  
Tongdo-sa Temple: O Chungo, Gim Jinheo, Gim Samdo, Baek Unjeok, Gu  
Yeon-un, Gim Jeongha, I Dongha  
Beomeo-sa Temple: I Donggwang, Song Dohan, Gim Yonghae  
Geonbong-sa Temple: Gim Gyeonggyu, Jang Wongyu  
Yujeom-sa Temple: Hong Yeongjin, I Namchae, Seo Sanggyu, Seong Nakhun  
(1911-1977), An Deogam (b. 1914), Gim Daljin (1907-1989)  
Woljeong-sa Temple: Sin Giseong, Gang Sangjun  
Seogwang-sa Temple: Choe Eungwan, Han Yeonggyu  
Gwiju-sa Temple: Yang Yeongbok, Jang Sangbong, Jeong Heungchang  
Seonam-sa Temple: I Donghun  
Bohyeon-sa Temple: I Seokgang

<sup>3</sup> See Gim Gwangsik, "8.15 haebang gwa jeon-guk seungnyeo daehoe," 22-23.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, 23-24.

In the conference they organized a committee of twelve members to examine the conference agendas. They were I Dongjo, Yun Hosun, Jeong Heungchang, Han Bosun, Cha Eungjun, I Deokjin, Hong Yeongjin, Gim Sanggi, Choe Eunggwon, I Sunhong, Yu Jaehwan, and Gu Yeon-un and the chair of which was I Deokjin.

They passed a resolution to abolish the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples and its enforcement ordinances, furthermore the parish system of Korean Buddhism prescribing relations between the 31 parish head temples and their respective branch temples, and the articles and bylaws of Taego-sa Temple, the central head temple of Korean Buddhism, all of which were devised under the Japan's occupation period. As a substitute measure, they made two levels in its order's administration, i.e., the central administration and the 12 provincial administrations. Abandoning the order's old constitution devised during Japanese occupation period, they passed its new constitution.

They suggested the order should manage all of the temples directly across the nation and its central administration to manage Buddhist properties under its direct control. The order could shut down and open up the temples based on the order's necessity. They diagnosed that the order's education, social welfare, finance, management, industry, and others should be based on its order's central management of the properties.

They discussed the rights and characters of monks and laypersons and how to assign married priests to either monks or laypersons. The issue became controversial throughout the Purification Buddhist Movement, 1954-1970. They argued that the established order could not develop because of the big gaps between believers and monks and they decided to accept the statement that the practitioners were monks and the ordinary (maybe married) monks and laypersons were believers. At the time, they did not strongly indicate that the ordinary monks were married because over ninety percents of the number of monks were married monks in Korean Buddhism. The later theorists and activists of Purification Buddhist Movement definitely categorized married monks into the group of believers.

They passed a resolution to establish a monastic praxis complex in the conference. They argued in the conference that (married) monastic administrators managed the temples and did not support celibate monastic Seon practitioners. They asked the order to assign a temple as the complex and to establish the complex at which they let unmarried monastic practitioners manage it by themselves. The order implemented the resolution by establishing the praxis complex at Haein-sa Temple in November 1946.

They recommended Bak Hanyeong (1870-1948), a monk of Naejang-sa Temple, to the order's supreme patriarch and elected Gim Beomnin to the order's Secretary-General, Choe Beomsul (1904-1979) to its Secretary of General Affairs, Yu Yeop to its Secretary of Education Affairs, Bak Yunjin to its Secretary of Finance, Bak Yeonghui to its Inspector General, and Gim Samdo and Jang Sangbong to its Inspectors.

On October 9, 1945, the education department of the US military government issued new education directives in which the religious discrimination should be removed. On November 2, 1945, the US military government promulgated its ordinance # 21 in which all of laws and ordinances made under Japan's rule should be effective unless it did not abolish them. The US military government wanted to use the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples and other laws, made by the Japan's colonial government, in order to control Korean Buddhism and Korean citizens effectively.

The order requested the chief minister of the US military government to abolish the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples on July 22 and August 27, 1946. However, the education minister of the office of the US military government ordered the provincial governors to supervise Buddhist temples in their respective jurisdictions based on the existing Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples when the temples sell their own properties.

On March 3, 1947, the order administration submitted its request to the Interim Parliament with the sponsorship of the 25 (parliament) representatives to abolish four regulations, i.e., the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples, its enforcement ordinances, the propagation rules and the temple rules. At the 126<sup>th</sup> general meeting on August 8, 1947, the parliament unanimously passed a resolution to abolish the four regulations and substituted them with the Law of Provisional Protection of Buddhist Temple Properties. The main points of the law were to abolish the bad regulations and to protect Buddhist temple properties. It let the Buddhist order have responsibility to independently control its properties from the government intervention.

The authority of the US military government did not approve it on October 29, 1947. The order's central administration took over the 43 Japanese temples in Seoul and assigned the local administration offices to take the local Japanese temples in their respective areas. The US military government prevented many Japanese Buddhist properties from belonging to the Buddhist order.

The Buddhist order and progressive leaders criticized the US military government's measure as a violation of religious freedom and submitted their letter of complaint to the head of the US military government, its chief minister, its congressional chairman, and its Chief Justice. They also declared manifestos and properly voiced their request that the US military government should approve the substitute law.

However, the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples was preserved to control the Buddhist order under the US military government and the first South Korean president I Seungman's regime. Because it was revised to another similar law entitled the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties in 1962 under the hands of the dictator Bak Jeonghui (1917-1979), it had officially continued from 1911 to 1962.

The US military government persecuted progressive Buddhist organizations since 1947 because it gave favors to right-wing organizations. The government considered progressive Buddhists as socialists and communists, so they lost the

momentum to reform Korean Buddhism. They actively tried to reform Korean Buddhism and to remove Japanized Buddhism from Korean Buddhism. They did not succeed in purifying Korean Buddhism from Japanized Buddhism because of strong confrontations from conservative leaders from the Buddhist order and the government.

Unlike progressive Buddhists, because the Seon practitioners centered on the individual praxis and cultivation, not the social and structural reform, only a few of them participated in the reformative activities. They concentrated on the practice of Seon Buddhism and focused on purifying Korean Buddhism in the level of individuals and local temples, not the level of the order's central administration.

### **3. The movement's sprout**

#### **3.1. Haein Praxis Complex**

Immediately after liberation from Japan on August 15, 1945, Abbot Hong Taeuk (d. 1945) of Bongeun-sa Temple, one of the parish head temples, convened a meeting of the branch temple abbots on August 28, 1945 in order to discuss how to reform Buddhism. I Jong-ik, instructor of Traditional Monastic Seminary, affiliated with the parish head temple, proposed Buddhist reformative measures in the meeting. He announced that because he married, he was a lay Buddhist. He became one of key figures in defending and advocating the Purification Buddhist Movement academically.

They passed a resolution with five items in the meeting. The items were (1) the abolishment of the current parish system and the establishment of the provincial parish system, (2) the inclusion of celibate and married monks under the category of Buddhists with special notes for celibate monks, (3) the reconstruction of praxis Buddhism in the Buddhist order and the propagation of Buddhism in society, (4) the unification of temple properties for mind cultivation, propagation and social welfare, and (5) the emphasis of five activities, i.e., mind cultivation, education, propagation, religious services and social welfare in a temple.

Progressive Korean Buddhist leaders held the national monastic conference on September 22-23, 1945, at which they proposed four priority projects, (1) the establishment of the monastic praxis complex, (2) the translation of Buddhist texts into Korean vernacular language, (3) the re-opening of the Buddhist mission school, Hyehwa Junior College, modern Dongguk University,<sup>5</sup> and (4) the purification of Korean Buddhism from Japanese Buddhist influences.

---

<sup>5</sup> The Japanese Governor-General Office closed the Hyehwa Junior College on September 30, 1944. The Hwehwa Junior College was reopened on November 30, 1945.

The conservative Seon practitioners also tried to recover the traditional Korean Buddhist praxis tradition. For example, I Hyobong (1888-1966) initiated the three-year retreat with some Seon practitioners at Songgwang-sa Temple, one of three major Korean Buddhist Temples, on July 15, 1946. They promised not to go out of the temple territory, not to eat meals after noon, not to sleep and not to talk during the retreat.

The order accepted the first proposal of the national monastic conference and established the monastic praxis complex at Haein-sa Temple, one of three major Korean Buddhist Temples, in October 1946.<sup>6</sup> The monastic complex is traditionally composed of four major praxis centers, i.e., (1) a Seon center, (2) a doctrinal seminary, (3) a discipline center and (4) a center for the Pure Land practice. The unmarried Seon practitioners urgently needed the complex in which they could concentrate in their own practices. During the Japanese occupation period, many Seon centers were closed because married abbots were not concerned about unmarried Seon practitioners and their Seon centers.

The monastic complex was established as a direct organ of the order's central administrative office. It was supposed to train Seon practitioners for three years and limited the number of practitioners to 50 monks. The applicants should be over 20 years old with a good educational background. The order's chief administrator could select some qualified monks whom the Seon centers recommended. There should be an abbot, a Dharmic master, a teaching instructor, a chanting master, a secretary and a secretary assistant according to its regulation.

The complex established a Seon center in the beginning and planned to open a doctrinal seminary and a discipline center consecutively. The latter two centers had never been established at the time. I Hyobong, resident senior monk of Songgwang-sa Temple, was appointed to the first spiritual leader of the complex on November 6, 1946, his disciple So Gusan (1909-1983) as its general manager and I Cheongdam (1902-1971) as the discipliner of the Seon center. More than 100 Seon practitioners practiced in the center.

Some Seon leaders, for example, I Seongcheol (1912-1993), discussed how to secure financial support from the order's central administration and from the Haein-sa Temple with the order's representative Choe Beomsul and the temple's abbot Im Hwan-gyeong (1887-1983). He did not participate in the order's project because of his disappointment at the order's and the temple's poor support. Later, practitioners gradually began to leave the monastic complex because of financial difficulties threatening their very survival.

The complex was naturally closed when the Communist North Korean military began the Korean War on June 25, 1950 and later occupied the Haein-sa Temple area. Around 30 Seon practitioners were forcibly drafted into the Communist North Korean military service and the remaining Seon practitioners took refuge in the southern part of the Korean Peninsula. I Hyobong, the

---

<sup>6</sup> See Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, ed., 174-177.

spiritual leader, established a Seon Center at Yonghwa-sa Temple in Chungmu in April 1951 with some participants in the monastic complex at the Haein-sa Temple.

Even though the complex aimed at revitalizing Seon Buddhism, it prescribed ecumenism originated from Wonhyo (617-686) between doctrinal traditions and from Jinul (1158-1210) between doctrinal and Seon traditions in its monastic codes. They were the major ecumenists in Korean Buddhism. It also ecumenically attempted to establish a Seon center, a doctrinal seminary, a chanting center, and a vinaya platform without excluding any of those traditions.<sup>7</sup> Even though the complex actually established and centered on a Seon center and did not establish other centers, it did not clearly exclude other doctrinal and praxis traditions in its monastic codes.

28 Seon practitioners attended the winter intensive retreat in 1946; 67 practitioners the summer retreat in 1947; 48 practitioners the winter retreat in 1947; 48 practitioners the summer retreat in 1948; 45 practitioners the winter retreat in 1948; 46 practitioners the summer retreat in 1949; 45 practitioners the winter retreat in 1949; and 51 practitioners the summer retreat in 1950. I Hyobong was the actual leader of the complex, served his term of the spiritual leader of the Seon center and attempted to revitalize Seon Buddhism from the winter intensive retreat of 1946 to the summer intensive retreat of 1950 at Haein-sa Temple.<sup>8</sup>

### 3.2. Gobul Praxis Complex

Song Manam established the monastic praxis complex entitled Gobul (Original Buddha) at his resident temple, Baegyang-sa Temple, in commemoration of the Buddha's Enlightenment Day on January 18, 1947 (lunar December 8, 1946). The meaning of the title "Original Buddha" is to recover the original Buddhist teaching from Japanese married Buddhism. The complex became defunct after the beginning of the Korean War on June 25, 1950. He attempted to recover traditional Korean Buddhism of celibate monasticism and vegetarianism from Korean Buddhism Japanized during the colonial period, 1910-1945.

Song Manam was ordained under Chwiun Dojin at Baegyang-sa Temple at 11 in 1886 after his mother passed away. He had studied Buddhism under Bak Hanyeong for seven years since 1891. He also meditated in Seon centers and propagated Buddhism in the Jeolla Province. He became the acting abbot of Baegyang-sa Temple, one of the 31 parish head temples, in 1914, served as the abbot from 1916 for more than twenty years and became an actual leader of the

---

<sup>7</sup> Gim Gwangsik, 203.

<sup>8</sup> Buddhology Institute of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, ed., *Seonwon chongnam* (A Conspectus of Korean Buddhism's Seon Centers) (Seoul: Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, 2000), 143-144.

temple until to his death on January 10, 1957. 111 Seon practitioners in total practiced Seon meditation during the period.<sup>9</sup> He also served as the principal of Jung-ang bulgyo jeonmun hakgyo (Central Buddhist Junior College), current Dongguk University, between 1928 and 1932.

He, a moderate reformist, tried to gradually reform Korean Buddhism through the official order administration. The order administration and the radical group of the opposition camp were fighting over the order's hegemony at the time. The order could not get involved in the reformative measures. He declared his separation from the order's administration and attempted to reform Korean Buddhism by himself. His main mission was influential in the Baegyang-sa Temple and its branch temples and propagation centers under his guide. He established the Gobul Praxis Complex along with 22 temples, 178 monks and lay followers in Jeolla Province<sup>10</sup> and declared a public statement on January 18, 1948 as follows:

In late Joseon Dynasty (1392-1910), due to maladministration, our nation of Korea became destroyed. Japanese invaded the border of Korea and destroyed and annexed the nation. The invaders tried their best to utilize various tactics and eradicate the national spirit. They also attempted to remove traditional Korean Buddhism. Our nation was supposed to spiritually and physically face the critical crisis and to completely disappear soon. After Japan was defeated, our nation became liberated. Even when we are reconstructing our nation, we cannot see a gleam of hope in Buddhism. I formally and informally advised the order and Buddhists to reconstruct and reform Buddhism, but the order did not accept my advice at all. If the order and Buddhists continuously do not accept my advice and reform degenerate Korean Buddhism, they are supposed to change their order (denomination) and their patriarchs. So, I declared that I disconnect relations with the order. I would inherit the miraculous virtues of past Buddhas and the teachings of pre-existent eminent monks on the Korean Peninsula. I hope that the light of a lamp might turn on one hundred thousand lamps and (Dharmically) illuminate the light all over the nation. Like recorded in the right side, I mustered fellow members and established Gobul Praxis Complex on the Buddha's Enlightenment Day on lunar December 8, 1947 (at Baegyang-sa Temple).<sup>11</sup>

He established the Lay Society for Gobul Praxis Complex to financially support the complex. The society's articles and bylaws grouped its members into three, (1) honorary members, (2) special members and (3) general members. Its

---

<sup>9</sup> Gim Gwangsik, 205.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, 86.

<sup>11</sup> Manam daejongsa munjip ganhaeng-hoe (The Publication Committee for the Collection of Grand Master Manam's Works), ed., *Manam munjip* (The Collection of Grand Master Manam's Works) (Jangseong: Baegyang-sa Temple, 1997), 244.



honorary members are not required to financially support the society, its special members to financially and partially support the society, and its general members to pay the annual fees of 100 won.<sup>12</sup> He tried to include laypersons in his complex.

The Gobul Praxis Complex established the general principles of Gobul Praxis Complex in 11 items. The preamble<sup>13</sup> to the general principles of Gobul Praxis Complex in 11 items<sup>14</sup> is almost same as the aforementioned public statement. It strengthened celibate monasticism and considered the development of Buddhism more than the public statement. He thought that we could develop Buddhism by de-Japanizing Korean Buddhism and recovering celibate monasticism. We can introduce the 11 general principles of Gobul Praxis Complex as follows:

1. Protection of the Three Jewels. The purification of mind is the Buddha. If we purify our body, mouth and mind at any time and at any place, we can respond to all Buddhas always illuminating and reflecting our bodies, mouths and minds in three periods, past, present and future. The light of mind is the Dharma. If we purify our six sense organs, we can illuminate perfect light. If so, seven thousand Kōans of Seon Buddhism and eighty thousand teachings of doctrinal Buddhism might be our Dharma property. The pure light unobstructed in any place is the Dao. If we take the light and cultivate ourselves, we can harmonize our Saṅgha community.
2. Return for Four Indebtednesses: Monks should return their indebtedness to four objects such as nation, parents, teachers and society. If so, they can save themselves from three evil paths. If we apply this teaching to our struggling Korean situation, we should ethically cultivate our bodies, benefit all beings with our virtues, and purify our minds and lands based on the instructions of Buddhas and patriarchs.
3. Transmission of the Dharma Lineage: Korean Buddhism has traditionally transmitted only the Dharma lineages of masters Hyujeong (1520-1604) and Buhyu (1543-1612), (two eminent disciples of master Buyong (1485-1571)). However, during the Japanese occupation, 1910-1945, Japanese Government-General established the system of 31 parish head temples and their respective branch temples and destructed the Dharma lineage of Korean Buddhism.
4. Organization of Two Monastic Groups: Buddhism was originally and traditionally composed of four groups such as monks, nuns, laymen and laywomen. Due to the current situations originated from Japanized Buddhism, we suggest Buddhists to divide monks in two groups, married monks and unmarried monks, making five groups in total. We can call celibate monks as the group of keeping the proper teaching and married monks as the group of protecting the proper teaching. (We have traditionally assigned married monks to the administrative monastic group

---

<sup>12</sup> Gim Gwangsik, 88.

<sup>13</sup> Baegyang-sa Temple, ed., *Gobul chongnim Baegyang-sa* (Gobul Praxis Complex Baegyang-sa Temple) (Jangseong: Baegyang-sa Temple, 1996), 15.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid, 16-18.

and unmarried monks to the doctrinal monastic group. The complex basically adopted the traditional division of monks in two groups.)

5. Enthronement of Leaders: Korean Buddhism has three major monasteries such as Tongdo-sa Temple representing the Buddha jewel, Haein-sa Temple representing the Dharma jewel and Songgwang-sa Temple representing the Saṅgha jewel. Korean Buddhists recommended eminent monks who strictly preserved precepts to become the spiritual leader in each of the three major monasteries respectively. Other temples should follow the model and recommended the masters who strictly keep precepts as their leaders. So, we should enthrone as the leader of Gobul Praxis Complex the master who sincerely preserves precepts.
6. Differently-Allotted Tasks for Two Monastic Groups: The complex shall assign its two groups to take different tasks. The complex shall have interior and exterior tasks. The group of unmarried monks is subject to charge the interior tasks and to take the positions of a Chan master, a doctrinal master, a chanting master, hermitage managers, and so on. The group of married monks is subject to charge the exterior tasks and to take the positions of a mission worker, a school teacher, a general affairs clerk, a financial agent, an accountant, a history recorder, a guest receptionist, a mountain manager, and so on.
7. Hiring of Personnel: The complex shall select a person qualified for a particular position. It shall prioritize the person of faith, impartiality and virtue to one of knowledge.
8. Protection of Property: Regardless of any land and tree in any temple and hermitage, we should legally establish a foundation, receive the government's approval of its establishment and strongly protect and preserve our Buddhist property inherited from our masters and eminent monks like our lives.
9. Naming of Gobul Praxis Complex: Two monastic groups should strictly accept and preserve the aforementioned principles. This is the most appropriate time for us to revitalize Korean Buddhism. To commemorate this period, we should add the term of Gobul Praxis Complex to our temple and land names. Like that we restored our land, we should restore our original Korean Buddhism (Gobul).
10. Emphasis of Vinaya: We should consider vinaya as our master and sincerely respect it based upon the Buddha's last injunctions. So, we do not need any other rules in Buddhism except it.
11. Cooperation of Members: Even though we fall to a deep hollow of ten thousand feet, if we share information and knowledge to get away from it, we can cooperate with each other and jump to the ground. Likewise, we can preserve the general principles in harmony and implement them at any place and at any time.<sup>15</sup>

Even though Song Manam, a moderate and realistic reformist, basically disagreed with married monasticism popularized during the occupation period, he attempted to revitalize the spirit of vinaya and gradually and realistically

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

solve out the problem based on the current situation of Korean Buddhism. He did not kick out the majority of married monks in his Gobul Praxis Complex but assigned them to take different tasks from the minority of celibate monks. He divided monks into two groups, the group of married monks and the group of unmarried monks and allotted different tasks to each of the groups, allowing the leadership of celibate monks over married monks.

The Gobul Praxis Complex also established the monastic codes, comprising a compendium and 22 detailed items.<sup>16</sup> We can summarize the codes in the following four.<sup>17</sup> First, Korean Buddhism should follow Taego's (1301-1382) Seon tradition, which transmitted the lineage of Linji Yixuan (d. 867) from China, considered the orthodox Seon Buddhism among Sino-Korean Buddhists. He clarified Korean Buddhism's Dharma lineage and accepted the Korean Linji Chan sectarian lineage as being authentic and orthodox. He was a strong Linji Chan sectarian in his Dharma lineage even though he philosophically advocated ecumenism between doctrinal and Seon Buddhism.

Second, the codes defined Korean Buddhist monastic order as being composed of two monastic groups, i.e., the celibate monastic one and the married monastic one. They suggested that each group should have their own duties based on their own roles. The Gobul Praxis Complex kept the moderate and realistic position to reform Korean Buddhism. Song Manam tried to include the prevalent married monks in his reformative movement. He gave the monastic privileges only to married monks who had already been ordained and he strongly prohibited the inheritance of temple properties by their sons. Accordingly, the number of married monks should decrease gradually and the purification of Korean Buddhism would thus be obtained over time.

Third, the codes favored unmarried monastics over married ones. Song Manam understood that the married monastic order could not be justified at all, based on traditional Buddhist monastic discipline codes. He suggested monks keep Buddhist monastic rules and study the fundamental spirit of Buddhism very seriously. Even though he preferred celibate monks to married monks, he did not exclude married monks in his movement based on realistic and practical reasons.

Fourth, the codes suggested that monastics secularize Buddhism in their everyday lives. They should study Buddhist texts, cultivate their minds, work everyday, live without relying on the believers, and propagate Buddhism. To accomplish this mission, Song Manam suggested the monastics to educate their disciples and save the temple properties and money. If the children of monks inherited properties and money, the codes required them to donate twenty percent to the complex.

---

<sup>16</sup> Manam daejongsa munjip ganhaeng-hoe, ed., 186-190.

<sup>17</sup> Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, ed., 180-182.

### 3.3. The intensive retreat society at Bongam-sa Temple

More than ten Seon practitioners, including I Seongcheol, I Cheongdam, Gim Jaun (1911-1992), I Ubong, Sin Bomun, I Dou, Gim Hyeam (1920-2001), Gim Cheong-an, Choe Ildo and Jang Boan, participated in the intensive Seon retreat at Bongam-sa Temple.<sup>18</sup> In fall 1947, I Cheongdam and I Seongcheol obtained Buddhist texts and canons, donated by layman Gim Beomnyong. Gim Naksun, abbot of Daeseung-sa Temple and a relative of Gim Beomnyong, introduced I Seongcheol and I Cheongdam to Gim Beomnyong. I Seongcheol and I Cheongdam moved the books to Bongam-sa Temple, where they decided to begin the retreat. They established a Seon Center and began to live their monastic lives based on the traditional Seon monastic codes.

They suggested the abolition of some superstitious rituals and the farming of agricultural lands for self-sufficiency without reliance on donations from lay believers. They standardized Korean Buddhist rituals, monastic robes, eating rituals, and other monastic rules in their own monastic community by removing the Japanese Buddhist influences. They agreed to meet regularly to confess and to correct their wrong doings. Some left Bongam-sa Temple because of the strict application of its self-governing monastic rules. Others came to the temple to cultivate their practice based on strict monastic codes. In 1948, the number of resident monks increased to more than twenty Seon practitioners, including Gim Hyanggok (1912-1978), Choe Wolsan (1912-1997), Gim Beopjeon (b. 1925), Gim Honggyeong, Seo Eungsan, Gim Sangwol, I Jeongcheon, Gim Cheong-an, Heo Hyejeong, Jin Hyemyeong, Seo Uihyeon (b. 1936), Seo Jongsu, and I Seongsu (b. 1923).

They considered Korean Buddhism as being degenerated from original and traditional Buddhist teaching and monastic codes and attempted to return to and recover Korean Buddhism with original teachings and monastic codes at Bongam-sa Temple that Buddhas and patriarchs taught and preserved. I Seongcheol drafted self-governing rules in 18 items, attempted to recover the Korean tradition of Seon Buddhism and celibate monasticism, and requested all resident monks to preserve them at the temple as follows:

1. We shall seriously practice strict precepts of Buddhas and holy instructions of patriarchs and accomplish complete and final enlightenment.
2. Regardless of any thought and system, we shall remove any personal and heretic views except the teachings and instructions of Buddhas and patriarchs.
3. We shall convey drinking waters and firewood pieces, cultivate agricultural lands, do needlework, and ask for alms on street in order to achieve economic self-sufficiency.

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid, 177-180.

4. We shall not make our living based on a rent by tenant farmers and special donation by laypersons.
5. We shall restrict lay Buddhists to offer only goods and gifts to the Buddha images in the services.
6. We shall always put on the five-piece monastic robe except in the toilet room for urination and defecation and the bedroom for sleeping.
7. When we go out from our temple, we shall wear bamboo hats and walk with staffs.
8. We shall make the surplices only with the hemp and without pattern.
9. We shall use only tile bowls for drinking and eating.
10. We shall chant the great spell included in the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* once per day.
11. We shall work for more than two hours per day.
12. We shall chant Bodhisattva precepts two times per month.
13. We shall serve the Buddha before noon and eat rice porridge for breakfast in the morning.
14. We shall determine our seating position based on our Dharma age.
15. We shall always practice meditation facing the wall in hall and shall not have an idle chat with each other.
16. We shall sleep or take rest on time.
17. We shall by ourselves prepare what we need in this temple.
18. We shall rely on Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna vinaya and previous Seon monastic rules in needed situations other than these aforementioned seventeen rules.

If anyone does not take and preserve the above rules, he is not allowed to live and practice Seon at Bongam-sa Temple.<sup>19</sup>

As above, resident monks at Bongam-sa Temple attempted to recover celibate monasticism and to dedicated themselves to practice Seon Buddhism. They want to build up traditional Seon monasticism and revitalize Seon Buddhism among Korean Buddhists. They tried to strictly impose rules in the intensive retreat. They combined the strict preservation of vinaya and the strong practice of Seon Buddhism in the temple. Gim Jaun, a disciple of Baek Yongseong (1864-1940) who emphasized vinaya during the occupation period, intensively conducted research on vinaya and theorized the standard of orthopraxy.

Many neighboring laymen came to the temple to ask Seon leaders to teach Buddhism. The practitioners standardized the rituals for laymen based on Korean Buddhist tradition and began to purify Korean Buddhism from Japanese Buddhist influences. They simplified the lengthy ceremonies and eliminated many superstitious elements in Korean Buddhist rituals. They clarified the relations between monastics and laypersons. However, because they radically

---

<sup>19</sup> Gim Gwangsik, 58.

removed superstitious elements in Buddhism, they could not secure financial supports from laypersons and had difficulties in managing the temple.<sup>20</sup>

They hosted the ceremonies to offer Bodhisattva precepts to lay Buddhists at Bongam-sa Temple and to strengthen the spirit of vinaya even among lay Buddhists under Gim Jaun's supervision. A number of laypersons visited the temple to receive and preserve the precepts and financially supported the temple. They guided and educated laypeople to prostrate themselves three times before monks in the ceremonies. Since then, Korean laypersons began to prostrate themselves three times before and respect celibate monks. They did not accept personal offerings but received offerings from laypersons to the temple and their community and equally distributed them among resident monks.

When more laypersons came to the temple to host memorial services for their ancestors, the temple's resident monks could get financial support from their offerings. They used to chant two scriptures such as the lengthy *Diamond Sūtra* and preferably the short *Heart Sūtra* in the services. However, they did not serve guardian deities but chanted the *Heart Sūtra* for the deities in them. They simplified the ceremonies and tried to kick out the superstitious, miscellaneous and lengthy ones.

The retreat became problematic in 1949 when the South Korean government tried to militarily expel the Communists residing in the nearby mountains. The leftist and rightist groups were fighting each other near the temple so that they could not concentrate in Seon practice. In this atmosphere, I Seongcheol and his followers moved the Buddhist texts to Myogwaneum-sa Temple in Busan and left the Bongam-sa Temple in September 1949 and the remaining Seon master I Cheongdam and his followers moved to the Musu-am Hermitage of Okcheon-sa Temple in Goseong around March 1950. Both cities are located in the southern part of the Korean Peninsula. Two months later, I Seongcheol and his followers visited the Musu-am Hermitage and intensively practiced Seon along with I Cheongdam and his followers. With the beginning of the Korean Civil War on June 25, 1950, they could not continue their retreat at there, so they went to places to escape themselves from the war. In this way, it was the external forces which led to the dissolution of the retreat group, not the internal problems.

The retreat at Bongam-sa Temple has several important meanings for the history of Buddhism in South Korea.<sup>21</sup> First, it was to recover Korean Buddhist celibate tradition from Japanese married Buddhism. Second, it had a fundamental direction to return to the celibate monastic community prescribed by the traditional monastic codes of Buddhism. Third, the standardization of monastic and lay rules by them became the model in the later Purification Buddhist Movement and present Korean Buddhism. Fourth, the retreat participants became the movement's leaders and established the identity of the

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, 55-56.

<sup>21</sup> Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, ed., 179.

Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism. Fifth, unlike Song Manam, spiritual leader of the Gobul complex, who suggested the moderate, gradual and realistic measures to cleanse Japanese Buddhism, the retreat participants at Bongam-sa Temple advocated a radical position. The retreat group became the main force during the movement period.

The revitalization of Korean celibate Seon tradition by the above-mentioned major Seon leaders, represented by three retreat groups, i.e., the Haein-sa Temple's praxis complex and the Gobul complex and the Bongam-sa Temple's Seon Center, later led into the early form of the Purification Buddhist Movement. Gim Jaun seriously conducted research in vinaya, published the manuals for offering precepts, and religiously and ideologically backed up celibate monasticism among monks. He also lectured the *Brahma Net Sūtra*, a major representative text of Mahāyāna Bodhisattva precepts, to laypersons and popularized the preservation of precepts among them.<sup>22</sup>

### 3.4. The government's agricultural land reform

The agricultural land reform became a very controversial issue in politics, economy and society since getting liberation from Japan's occupation in 1945.<sup>23</sup> On April 27, 1949, the South Korean national assembly passed the bill of agricultural land reform, having the principle that the government buys the agricultural lands from the landowners and sells it to the farmers. On June 21, 1949, the government promulgated the law, consisting of the preamble, 6 chapters and 29 articles. On October 25, 1949, with a difficulty to implement the law, the revised version of the law was submitted to the national assembly. On March 25, 1950, its enforcement ordinance; on April 28, its detailed enforcement regulations; and on June 23, the regulations on distributing agricultural lands to the farmers were promulgated. Because the civil war broke out on June 25, 1950, the enforcement of the law of the agricultural land reform was postponed temporarily. On October 19, 1950, the government implemented the agricultural land's reform.<sup>24</sup>

Korean Buddhists requested the government to reconsider the reform of the temple agricultural lands because they had serious financial difficulties in maintaining Buddhist activities and managing temple affiliates such as Seon centers, doctrinal centers and so on. President I Seungman issued his

---

<sup>22</sup> Gim Gwangsik, 64.

<sup>23</sup> See Gim Seongho, *Nongji gaehyeok-sa yeongu* (Research on the History of Agricultural Land Reform) (Seoul: Research Institute of Korean Rural Economy, 1989); and Hong Seongchan, *Nongji gaehyeok yeongu* (Research on Agricultural Land Reform) (Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 2001).

<sup>24</sup> Refer to the Department of Agriculture and Fishing, ed., *Nongji gaehyeok-sa gwangae jaryo-jip* (Source Materials for the History of Agricultural Land Reform), 3 vols (Seoul: Department of Agriculture and Fishing, 1984).

presidential message and requested his officials to reconsider how to maintain and manage the temples and their affiliates on April 1, 1952. The government's Department of Education submitted the case to the State Council for discussion on May 20, 1952.

President I Seungman issued his presidential message and asked farmers to return the agricultural lands to the temples in order to let temples financially manage cultural properties with the income from the lands on May 4, 1953. So, the government's three departments of Agriculture and Forestry, Home Affairs and Education issued administrative directives to provincial governors and asked them to reconsider the temple lands and make them be returned to the original temples on July 6, 1953. The temples had difficulties in having their lands returned from the farmers. So, even though the temples could secure some lands in their neighborhood, they could not take back their lands but lost a lot of their lands.

The reform impacted on the temple economy very seriously.<sup>25</sup> Most of agricultural lands that temples do not cultivate were taken over to tenant farmers. The temple economy was heavily based on agricultural lands and mountain forests at the time. Because the temples lost one of two major financial sources, the temple activities were shrunk, the monks had a serious struggle to survive economically, many Seon centers and monastic seminaries were closed, and the maintenance of the temples was difficult. In this situation, Seon practitioners could not have the centers to practice Seon Buddhism because they could not get the financial support from the temples. After the agricultural land reform, they emergently had to secure the temples to survive economically and to support themselves to practice the Seon meditation.

The financial problem originated from the Law of Agricultural Land Reform and its implementation in early 1950's might have pushed Seon practitioners to take the control in the order's politics and economy. Seon practitioners actively participated in the movement and took the order's hegemony to financially back up their Seon centers for them to practice Seon Buddhism. Because Seon practitioners seriously needed the temple's management rights to back up their Seon centers, they attempted to take control of the order and temples in the movement.

---

<sup>25</sup> Gim Gwangsik extensively discussed the agricultural land reform and its impact on Buddhism in his article, "Nonji gaehyeok gwa bulgyo-gye ui daeeung" (Agricultural Land Reform and Buddhist Reaction), in *Hanguk hyeondae bulgyo-sa yeongu*, 113-146.



## **PART V**

### **PURIFICATION BUDDHIST MOVEMENT, 1954 – 1970: DETAILED CHRONOLOGICAL EXPLANATIONS**

In the previous sections I defined the movement, 1954 – 1970, as a sectarian movement for the minority of celibate monks. The minority of celibate monks conservatively and literally interpreted precepts (orthopraxy) and attempted to recover celibate monasticism and vegetarianism of traditional Korean Buddhism from Korean Buddhism Japanized during Japanese occupation, 1910 – 1945 and to politically and sectarianistically take the hegemony of Jogye Order and its temples from the majority of established married monks. Unlike the celibate monks, married monks progressively and freely interpreted the precepts and attempted to defend their married monasticism and non-vegetarianism and to maintain their hegemony in the order and temples. So, I chronologically detailed the movement from its beginning in 1954 to its end in 1970, chronologically arranging several sections in this part.

I arranged this lengthy part in this current book on the Purification Buddhist Movement and attempted to concretely and in detail prove my arguments that the movement was orthopraxis, sectarian, political, and ideological, not orthodox, ecumenical, religious and non-political. Even though celibate monks were sectarian to remove married monks from the order and tried to make it only for themselves in the movement's early stage, they mitigated their sectarianism and realistically and ecumenically attempted to include married monks in the

order after taking the hegemony in the order and temples. However, unlike the celibate monks, after losing the order's hegemony, married monks did not advocate their ecumenism but strengthened their sectarianism. So, because they could not officially divide the established Jogye Order in two, they separated themselves from it and sectarianistically established a new order named Taego Order for them. So, the movement was institutionally completed.

The celibate monastics affiliated with the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism officially established on April 23, 1941 during the Japanese occupation period, initiated the movement based on I Seungman's (1875-1965) 1<sup>st</sup> presidential message on May 20, 1954. With the official registration of the order's administration to the government on April 14, 1962, even though celibate monks gradually developed their sectarianism, the administration did not continue the movement's sectarian momentum but included married monks in the order's cabinet. Depending on the official registration of Taego Order for married monks to the government on May 8, 1970, married monks made the established Jogye Order as a sectarian order for celibate monks. So, the movement became institutionally completed.

After the initiation of the movement with the government's strong support, celibate monks hosted the government's 1<sup>st</sup> authorized and their 5<sup>th</sup> national conference for unmarried monks on August 12 -14, 1955 and were officially able to take the order's hegemony and appoint temple abbots across the nation. After taking the order's hegemony in 1955, the minority of celibate monks softened their sectarianism and finally included the majority of married monks under their control in 1962, so they realistically and properly could manage the temples which they could not handle by themselves. When the movement's strong and un-conditioned patron President I Seungman resigned his presidential position due to a national massive demonstration on April 19, 1960, married monks actively counterattacked celibate monks and seriously attempted to take their hegemony in the order and temples.

After General Bak Jeonghui (1917-1979) obtained power through the May 16, 1961 coup, he and his government actively intervened in the movement and let Korean Buddhists include married monks in and officially launch the order's new administration under the hegemony of unmarried monks on April 14, 1962. After married monks lost their hegemony in the order, they attempted to officially partition the ecumenical Jogye Order consisting of married and unmarried monks since its official establishment in 1941 in two, making each order represent each side. However, because they could not partition it in two, they separated themselves from the order, established the sectarian Taego Order for them on May 8, 1970. So, the movement was institutionally completed. Both camps inconsistently and differently applied sectarianism and ecumenism based on circumstances for their orthopraxis, not orthodox, purposes.

## 1. The movement's early stage

I discuss the movement's early stage in this section from its official beginning based on President I Seungman's 1<sup>st</sup> presidential message issued on May 20, 1954 to the 3<sup>rd</sup> national conference for celibate monks hosted on December 11, 1954. In this section, I subdivided this section in three subsections, discussing the movement from the 1<sup>st</sup> presidential message to the 1<sup>st</sup> national conference for celibate monks held on August 24, 1954 in the first subsection; from the 1<sup>st</sup> national conference to the 2<sup>nd</sup> national conference hosted on September 28, 1954 in the second subsection; and from the 2<sup>nd</sup> national conference to the 3<sup>rd</sup> national conference held on December 11, 1954 in the third subsection.

### 1.1. May 20 – August 24, 1954

After the outbreak of the Korean War on June 25, 1950, on August 18, 1950, the government temporarily moved government offices to Busan and on October 27, 1950, it moved them back to Seoul. On January 3, 1951, it moved them back to Busan. Immediately after the war on July 27, 1953, it permanently moved them back to Seoul on August 15. During the Korean War, Busan was the political and administrative center.

On the Memorial Day, June 6, 1952, the government hosted a memorial service for deceased soldiers of the Korean army, the UN forces, and the Korean police at Beomeo-sa Temple in which the government's major persons, of course including President I Seungman, a sincere Christian, participated. Ha Dongsan (1890-1965) presided over the service based on a Buddhist ritual. The government enshrined the relics of deceased soldiers in halls affiliated with the temple. Ha Dongsan chanted ritual texts and prayed for them to be born in a better world in their next lives. At the time, he, a major leader of the movement, made a connection with President I Seungman.

On January 10, 1953, President I Seungman visited Beomeo-sa Temple for the second time, accompanying a US military general and his wife. Ha Dongsan asked the president to support unmarried Buddhist monks against married Buddhist priests. He suggested that the president should intervene in Buddhism and secure some temples for unmarried monks to practice Seon Buddhism. Because married monks managed and controlled almost all of temples, unmarried monks had difficulty in finding temples to practice Seon and in securing financial support.<sup>1</sup> To solve the problems, Ha Dongsan did not remain independent from the government but heavily relied on it. Even though his

---

<sup>1</sup> Chanju Mun, "Purification Buddhist Movement, 1954-62: The Recovery of Traditional Monasticism from Japanized Buddhism in South Korea," in *Hsi Lai Journal of Humanistic Buddhism* 8 (2007): 262-294.

arguments that we should purify Korean Buddhism's Japanized married monasticism were proper, his methods, resorting to the external power, could not be justified.

Less than one tenth of the monastic population was unmarried when Korea was liberated from Japan.<sup>2</sup> In this situation, in April, 1952, during the Korean War between June 25, 1950 and July 27, 1953, I Daeui (1901-1978), resident monk at the Center for Seon Studies (Seonhak-won), submitted a proposal to the current supreme patriarch Song Manam (1876-1957) in which he explained many problems which originated from the Japanese occupation of the Korean peninsula. He requested that the patriarch should give several large temples for unmarried monks to live in and practice Seon.

Song Manam accepted I Daeui's proposal and referred to his experimental model of the Gobul monastic praxis complex. He, a moderate reformist, accepted that there should be two monastic groups, unmarried and married, as a realistic measure. He suggested that all of temple management should be carried out under the leadership of unmarried monks. He also proposed to keep intact the established privileges of the current married monks but not to authorize newly married monks.

In April, 1953, the order's Regulations Committee held its general meeting at Bulguk-sa Temple in order to concretize the determination which the order made in the cabinet meeting at Tongdo-sa Temple. The committee designated 18 temples for unmarried monastics by excluding the major Buddhist temples, for instance, three major Korean Buddhist temples, Tongdo-sa Temple, Haein-sa Temple and Songgwang-sa Temple. The unmarried Seon practitioners were disappointed at the measure. Even the 18 temples were not given to the unmarried monastic group. In May, 1954, some resident monks at the Center for Seon Studies requested the order administration to implement the promise immediately.

In May 1953, Ha Dongsan criticized married monks because they did not provide even a single temple for celibate Seon practitioners. He also sent a nationwide written appeal to Seon centers. In it, he suggested Seon practitioners should cooperate with each other to revive Korean Buddhism's traditional celibate monasticism from current Korean Buddhism's married monkhood. He argued that Korean Buddhism should recover the vinaya lineage of celibate monasticism that Korean Buddhism had preserved since its inception.

Married resident monks of Beomeo-sa Temple, in cooperation with the order's central administration, kicked him out of his home temple of Beomeo-sa and closed its affiliate Seon center. Ha Dongsan and his followers moved to Eunhae-sa Temple in Yeongcheon County, North Gyeongsang Province, where they practiced Seon meditation. Because Gim Beomnin (1899-1964), a famous

---

<sup>2</sup> See Jeong Gwangho, *Hanguk bulgyo choegeun baengnyeon-sa pyeonnyeon* (The History of Korean Buddhism during Recent 100 Years, 1865-1965) (Incheon: Inha University Press, 1999), 261-272.

politician and a married monk as well as the current government's secretary of education, and Jeon Jinhan (1901-1972), a married monk and a famous politician as well as the former secretary of social affairs, mediated between Ha Dongsan and married resident monks, Ha Dongsan could take his following of unmarried monks and return to Beomeo-sa Temple after three months.

The unmarried Seon practitioners were disappointed at the slow process of de-Japanizing Korean Buddhism. In May 1954, some resident monks at the Center for Seon Studies requested the order administration to implement immediately the promise made more than one year earlier in April 1953. At the time, the order's Regulations Committee held its general meeting at Bulguk-sa Temple and designated eighteen temples for unmarried monastics by excluding the major Buddhist temples, for instance, three major Korean Buddhist temples, Tongdo-sa Temple, Haein-sa Temple and Songgwang-sa Temple.

In April 9, 1954, the order's central administration held an official cabinet meeting and examined Patriarch Song Manam's directives to revitalize Korean Buddhism at Tongdo-sa Temple, one of biggest temples in Korea. The administration decided to accept his suggestion. Song Manam, Gim Guha (1872-1965),<sup>3</sup> I Hyobong, Gim Gyeongbong (1892-1982), I Unheo (1892-1980), and other representative monks also attended the meeting.<sup>4</sup>

Around the time, "purification of Japanized Korean Buddhism's monasticism" became a serious social issue. Married and unmarried monks vehemently disputed the rights of temple management at many temples. Married monks did not want to concede even a portion of the properties that had been established as theirs. Celibate monks were eager to reclaim the management of at least some of the temples lost upon when their nation was dominated by Japan.

On May 20, 1954, President I Seungman issued his 1<sup>st</sup> presidential message to cleanse Japanized Korean Buddhism. At that time, he demanded that married monks should be removed from the order and its temples and unmarried monks should take over the management of the order and its temples. His message made a very serious impact on both sides, that is, the married monastic group of the order's central administration and the unmarried monastic one of Seon practitioners. President I Seungman backed up unmarried monks against married ones. He did not objectively evaluate Japanese Buddhism's influence on Korean Buddhism's modernization. Japanese Buddhism heavily influenced to modernize Korean Buddhism. He just simply generalized in his 1<sup>st</sup> presidential message that married monks supported imperial Japan and were originated from Japanese Buddhism.

His overgeneralization of married monks to be pro-Japanese was wrong and was based on his biased nationalistic presumption. We can easily find out a lot

---

<sup>3</sup> I Jeong, ed., *Hanguk bulgyo inmyeong sajeon* (Dictionary of Korean Buddhist Names) (Seoul: Bulgyo sidae-sa, 1991), 298-299.

<sup>4</sup> Dongsan mundo-hoe and Gim Gwangsik, eds., *Dongsan daejongsa wa bulgyo jeonghwa undong* (Great Master Ha Dongsan and Purification Buddhist Movement) (Busan: Beomeo-sa Temple, 2007), 381, 386-388.

of counter-evidences that numerous married monks such as Gim Seongsuk (1898-1969) and Han Yongun (1879-1944) were not pro-Japanese. I think that the majority of celibate Seon practitioners did not engage themselves to social issues in the social context but dedicated themselves to cultivate their minds in the individual context.

He argued that Korean Buddhists should purify Korean Buddhism Japanized during Japanese occupation period, 1910-1945, in the following, his 1<sup>st</sup> message:

Imperial Japan, for the past forty years of its occupation, 1910-1945, brought its own Shintō religion and legalized emperor worship exercised at Japanese Shintō shrines among Korean citizens on the Korean Peninsula. It required all Korean citizens to visit Shintō shrines and worship its native gods enshrined at the shrines. When some foreign Christian missionaries did not follow Japan's directions but rejected emperor worship at Shintō shrines, Japan deported them from or persecuted them in Korea. When some Korean Christians did not visit and venerate gods in the shrines, Japan threw them into prison and caused some of them to die there. Concurrently, Japan brought its own Buddhism, propagating and popularizing it in Korea. Japanese Buddhists did everything that Korean Buddhists had never done. (For example), they established their temples in cities and farming villages and took wives, got along with lay town residents and villagers and used to transmit Buddhism to them in Japan. Even though Japan, actually, learned and imitated Buddhism from our nation of Korea, it did not accept the celibate monasticism of our Korean Buddhism. On the contrary, Japan took its married monasticism back to Korea, implemented it, and finally obliterated sublime celibate monasticism of Korean Buddhism. As a result, we cannot differentiate monastics from laymen in current Korean Buddhism and original Korean Buddhism became nothing but a name.<sup>5</sup>

Even though the presidential message seriously violated the constitution prescribing the separation between politics and religion, unmarried monks welcomed and utilized it to take the order's hegemony. I Seungman, a leader for the independence movement of Korea, considered married monasticism and meat eating as having been formed under Japanese Buddhism's influences, vehemently criticized Japanized Korean Buddhism, and requested Korean Buddhists to recover Korean Buddhism's celibate monasticism and vegetarianism.

Gang Seokju (1909-2004) and Bak Gyeonghun (b. 1934) outlined the background for I Seungman's presidential message in their *Korean Buddhism during Modern 100 Years* in the following quote:

When the group of unmarried monks was planning to purify married monasticism and meat eating of Japanized Korean Buddhism, President I Seungman visited Bongguk-sa Temple in the Block of Jeongneung, the Ward

---

<sup>5</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., *Hanguk bulgyo seungdan jeonghwa-sa* (Gyeongju: Hanguk bulgyo seungdan jeonghwa-sa pyeonchan wiwon-hoe, 1996), 765-766.

of Seonbuk, the City of Seoul on Mt. Samgak.<sup>6</sup> At the time, President I Seungman saw married monks who were living with their wives in the temple. He asked his aide how monks married, saying that he had never seen married monks in temples before when he went to foreign nations. Even so, at the time, he thought that he did not clearly differentiate married and celibate monks in Korean Buddhism.

However, President I Seungman visited Yeonju-am Hermitage in the Town of Gwacheon, the County of Siheung, Gyeonggi Province, on Mt. Gwanak.<sup>7</sup> There was a Korean monk who had lived in Japan, returned to Korea, taken a Japanese wife and was living with her in the temple. He saw Japanese clothes hanging up in the temple. He saw a banner that read, "Hurray for the Japanese Emperor!" and a banner, "Good Fortune in Battle for the Japanese Imperial Army!" in the temple's main hall. So, he thought that he would clear away Japanized married monasticism and meat eating in Korean Buddhism.

He also visited Gwanchok-sa Temple in the County of Nonsan, South Chungcheong Province on Mt. Banya.<sup>8</sup> At the time, the temple's abbot, embarrassed with the sudden appearance of President I Seungman, put on a hat to hide long hair on his head and wore a long ritual robe to cover his Western clothing. Upon seeing the temple's strange appearances, President I Seungman strongly determined to purify Japanized Korean Buddhism. Then, President I Seungman told the abbot, "You seem to have two wives." Because the abbot actually had two wives, the president was extremely surprised.

This being the case, upon seeing the temples and monks Japanized (during Japanese occupation period), on May (20), 1954, President I Seungman issued his 1<sup>st</sup> presidential message and backed up the movement. The message aimed at completely cleansing the Japanized married monasticism and meat eating in Korean Buddhism. In addition, the government's Department of Education prohibited people from drinking, singing and dancing in temples in order to protect historical properties.<sup>9</sup>

Immediately after the presidential message, on May 21 - 23, some Seon practitioners utilized the presidential message and began to organize the movement. They were not concerned about the constitution, but were only interested in reclaiming hegemony over married monks in the management of each temple and the order. Legally, the presidential message and the movement initiated from the message were improper.

On June 20, married monastics who actually managed the order's Secretariat Head Office (Chongmu-won) hosted an emergency meeting for its Central Assembly and discussed how to respond to I Seungman's 1<sup>st</sup> presidential message. Some Seon practitioners assembled at the Center for Seon Studies.

---

<sup>6</sup> I Dongsul, ed., *Hanguk sachal bogam* (Dictionary of Korean Buddhist Temples) (Seoul: Uri chulpan-sa, 1997), 171.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, 293.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, 37-38.

<sup>9</sup> Gang Seokju and Bak Gyeonghun, *Bulgyo geunse baengnyeon* (Korean Buddhism during Modern 100 Years), 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 2002), 208-209.

These included Jeong Geum-o (1896-1968),<sup>10</sup> So Gusan (1909-1983),<sup>11</sup> I Daeui, Gim Jomyeong, Song Sanggeun, Chae Byeogam (1924-2005), Min Dogwang, Gim Jiyeong, and Ha Jiseon, and two lay leaders, Gim Hancheon and Hyeon O went to Taego-sa Temple, the order's head temple, the current Jogye-sa Temple, who observed the meeting.<sup>12</sup> Even though they discussed returning three major temples, Tongdo-sa Temple, Haein-sa Temple and Songgwang-sa Temple to celibate monks, they did not settle down the issue. On June 21, they resumed the meeting and the group of celibate monks also observed the resumed meeting.<sup>13</sup> They resolved that they would not concede the three major temples but the minor and smaller 48 temples including Donghwa-sa Temple and Jikji-sa Temple to celibate Seon practitioners.

Min Dogwang, a recorder and historian of the events of the movement, vividly explained what happened on June 20 – 21, 1954 at Taego-sa Temple. From the partisan and sectarian perspectives of celibate monks, he comprehensively collected and published the records of the movement between August 24, 1954 and August 16, 1955. He recorded the events from August 24, 1954 on which the 1<sup>st</sup> national conference for celibate monks was hosted to four days after August 12, 1955 on which the 1<sup>st</sup> government-authorized and the 5<sup>th</sup> national conference for unmarried monks was held. The government intervened in religious affairs and manipulated for and authorized the 5<sup>th</sup> monastic conference the hegemony of celibate monks in the order. Therefore, across the nation and with the government's support, they could appoint celibate monks to the order's key posts and as abbots.

From the sectarian view of unmarried monks, Min Dogwang recorded the events that happened during the most dynamic period of the movement in his book of 832 pages entitled *The History of Purification Buddhist Movement in Korean Buddhist Monastic Order*. It can serve as source material for research in the movement. It chronologically describes the movement's events for almost one year between August 24, 1954 and August 16, 1955 (pp. 1-563) and attaches source materials directly related to the movement (pp. 565-829).

If we read the descriptions on the event on June 20 – 21 by Min Dogwang, we can easily understand how the movement's advocates and participants emotionally and from their partisan perspectives reacted against married monks and how seriously they had antagonism against them as illustrated in the following quote:

(On June 20), we monks wore monastic robes (and went to Taego-sa Temple from the Center for Seon Studies). Because we were allowed to observe the meeting of the order's Central Assembly, we entered the hall and observed its proceedings. While some members of the assembly were dressed

---

<sup>10</sup> I Jeong, ed., 318.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, 154.

<sup>12</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 39.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, 39-40.



in black-colored monastic long robes (of Japanese styles) and red surplices, others put on lay clothes and western-styled ones. The meeting seemed like a meeting among laypersons, not among monks. Bak Seongha (b. 1907), chairman of the order's Central Assembly, had on western-styled clothes and wore his hair long, moderated over the meeting. Even though they discussed conceding three major temples of Korean Buddhism such as Tongdo-sa Temple, Haein-sa Temple and Songgwang-sa Temple to celibate monks, they decided to continue the discussion of the topic the next day. After observing this, we came back to the Center for Seon Studies.

The next day, on June 21, we monks also went to Taego-sa Temple to observe the meeting. When we arrived at the temple, the meeting already started. All of us who observed the meeting attended it. They proceeded to discuss the concession of three major temples to celibate monks. They changed the discussion from three major temples to the 48 poor and minor temples such as Donghwa-sa Temple and Jikji-sa Temple. Instead of the big three temples, they discussed the concession of the 48 temples to unmarried monks. At the time, layman Hyeon O of our celibate monastic side stood up from an observers' gallery and shouted, "You put on the western-styled clothes and wear your hair long. Are you monks? How can you discuss and say whether or not you, married ones, can provide temples to celibate Seon practitioners?" It was a bombshell announcement. So Gusan also aligned himself with his thunderbolt-like sayings. Chairman Bak Seongha ordered guards to quiet observers and told them, "If you observers apologize your disturbance for now, you can stay in here. If not, we will turn you out of this meeting." Layman Hyeon O responded and shouted again, "If I confess my action for now, why should I have shouted?" He walked out of the room. We celibate Seon practitioners also observed the meeting for a little while and left the hall.<sup>14</sup>

On July 2, Ha Dongsan, I Hyobong and Gim Jeogeum (1900-1961) issued and circulated an official letter and informed the national conference for celibate monastic representatives supposed to be held on August 24 at the Center for Seon Studies. Chae Byeogam, Gim Jiyeong, Song Sanggeun and others informed and strongly recommended celibate monks across the nation to attend the national conference. So, eminent Seon masters such as I Hyobong, I Cheongdam (1902-1971), Ha Dongsan, and Jeong Geum-o were invited to the 1<sup>st</sup> national conference.<sup>15</sup> Some celibate monks stayed at Daegak-sa near the Center for Seon Studies and attended the 1<sup>st</sup> conference.

## 1.2. August 24 – September 28, 1954

On August 24, sixty-five Seon practitioners hosted the 1<sup>st</sup> national conference for celibate monks at the Center for Seon Studies located at 40 Anguk-dong, Jongno-gu, Seoul between 9: 30 in the morning and 5: 30 in the

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, 41.

evening and on August 25, they continued it at 9:00 in the morning and adjourned it at 5:30 in the evening.<sup>16</sup> Several tens of Buddhists, three policemen including Ji Seonmyeong, and one reporter of *Dong-a ilbo*, a major national newspaper, observed the conference. Yun Wolha (1915-2003), along with other four major leaders of the movement such as I Hyobong, Ha Dongsan, Jeong Geum-o and I Cheongdam participated in the movement from the start.

They passed a resolution, resolved to establish a praxis complex, decided to revise the order's constitution and elected nine committee members to revise it and fifteen committee members to enforce the movement.<sup>17</sup> They also discussed how to educate young Buddhist monks. They determined that they should return to the original teaching of Buddhism and remove married monasticism in Korean Buddhism.<sup>18</sup>

The nine committee members for revising the order's constitution whom they elected are (1) I Hyobong of Yonghwa-sa Temple in Tongyeong County, South Gyeongsang Province, (2) Ha Dongsan of Beomeo-sa Temple in Busan, (3) Jeong Geum-o of Paldal-sa Temple in Suwon City, Gyeonggi Province, (4) I Cheongdam of Musu-am Hermitage in Goseon County, South Gyeongsang Province, (5) Bak Ingok (1895-1961) of Haein-sa Temple in Hapcheon County, South Gyeongsang Province, (6) (unattended) I Seongcheol (1912-1993) of Anjeong-sa Temple (in Tongyeong County, South Gyeongsang),<sup>19</sup> (7) I Seokho of Pagye-sa Temple in Daegu, North Gyeongsang Province, (8) Gim Hyanggok (1912-1978)<sup>20</sup> of Seonam-sa Temple in Busan, and (9) Yun Wolha of Tongdo-sa Temple in Yangsan County, South Gyeongsang Province.<sup>21</sup>

The fifteen committee members elected for enforcing the movement are (1) I Hyobong, (2) Ha Dongsan, (3) Jeong Geum-o, (4) Bak Geumbong of Jeonghye-sa Temple in Yesan County, South Chungcheong Province, (5) Bak Ingok, (6) Gim Jeogeum of the Center for Seon Studies in Seoul, (7) Gim Jaun (1911-1992) of Gamno-sa Temple in Busan, (8) Gim Bogyeong of Gyeongguk-sa Temple in Seoul,<sup>22</sup> (9) Gim Hyanggok, (10) Mun Iljo of Seongju-sa Temple in Masan City, South Gyeongsang Province, (11) (unattended) I Seongcheol, (12) Gim Honggyeong of Tongdo-sa Temple in Yangsan County, South Gyeongsang Province, (13) Sin Bomun of Samseong-am Hermitage in Daegu, (14) I Seokho, and (15) I Cheongdam.<sup>23</sup>

On August 26, the aforementioned two committees hosted a joint meeting and organized several departments and respectively assigned them to the

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, 42-44.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> See the August 26, 1954 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1. 185.

<sup>19</sup> I Dongsul, ed., 283.

<sup>20</sup> I Jeong, ed., 342.

<sup>21</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 44.

<sup>22</sup> I Dongsul, ed., 23.

<sup>23</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 45.

departments and posts to implement the movement.<sup>24</sup> On August 26, the *Dong-a ilbo* reported the 1<sup>st</sup> national conference for celibate monastics held on August 24. On August 28, two monks Jeong Geum-o and I Cheongdam visited the Press Secretary's Office, presented to the secretary a letter of thanks to President I Seungman's 1<sup>st</sup> presidential message and a memorial to the president and asked him to deliver the two aforementioned documents to the president.<sup>25</sup>

On September 1, celibate monastics sincerely discussed in the officer's meeting how to advertize to and justify the movement in Korean society and determined that they would announce a written oath and a public proclamation and justify the movement to all Koreans and Korean Buddhists.<sup>26</sup> The *Seoul sinmun* published a declaration by Secretary-General Hyeon O of the Association of Korean Lay Buddhists in its September 1, 1954 issue and supported the movement.<sup>27</sup>

On September 2, two secretaries of General Affairs and Finance of the order's Secretariat Head Office visited the Center for Seon Studies and discussed with the committee members how to settle issues between the order's administration and the Center for Seon Studies.<sup>28</sup>

They advertized in three issues, the September 3, 1954 issue,<sup>29</sup> the September 5, 1954 issue,<sup>30</sup> and the September 6, 1954 issue,<sup>31</sup> of *Joseon ilbo*, a major national newspaper, the "Written Oath of Purification Buddhist Movement to All Korean Buddhists" that sixty-five Seon practitioners unanimously determined on August 25, 1954 in the 1<sup>st</sup> national conference for celibate monks.<sup>32</sup>

On September 4, I Cheongdam visited the order's Secretariat Head Office around ten o'clock in the morning, explained what they had discussed in the 1<sup>st</sup> national conference for celibate monks hosted on August 24 – 25 and returned to the Center for Seon Studies.<sup>33</sup> He reported that married monks serving in the order's Secretariat Head Office showed their sincerity to settle several issues between celibate and married monks.

On September 5, after reading the afore-cited declaration by Secretary-General Hyeon O of the Association of Korean Lay Buddhists in its September 1, 1954 issue of *Seoul sinmun*, President I Seungman sent his letter to celibate

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid, 46.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid, 49.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, 47.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid, 48.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid, 50.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid, 47, 48.

<sup>33</sup> Min Dogwang, 48.

monks through his presidential secretary Cha Ikgyo.<sup>34</sup> Upon receiving it, on September 6, Jeong Geum-o and I Cheongdam visited the Press Secretary's Office and discussed with the secretary how to settle the issues related to the movement.<sup>35</sup>

On September 6, they established the Diamond Precept Platform in the main hall of the Center for Seon Studies and began to preside over the ceremony to offer Bodhisattva precepts to more than 200 lay Buddhists from one o'clock in the afternoon and on September 8, they finished the ceremony and took a memorial photo at five o'clock in the afternoon.<sup>36</sup> They aimed at revitalizing the importance of precepts and vinaya monastic codes in degenerate Korean Buddhism and suggesting Korean Buddhists to recover the Korean Buddhist tradition that had strictly preserved the precepts and vinaya monastic codes.

On September 9, the *Dong-a ilbo*, a major national newspaper, positively evaluated the movement and sincerely requested Korean Buddhists to recover celibate monasticism of traditional Korean Buddhism from the current tradition corrupted and Japanized during Japanese occupation, 1910-1945 in its editorial. Koreans developed strongly anti-Japanese sentiments during Japanese occupation. So, we can easily find in the following editorial that Koreans and Korean Buddhists heavily relied on and expressed strong anti-Japanese emotional sentiments originated from Korean nationalism and vocally supported the movement.<sup>37</sup>

On September 9, they convened a joint meeting between the committee members for revising the order's constitution and the committee members for enforcing the movement for three hours from two o'clock in the afternoon. They agreed to cooperate with the married monastic group after revising and to pass the order's constitution in the order's central assembly. They also determined to recruit two eminent lay scholars, I Jaeyeol (1915-1981) and I Jong-ik (1912-1991) and to let them theorize and justify the movement in the joint meeting.<sup>38</sup>

On September 10, they began the meeting from 6:00 pm and speeded up to draft the revised constitution. If they finish the revised constitution, they are supposed to discuss it with the order's Secretariat Head Office and pass it in the order's Central Assembly.<sup>39</sup> On September 11, they celebrated the Korean Thanksgiving Day, the most festive traditional holiday, based on August 15 by the lunar calendar at the Center for Seon Studies. They reviewed the draft

---

<sup>34</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 48 and Geum-o seon suhaeng yeongu-won (The Research Institute for Seon Master Jeong Geum-o's Seon Praxis), ed., *Geum-o seunim gwa bulgyo jeonghwa undong* (Master Jeong Geum-o and Purification Buddhist Movement) (Seoul: Geum-o seon suhaeng yeongu-won, 2008), 1: 114.

<sup>35</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 50 and Geum-o seon suhaeng yeongu-won, ed., 1: 114.

<sup>36</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 50-51.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid, 53-54, 762-763, 768-769.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid, 53.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid, 55.

constitution from its beginning to its 16<sup>th</sup> chapter in the joint meeting from 6:30 pm to 9:00 pm.<sup>40</sup>

On September 12, they continued to review the draft constitution. Sin Jijeong, secretary of general affairs of the order's Secretariat Head Office, belonged to the married monastic group, visited the Center for Seon Studies and told them that if they draft the revised constitution, he would take it to the order's patriarch along with them and if the patriarch recognizes it, he would follow it. They also discussed how to recruit and educate talented Buddhists.<sup>41</sup>

On September 13, they hosted and determined in the meeting that after making the draft constitution, they would convene and pass it in the national conference for celibate monastics and let married monastics preserve it. They suggested themselves to persuade married monastics to reconstruct the order based on the revised constitution. They resolved in the meeting that if married monastics do not accept it, they would enforce it based on the original teaching of the Buddhas and patriarchs. On September 15, they continued to revise the draft constitution.<sup>42</sup>

On September 16, they finalized and printed the draft constitution. They hosted the meeting at 7:00 pm and decided to discuss it with the order's Secretariat Head Office, to pass it in the order's Central Assembly, and to receive the recognition from the patriarch. They also agreed in the meeting that if they could not make the draft constitution smoothly passed and recognized, they would sincerely preserve the Buddhist original teachings and precepts.<sup>43</sup>

On September 17, I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha visited the order's Secretariat Head Office and informed it of hosting the national conference for celibate monastics.<sup>44</sup> The *Jayu sinmun* positively discussed and backed up the movement in its September 17, 1954 issue.<sup>45</sup> On September 17, the *Pyeonghwa sinmun* also positively reported the movement.<sup>46</sup> On September 18, the celibate monastic group requested major newspapers such as *Dong-a ilbo*, *Gukje sinmun*, *Seoul sinmun*, *Busan ilbo*, *Joseon ilbo*, and *Pyeonghwa sinmun* to publicize the national conference for celibate monastics. They also sent an official letter to each temple across the nation and encourage celibate monastics to attend the conference.<sup>47</sup> On September 19, Ha Dongsan and I Cheongdam visited the presidential office to get support from President I Seungman. However, they were unable to see him.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid, 56.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid, 57.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid, 57-58.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid, 58.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid, 59.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid, 61.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

The September 20, 1954 issue of the *Dong-a ilbo* publicized the national conference for celibate monastics on September 27 – 29 for three days at the Center for Seon Studies. Jo Yongmyeong (d. 2003), secretary-general of the Secretariat Head Office in South Gyeongsang Province, visited the Center for Seon Studies and vehemently protested against the announcement's content.<sup>49</sup>

On September 21, the order's Secretariat Head Office asked the Center for Seon Studies to come to its office and to discuss the national conference. I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha visited the Secretariat Head Office and agreed with them that Yun Wolha and Sin Jijeong, its secretary of general affairs would visit Baegyang-sa Temple and see Patriarch Song Manam.<sup>50</sup> On September 23, Yun Wolha and Sin Jijeong took a train for Gwangju at Seoul Station.<sup>51</sup> On September 26, Yun Wolha came from Mokpo to Seoul.<sup>52</sup> On September 27, they delayed the beginning day of the conference from September 27 to September 28. On September 27, Patriarch Song Manam arrived at Seoul Station at 8:40 pm and 7-8 celibate monks went to the station to welcome the patriarch. He went to and slept in Taego-sa Temple.<sup>53</sup>

### 1.3. September 28 – December 11, 1954

On September 28, 146 Seon practitioners (116 monks and 30 nuns), along with Patriarch Song Manam attended, hosted the 2<sup>nd</sup> national conference for celibate monks between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm at the Center for Seon Studies.<sup>54</sup> 3 policemen, 6 newspaper reporters and 70 observers also attended the conference. They held the conference on September 28 – 30 and passed the revised constitution. Based on the revised constitution, they elected 50 representatives for the order's central assembly.<sup>55</sup>

The elected 50 representatives are I Hyobong (of Yonghwa-sa Temple in Tongyeong), Gim Jeogeum (of Seonhak-won in Seoul), Jeong Geum-o (of Paldal-sa Temple in Suwon), Bak Ingok (of Haein-sa Temple in Hapcheon), I Cheongdam (of Munsu-am Temple in Goseong), Gim Hyanggok (of Seonam-sa Temple in Busan), Gim Jaun (of Gamno-sa Temple in Busan), Gi Yudam (of Geumjeong-sa Temple in Dongnae), Gim Hyangbong (of Baegun-sa Temple in Gangneung), Gim Jihyo (1909-1989)<sup>56</sup> (of Dabo-sa Temple in Naju), I Daecheol (of Yeongyong-am Temple in Gimhae), Gim Jiyeong (of Geumjeong-sa Temple in Dongnae), Mun Jeong-yeong (1923-2007) (of Seonhak-won in Seoul), Choe

---

<sup>49</sup> Ibid, 62-63.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid, 63.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid, 63-64.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid, 64.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid, 64-65.

<sup>54</sup> See the October 28, 1954 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.185.

<sup>55</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 65.

<sup>56</sup> I Jeong, ed., 286.

Wolsan (1912-1997) (of Paldal-sa Temple in Suwon), Nam Mubul (1907-1994) (of Tongdo-sa Temple in Yangsan), Gim Yongbong (of Haein-sa Temple in Hapcheon), Bak Jeong-am (of Beomnyun-sa Temple in Seoul), Bak Bon-gong (of Samseong-am Temple in Seoul), Bak Chudam (1898-1978) (of Jeokjo-am Temple in Seoul), Mun Iljo (of Seongju-sa Temple in Masan), I Beobung (of Bong-am-sa Temple in Mungyeong), Yun Wolha (of Tongdo-sa Temple in Yangsan), Sin Socheon (1897-1978) (of Seonhak-won in Seoul), Bak Beomnyong (1914-2005) (of Jeonghye-sa Temple in Yesan), Gim Seoun (1903-1995)<sup>57</sup> (of Gapjang-sa Temple in Sangju), Im Wongwang (of Dabo-sa Temple in Naju), Gim Wongwang (of Haein-sa Temple in Hapcheon), Gang Seokju (of Geumjeong-sa Temple in Dongnae), Gim Jiwol (1911-1973) (of Seonam-sa Temple in Busan), Gim Gyeong-u (b. 1928)<sup>58</sup> (of Cheongguk-sa Temple in Jinju), I Beophong (1915-2003) (of Geumsu-sa Temple in Busan), Min Dogwang (of Seonhak-won in Seoul), Gim Tanheo (1913-1983)<sup>59</sup> (of Chilbo-am Temple in Gangneung), Gim Honggyeong (of Chilbo-am Temple in Gangneung), Ha Dongsan (of Beomeo-sa Temple in Dongnae), Son Gyeongsan (1917-1979)<sup>60</sup> (of Geumjeong-sa Temple in Dongnae), Gim Daeu (of Mangwol-sa Temple in Yangju), I Jonghwi (of Beomeo-sa Temple in Dongnae), Chae Byeogam (of Seonhak-won in Seoul), Bak Dong-am (1904-1969) (of Daegak-sa Temple in Seoul), Choe Wonheo (1889-1966) (of Seonhak-won in Seoul), Yu Seogam (1911-1992) (of Seonam-sa Temple in Busan), Gim Seoksan (of Sinheung-sa Temple in Ulsan), So Gusan (of Yonghwa-sa Temple in Tongyeong), Min Cheongho (of Daegak-sa Temple in Seoul), Gim Daewol (of Mubong-am Temple in Milyang), Bak Byeogan (1901-1988)<sup>61</sup> (of Gamno-sa Temple in Busan), I Seokho (of Paye-sa Temple in Daegu), and Yang Gyeongsun.<sup>62</sup>

They also elected seven members of Regulations Committee, i.e., Gim Daeu, I Cheongdam, Gim Gyeong-u, Gim Honggyeong, I Unheo, Gim Hyangbong, and Nam Mubul; seven members of Education Committee, i.e., Gim Yongbong, I Beopjang, Gim Jiwol, Jo Geumdam, I Daeui, I Daecheol, and Gang Seokju; and five members of Reward and Punishment Committee, i.e., Son Gyeongsan, Choe Wonheo, Chae Byeogam, Gim Jiyeong, and Bak Beomnyong.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Hanguk bulgyo chongnam pyeonjip wiwon-hoe (The Editing Committee for the Comprehensive Collection of Source Materials of Contemporary Korean Buddhism), ed., *Hanguk bulgyo chongnam* (The Comprehensive Collection of Source Materials of Contemporary Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Daehan bulgyo jinheung-won, 1993), 535.

<sup>58</sup> *Chongnam*, 529.

<sup>59</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 319.

<sup>60</sup> I Jeong, ed., 368.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 109-110.

<sup>62</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 71-72.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 72.

On September 30, the 50 representatives held the order's 1<sup>st</sup> provisional assembly meeting in which they appointed the order's spiritual leader and cabinet members among the unmarried monks. Song Manam was elected as the order's supreme patriarch, Ha Dongsan as its vice supreme patriarch, I Cheongdam as its general manager, Gim Jaun as its vinaya preceptor, Yun Wolha as its secretary of general affairs, Bak Ingok as its secretary of education, and I Beophong as its secretary of finance. I Hyobong was elected as the central assembly's speaker and Gim Jeogeum as vice speaker.

The *Jayu sinmun* discussed the 2<sup>nd</sup> national conference for celibate monastics in its September 28, 1954 issue. The order's Secretariat Head Office considered the conference as being illegal and unauthentic. The married monastic group considered it as a government-authorized conference and the movement as a government-sponsored one. Married monks regarded that nobody kept 250 monastic precepts in Korean Buddhism. According to their standard, there was no real monk. They also counter-argued against I Seungman's arguments that generalized married monks as being pro-Japanese. The newspaper quoted and introduced Ha Dongsan and Bak Seongha, who represented unmarried and married monks respectively, as follows:

Ha Dongsan of Seonhak-won (Center for Seon Studies) says, "We do not have any worldly desire but make efforts to purify Korean Buddhism. We do not intend to occupy temples but to establish proper Jogye Order. We can admit the assertion that there is no monk in Korean Buddhism. We are making efforts to become celibate monks."

Bak Seongha (Secretary-General of the Secretariat Head Office of Jogye Order) says, "As the 1<sup>st</sup> presidential message requested, we need to purify 300 temples near and in cities which became merrymaking places. We really appreciate his message. However, we do not agree him that generalized married monks as being pro-Japanese. I hope that the conference will not make a bad reputation."<sup>64</sup>

The *Yeonhap sinmun* summarized the 2<sup>nd</sup> national conference for celibate monastics in its September 29, 1954 issue and introduced the arguments of both sides as follows:

The 2<sup>nd</sup> national conference for celibate monks was held on September 28 in the morning at Seonhak-won in Seoul on three agendas such as the passing of the revised constitution, the reorganization of the order, and the education of Buddhist monks. Celibate monks argue that with this conference as a momentum, they will correct and clean the corrupt order.

.....  
The conference will pass a resolution that the conference participants should remove married monks from the monk register and return them to lives

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid, 66.



as laypersons. If so, they can remove from the order married monks who manage temples across the nation. They wanted to reorganize the monastic order only with celibate monks and nuns by excluding married monks. They will resolve in the conference that if married monks have their marriage annulled, they can be included in the monastic order. Married monks vehemently criticize celibate monks who reorganize the order in order to aim at taking the interests from temples.<sup>65</sup>

As above, celibate monks argued that married monks should be removed from the monk register and reassigned as laypersons. However, married monks countered that the actual and real goal of the conference is to take the hegemony from married monks and to gain management rights of temples. Each side attacked the other from different contexts. Celibate monks defended their arguments based on celibate Buddhist monastic tradition and vinaya texts and theoretically attacked married monks. However, married monks questioned the identity of celibate monks, considered that the majority of them did not actually preserve the precepts and counter-argued against celibate monks that they just utilized vinaya texts to accomplish their political goals and interests.

Celibate monks passed the order's revised constitution in the 2<sup>nd</sup> national conference for celibate monks. Married monks did not recognize the constitution but considered it as being illegal. They argued that celibate monks did not pass the revised constitution in the order's central assembly. Immediately after the 1<sup>st</sup> presidential message on May 20, 1954, the order's Secretariat Head Office revised and passed its constitution in its cabinet meeting on June 20, 1954 and promulgated and implemented it on July 6<sup>th</sup> and celibate monks revised and passed the constitution in the 2<sup>nd</sup> national conference for celibate monks on September 28-29.

While the constitution passed on June 20, 1954 defined the monastic order as consisting of two groups, i.e., married and unmarried monastic groups, the newly revised constitution excluded married monks in the monastic order and classified only unmarried monastics as monastics. While the previous constitution considered National Master Taego (1301-1382) to be the order's founding patriarch and adopted the sectarian Imje Seon Dharma lineage of Taego, the new constitution regarded National Master Jinul (1258-1210) to be the order's founding patriarch and adopted the ecumenical Dharma lineage of Jinul. While Taego belonged to the Seon Dharma lineage established on Mt. Gaji by Doui (d. 821), Jinul transmitted the Seon Dharma lineage established on Mt. Sagul by Beomil.

The characteristics of the revised constitution passed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> national conference for unmarried monks can be summarized in the following two points. First, it defined the monastic order as being composed of only unmarried monastics and it categorized married monks as part of the lay group from the

---

<sup>65</sup> Ibid, 67.

sectarian perspective of celibate monks. The constitution theoretically backed up the sectarian perspective for celibate monks.

Second, it changed the Dharma lineage of the order from National Master Taego to National Master Jinul in order to differentiate their founder from the married group.<sup>66</sup> The change of the order's founder was completely political, not based on doctrine. Taego was a Seon sectarian and Jinul was an ecumenist between doctrinal aspects and practical Seon ones. The current monastic education curriculum was formed under the influence of ecumenist Jinul. However, the Seon masters traditionally asserted that they were successors of the Linji Chan lineage of Taego, not the ecumenical lineage of Jinul. Because the movement's advocates define themselves as being Seon practitioners and aim at revitalizing Seon Buddhism, they are natural to follow the Imje Seon sectarian Dharma lineage, not ecumenical Dharma lineage.

On October 3, Gwon Sangno (1879-1965) and I Jong-ik argued against each other at the Center for Seon Studies. Gwon Sangno considered the order's founding patriarch to be Doui who firstly introduced Seon Buddhism to Korea while I Jong-ik adopted Jinul as the order's founding patriarch. Celibate monks adopted I Jong-ik's and his colleague I Jaeyeol's assertion, considered Jinul to be the founding patriarch, and accepted the ecumenical Dharma lineage of Jinul.<sup>67</sup>

On October 4, Patriarch Song Manam, I Hyobong and Ha Dongsan visited Yongju-sa Temple in Suwon and on October 5, they came back to the Center for Seon Studies. On October 4, Gim Gyeong-u, a younger Dharma brother of Yun Wolha and a disciple of Gim Guha, went to Busan, and on October 6, Gim Gyeong-u accompanied his master Gim Guha to Taego-sa Temple and came back to the Center for Seon Studies by himself. On October 7, Gim Guha came from Taego-sa Temple to the Center for Seon Studies.<sup>68</sup>

On October 9, Ha Dongsan along with more than three hundred celibate monks went on a hunger strike and demanded to purify Japanized Buddhism in Korean Buddhism at Taego-sa Temple, the order's head temple. On October 9, the order's Secretariat Head Office declared that the revised constitution passed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> national conference for celibate monks was unauthentic and illegal.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> When the movement was completed, even Patriarch I Seongcheol of the Jogye Order, also spiritual leader of Haein-sa Temple, vehemently criticized the change of its founder from Taego to Jinul and strongly asserted that the Jogye Order should transmit the Linji Chan lineage originated from Taego. He is a strong Chan sectarian unlike the ecumenist scholar/practitioner Jinul. The argument by I Seongcheol caused political and theoretical tension between the monastic group of the Haein-sa Temple and the group of the Songgwang-sa Temple at which Jinul resided.

<sup>67</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 74.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid, 74-75.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid, 81.

The *Dong-a ilbo* summarized disputes between married and unmarried monks and the movement's process in its October 9, 1954 issue.<sup>70</sup>

On October 10, the two sides, the unmarried monastic group and the married one, discussed the order's urgent cases at Taego-sa Temple. On the issue of the definition of the monastic order, the two groups differed completely. The married monastic group considered the order to be the combination of married and unmarried monks based on the order's previous constitution and did not accept the new one, revised by only the unmarried monks. However, the unmarried monastic camp degraded married monks to laypersons based on the traditional monastic discipline texts and their revised constitution. The meeting was broken off. On October 10 - 11, representatives of the unmarried group, i.e., Ha Dongsan, I Cheongdam, and Yun Wolha, visited the presidential office two times to get support from President I Seungman.<sup>71</sup>

According to the October 11, 1954 issue of *Yeonhap sinmun*, while married monks contended that they should partition the order into two, the married monastic group and the unmarried monastic group, unmarried monks argued that they should reassign married monks to laypersons and preserve the order united without dividing the order into two.<sup>72</sup>

We can summarize the arguments by married monks as follows: "(1) Because they have grown up from childhood as monks, their identity as monks should be recognized. (2) If possible, celibate monks can be categorized as the monastic group of self-cultivation and married monks as the monastic group of propagation. (3) Because their religious masters were Seon masters and-or vinaya masters, even though they are married, they are still monks. (4) Because Korea is a democratic nation and a law-governed country, the president cannot intervene in religion and the president should comply with laws. If the president persists in maintaining his own stubborn opinion, the case would be brought to court."<sup>73</sup>

We can also outline the counterarguments by celibate monks as follows: "(1) If monks marry and have their wives, they should immediately lose monkhood. Married monks should be laypersons, not monks. (2) Only celibate monks can be the group of monastics, and married monks are not monks. We should categorize them in the group of protecting Buddhist teachings. (3) Only celibate monks should be the direct descendants of the Buddha. We should preserve the precepts originated from the Buddha himself, protect the Three Jewels, i.e., the Buddha, the Buddha's teachings and the Buddha's followers, and guide the Buddhist community. (4) The Buddha entrusted rulers to take care of Buddhism during the degenerate ages. If we Buddhists cannot handle our own problems, we can borrow the state power to purify those."<sup>74</sup>

<sup>70</sup> Ibid, 76-77.

<sup>71</sup> See the November 28, 1954 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.190.

<sup>72</sup> See the October 11, 1954 issue of *Yeonhap sinmun*, Min Dogwang, ed., 84.

<sup>73</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 78-79.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid, 78.

Both arguments are debatable and are not objective. First, according to Buddhist teaching, we cannot justify married monkhood. The definition of monkhood by married monks is not reasonable based on Buddhist vinaya texts. However, married monkhood historically resulted from Japanese occupation. Realistically speaking, we could not ignore the historical background of married monkhood. Second, Buddhism originally advocates separation between religion and state. The argument by celibate monks that Buddhism can rely on state is wrong. They needed the state and external power to back them up because they could not compete with married monks. The necessity of state power by celibate monks does not base on Buddhist texts, but on political purposes. Reflecting upon the arguments and counterarguments of both sides, they unreasonably concocted and developed their own arguments and counterarguments.

Because the sides disagreed, they could not continue their meeting. Eighty celibate monks who observed the meeting visited the presidential office and could not see President I Seungman. However, they reserved a meeting between the president and some representatives of celibate monks scheduled next day on October 11.<sup>75</sup> Most of them returned to the Center for Seon Studies. While meditating, Ha Dongsan entered a hunger strike at Taego-sa Temple. Several celibate monks followed him and fasted.<sup>76</sup>

On October 11, five representatives such as I Cheongdam, Jeong Geum-o, Choe Wonheo, Gim Jeogeum, and Yun Wolha of the celibate monastic group visited and see President I Seungman at the presidential office to get political and administrative support from him. President I Seungman encouraged them to develop and complete the movement. The movement's advocates proudly requested, even in modern times and without question, state protectionism which pre-modern Korean Buddhists welcomed. They clearly violated the modern constitution and democracy which prescribes the separation between religion and state in order to accomplish their political purpose. So, married monks defined the movement as a government-sponsored movement.

On October 12, lay Buddhist representatives hosted an informal meeting and discussed how to support the movement at the Center for Seon Studies. Celibate monks organized the committee for purifying the order of Korean Buddhism (Hanguk bulgyo gyodan jeonghwa wiwon-hoe) at 7:00 pm and its eight subcommittees. They assigned 11 monks to the measure committee, 15 monks to the finance committee, 13 monks to the publicity committee, 15 monks to the communication committee, 12 monks to the information committee, 13 monks to the implementation committee, 8 monks to the planning committee, and 5 monks to the negotiating committee.<sup>77</sup>

On October 13, around 60 lay Buddhist representatives in the Seoul area met at Daebi-won in Seoul and discussed how to support the movement and

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid, 82.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid, 79.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid, 86.

determined in the meeting that they would host the national conference for lay Buddhists at Seonhak-won (Center for Seon Studies) on October 15.<sup>78</sup> They advertized the meeting in the October 15, 1954 issue of *Pyeonghwa sinmun*.<sup>79</sup>

On October 15, Gim Hancheon hosted the conference for lay Buddhist representatives in the Seoul area at the Center for Seon Studies for two hours in which around 126 lay Buddhists, a policeman, and a reporter participated and passed the following resolutions as follows:

- (1) We, lay Buddhists, should support the celibate monastic group.
- (2) We should host a national conference for lay Buddhists in Seoul as soon as possible.
- (3) We should make the association of lay Buddhists in each province and justify why we should purify the order.<sup>80</sup>

On October 15, Patriarch Song Manam declared a manifesto in that he agreed with the movement's main ideas and seriously criticized the change of the order's founding patriarch. Two representative lay Buddhist scholars, I Jaeyeol and I Jong-ik, and one representative monastic Buddhist I Cheongdam, theorists of the movement, changed the order's founder from Taego to Jinul. It ignited the controversies in Korean Buddhism.

On October 17, Bak Seongha, Secretary-General of the Jogye Order, issued a public declaration for married monastic group in the *Jayu (Liberty) sinmun* and defined the movement as the political, unethical, splittist and sectarian movement which divides united and harmonious Jogye order.<sup>81</sup>

On October 18, the celibate monastic group counter-issued a public statement against Bak Seongha's public declaration, refuted his arguments and defended the movement in the *Dong-a ilbo* as follows:

Since Buddhism was introduced to our nation, it did not serve only for the limited number but also for the masses. It was not an empty theory and was not available in the limited space. It was not a mystic religion and was not separated from the masses. Buddhism really became the meals and life of the masses, liberated them from ignorance and confusion, developed wisdom and light in them, was deeply rooted in their spirit, and became the progressive and guiding religion. However, Korean Buddhism was Japanized under the Japanese colonial period, 1910-1945, for around past forty years. So, Korean Buddhism lost its purity due to imperial Japan's poisonous teeth and iron belts....<sup>82</sup>

The above statement also considered married monasticism and meatism as being originated from Japanese Buddhism during the colonial period and

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid, 88.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid, 90.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid, 91-92.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid, 93.

defined Japanized Korean Buddhism as being deteriorated from original Buddhism and authentic Korean Buddhism.

Jeon Jinhan, a married monk, an ex-congressman and the government's former secretary of social affairs, who helped Ha Dongsan to return to his home temple of Beomeo-sa when married monks kicked him out of it in 1953, strongly supported the movement and declared that he would return to a lay Buddhist because he was married.<sup>83</sup>

On October 22, 1954, Hyeon O, president of Korean Lay Buddhists, asked married monastics in seven items and justified the movement in the *Seoul sinmun* as follows:

1. Everyone knows that monks should not marry, drink intoxicants, smoke cigarettes, eat meat, and tell a lie. How can married priests be monks?
2. If we save money except necessary expenses, we are able to establish a school and a newspaper company each year. Where did married priests spend the money?
3. The government implemented an agricultural land reform and compensated married priests for temple lands. You, married priests, used land securities to purchase and manage theaters and breweries and finally changed your occupation. Can you remember your actions?
4. President I Seungman issued an informal announcement and requested temple lands not privatized and returned to temples. You, married priests, returned to the temples. Did you come back to their temples for their own interests or to follow the president's announcement?
5. Did Śākyamuni Buddha allow you, married priests, to tell fortunes? How can you cheat others and escape from the sin which you committed?
6. You, married priests, defamed monastics, monks and nuns, and laypersons who tried to recover celibate monastic tradition. How can you do so as Buddhists?
7. Everybody knows that you, married priests, have maltreated celibate monastics who transmit the life of Śākyamuni Buddha by being clad in tattered clothes, eating pine needles, and seriously cultivating their minds.

Due to the Buddha's favors, you, married priests, could study abroad, become congressmen, and enjoy five sensual desires. Now, you should reflect your past conducts. We stand at the crossroads of our Buddhism. I think that it is the time that we should repay the kindness of celibate monastics. If celibate monastics can grind the bones and revitalize Buddhism, they will compete to disembowel themselves and to observe a fast. I wish you should not pretend yourselves as monks but return to the laypersons and protect the proper Buddhist teachings.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Ibid, 771.

<sup>84</sup> See the October 22, 1954 issue of *Seoul sinmun*, Min Dogwang, ed., 98.

On October 29, Ha Dongsan, I Cheongdam and Jeong Geum-o visited the presidential office.<sup>85</sup> On the same day, Jeong Geum-o, I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha visited and discussed how to successfully accomplish the movement with the government's secretary of education.<sup>86</sup>

On November 3, because Song Manam was the patriarch of both sides and disagreed with celibate monks in terms of the order's founder, the unmarried monastic side held the order's 2<sup>nd</sup> provisional assembly meeting at the Center for Seon Studies, fired the current patriarch Song Manam, recommended the new patriarch, and elected the order's some new cabinet members. Thirty-one representatives of the order's central assembly attended the meeting. They recommended Ha Dongsan to be its highest patriarch, Jeong Geum-o to its vice highest patriarch, Gim Jaun as its vinaya preceptor and I Cheongdam as its general manager of the order's Secretariat Head Office. Because I Beophong, secretary of finance, sided with married monastics, Gim Seoun substituted the position. Ha Dongsan became the spiritual leader only for the group of celibate monks, not for all of Buddhist monks.

Because they expelled I Beophong (of Geumsu-sa Temple in Busan) because he sided with the married monastic group and Bak Bon-gong (of Samseong-am in Seoul) and Bak Yeong-am (of Beopsu-sa Temple in Seoul) due to insincerity, they elected 3 vacant members of the order's central assembly, i.e., I Daeui (of Seonhak-won in Seoul), Yun Goam (1899-1988) (of Dabo-sa Temple in Naju), and Bak Geumbong (of Bojeong-sa Temple in Yesan).

On September 18, unmarried monks sent an official notice only to monks, not to nuns, and did not encourage nuns to attend the 2<sup>nd</sup> national conference for celibate monks on September 28-29, 1954. They did not include celibate nuns in the celibate monastic category. Gim Jiyeong criticized the movement's leaders who discriminated against nuns.<sup>87</sup> However, they added 10 nuns to 50 members of the order's central assembly on November 3, making 60 members in total in the order's central assembly. They added ten nuns to the order's central assembly. The ten additional members are Jeong Geumgwang, Jeong Suok (1902-1966),<sup>88</sup> I Inhong (1908-1997),<sup>89</sup> I Seong-u, I Ryeonjin, An Hyeun (1911-2009), Gang Jaho, Bae Myojeon (d. 2003), Bae Myochan, and Yu Hyechun (d. 1998).

November 4, President I Seungman issued his 2<sup>nd</sup> presidential message at 9:30 pm. Next day, on November 5, Ha Dongsan, I Hyobong and I Cheongdam guided eighty celibate monks and marched on the street from the Center for

---

<sup>85</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 103. Min Dogwang mentioned that the three representatives of the celibate monastic side visited the presidential office. However, he did not state in his book whether or not they met President I Seungman and if they met with each other, what they talked.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid, 106-107.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid, 61.

<sup>88</sup> I Jeong, ed., 156.

<sup>89</sup> *Chongnam*, 578.

Seon Studies to Taego-sa Temple, the head temple of Korean Buddhism.<sup>90</sup> They occupied the head temple. The *Jayu sinmun* positively discussed the movement in its November 7, 1954 issue.<sup>91</sup>

On November 10, celibate monks changed the temple title from Taego-sa Temple related with Taego to Jogye-sa Temple related with Jinul who was active on Mt. Jogye on which his resident Songgwang-sa Temple is located. They changed the order's title board to the Jogye Order. Unmarried monk asked Secretary-General Bak Seongha of the order's Secretariat Head Office to hand over business to them. However, Secretary-General Bak Seongha did not hand over it to them.

On November 10, the supreme patriarch Ha Dongsan, the vice supreme patriarch Jeong Geum-o and the general manager I Cheongdam issued a manifesto in the November 13, 1954 issue of *Seoul sinmun* and propagated the movement's justification to the Korean masses.<sup>92</sup> However, on November 11, Secretary-General Bak Seongha of the order's Secretariat Head Office announced a notice in the November 16, 1954 issue of *Dong-a ilbo* as follows:

The *Joseon ilbo* reported that self-defined celibate monks occupied Taego-sa Temple and obtained the temple's hegemony. In fact, several tens of celibate monks gathered at the Center for Seon Studies, upon the announcement of the 2<sup>nd</sup> presidential message by President I Seungman, invaded Taego-sa Temple, removed the title board of the Secretariat Head Office of the Jogye Order and the title board of Taego-sa Temple, and illegally and arbitrarily put up the title board of Jogye-sa Temple, a fake temple title. However, employees of the order's Secretariat Head Office and monks of various temples across the nation are protecting Taego-sa Temple from their invasion in union. I remind you that Taego-sa Temple and the order's Secretariat Head Office are ok and without problem.<sup>93</sup>

On November 14, celibate monks hosted a public lecture on the theme of Purification of Buddhism at Jogye-sa Temple in which around 700 Buddhists participated. The supreme patriarch Ha Dongsan attended the lecture and read a written oath for purifying Korean Buddhism.<sup>94</sup> I Cheongdam as the keynote speaker explained the movement's objectives.

On November 15 – 16, unmarried monk hosted the annual memorial service for late eminent Seon master Song Mangong (1871-1946) at Jogye-sa Temple. On the same day, the supreme patriarch Song Manam who advocated the Imje Seon Dharma lineage of Taego and did not accept the ecumenical Dharma lineage of Jinul ordered married monks to remove the board of Jogye-sa Temple and the title board of the order's Secretariat Head Office.

---

<sup>90</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 111-115.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid, 121.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid, 128.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid, 134.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid, 129-130.



On November 15, I Seon-geun (1905-1983) served as the government's secretary of education between April 21, 1954 and June 7, 1956 hosted a joint meeting between Secretary-General Bak Seongha, former Secretary-General Gim Beomnin and Secretary Sin Jijeong of General Affairs in the order's Secretariat Head Office representing the married monastic side and Vice Patriarch Jeong Geum-o, General Manager I Cheongdam, and Secretary Yun Wolha of General Affairs of the Center for Seon Studies representing the unmarried monastic side. The married monastic representatives suggested the unmarried monastic representatives should convene and pass a newly revised constitution in the order's central assembly's meeting in which married and unmarried monks should participate on November 20 and to legally accomplish the movement based on the new constitution. However, the unmarried monastic representatives suggested the married monastic representatives to unite under the guidance of Supreme Patriarch Ha Dongsan and to concede temple management rights to unmarried monks as soon as possible. The government's department of education recommended both sides to cooperate with each other and to finish the movement.<sup>95</sup>

The *Hanguk ilbo* estimated the number of monks at 7,000 and the number of unmarried monks at around 300 in its November 17, 1954 issue.<sup>96</sup> Because unmarried monks were not enough in number, they relied upon the external power of the government. They did not want to give any voting rights to married monks and tried to exclude them in the temple management rights and the order's administrative rights. However, married monks tried to maintain and defend their status quo and not to let unmarried monks intervene in the temple management rights and the order's administrative rights as possible as they could.

On November 17, unmarried monks hospitalized six monks who received violence from married monks who tried to change the title boards at Taego-sa Temple. On November 18, they attached medical certificates and sued them for their violence. On November 19, President I Seungman issued the 3<sup>rd</sup> presidential message and politically supported the movement. On November 20 – 21, married monks hosted the order's central assembly meeting at Taego-sa Temple and changed the title board of Jogye-sa Temple to Taego-sa Temple. The police removed the title board of Taego-sa Temple for unmarried monks.

On November 22, Gwon Sangno delivered his lecture on Taego in the morning at Taego-sa Temple. In the afternoon, married monks decided to let the Association of Master Taego's Dharma Descendants respect National Master Taego and establish a sect, to hand over the order's administrative rights and temple management rights to unmarried monks of the association, and let them take over the order and temples. The unmarried monks affiliated with the Center

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid, 136.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid.

for Seon Studies again put up the title board of Jogye-sa Temple at Taego-sa Temple.

On November 23, married monks organized the Association of Taego's Dharma Descendants constituting celibate monks and let them take the key posts of the order's Secretariat Head Office. The unmarried monks considered themselves as authentic celibate monks and criticized them as puppet and pseudo-celibate monks representing married monks. The married monastic side appointed Im Seokjin (1892-1968) to the secretary-general, Jeong Bongmo to the secretary of general affairs, Gim Sangho to the secretary of religious affairs, Bak Seogak to the secretary of finance, Guk Mukdam (1896-1981) to Inspector General and Bak Seongwon to Vice Inspector General. They also appointed the sixteen members to the measure committee. Those 16 members whom they appointed are Gim Beomnin, Baek Seong-uk (1897-1981), Choe Gaphwan (b. 1910), Gim Cheong-am, Gwon Sangno, I Honseong (b. 1886), Gim Donghwa (1902-1980), Gwak Gijong, Gim Junyeol, Seo Sang-in, I Dongjo, Bak Seungnyong (1918-1996), Jang Yongseo, Jo Ilpa, Bak Gowon, Gim Suseong, Byeon Wolju, Bae Hongsik, Sin Jeongho, Han Jaehwa, I Jaeseok, Bak Chunhae, I Namchae, Gim Yonghak, Gim Cheol, and Ji Hyeun.

On November 29, the unmarried monks affiliated with the Center for Seon Studies sent six monks to each provinces and asked celibate monks to register themselves in the monk register. They also sent an official notice to temples and noticed the 3<sup>rd</sup> national conference for celibate monks and nuns on December 7 – 8 in it.<sup>97</sup> On November 30, they dispatched lecturers to provinces and let them take lecture on and popularize the movement.<sup>98</sup>

On December 1, unmarried monks decided to host the 2<sup>nd</sup> public lecture on Purification Buddhism on December 5 at Jogye-sa Temple.<sup>99</sup> On December 3, more than 80 celibate monks and nuns living in Seoul visited the presidential office to appreciate President I Seungman for supporting them and to request him to strongly and continuously support the movement. However, they did not meet him at the presidential office. On December 4, I Seon-geun, secretary of education, told in the press conference that the government would make an administrative measure to purify temples.<sup>100</sup>

On December 5, the Association of Male Lay Buddhists and the Association of Female Lay Buddhists hosted a public lecture on the movement at Jogye-sa Temple and requested married monks to become laypersons conscientiously and preserve the wisdom lamp of the Buddha. Local lay leaders announced their written petitions to President I Seungman.<sup>101</sup> On December 6,

---

<sup>97</sup> Ibid, 160.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid, 162.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid, 165.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid.

around twenty lay representatives visited the office of education secretary and requested him to support the movement.<sup>102</sup>

On December 7, around 20 leaders of each side attended a joint meeting between married and unmarried monks respectively for around three hours at Jogye-sa Temple. Married monks argued that unmarried monks should abandon the constitution which they illegally passed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> national conference for celibate monks on September 28 and should become the Dharma descendants of National Master Taego, not of National Master Jinul and they would not become laypersons. Unmarried monks argued that married monks should be classified as laypersons and should not intervene in the monastic affairs.<sup>103</sup>

On December 7, Ha Dongsan, supreme patriarch of the celibate monastic side, postponed the 3<sup>rd</sup> national conference for celibate monks and nuns scheduled on December 7 – 8 to December 10. On December 10, because married monks blocked the entrance to main hall at Jogye-sa Temple, more than 400 celibate monks sat down in courtyard in front of main hall for five – six hours in protest against married monks and declared the adjournment. On December 11 - 13, unmarried monks consisting of 211 monks and 221 nuns discussed various topics in the conference.

Ha Dongsan published the order's official announcement as its supreme patriarch in the December 8, 1954 issue of *Haengjeong sinmun* (Government Administration Newspaper) and asked married monks to clear their married status and become to celibate monks or to clear their monastic registers and return to lay Buddhists.<sup>104</sup> According to the announcement, if married monks registered themselves as lay priests and returned monastics, the order could appoint them as a temple's acting abbot, its major secretarial position, its manager, its mission workers, and others.

On December 10, just one day before the 3<sup>rd</sup> national conference for celibate monastics, Ha Dongsan issued his patriarchal message to Korean Buddhists and asked Korean Buddhists to recover Korean Buddhism from Japanized married monasticism as the highest patriarch of the Jogye Order.<sup>105</sup>

On December 13, just after the 3<sup>rd</sup> national conference for celibate monastics at Jogye-sa Temple, around 5 – 6 hundreds of monks, nuns, laymen and laywomen marched in downtown Seoul and advertized the movement to the public.<sup>106</sup> The highest patriarch Ha Dongsan and other six representatives visited the presidential office and discussed the movement with President I Seungman.

---

<sup>102</sup> Ibid, 166.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid, 166-167.

<sup>104</sup> Dongsan mundo-hoe, ed., 307.

<sup>105</sup> Gim Gwangsik, "Ha Dongsan ui bulgyo jeonghwa," in Dongsan mundo-hoe and Gim Gwangsik, eds., *Dongsan daejongsa wa bulgyo jeonghwa undong* (Great Master Ha Dongsan and Purification Buddhist Movement) (Busan: Beomeo-sa Temple, 2007), 597, originally included in *Jogye jongbo* (Official Magazine of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism) 127 (2006): 50-51.

<sup>106</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 181-182.

President I Seungman encouraged them to successfully accomplish their movement.

In January 1955, criticizing the celibate monks who changed the order's founder from Taego to Jinul, Song Manam resigned the highest patriarch post and joined the group of married monks. Even so, married monks still considered Song Manam as their spiritual patriarch. Since November 3, 1954, on which celibate monks recommended Ha Dongsan as their highest patriarch, there were two highest patriarchs in the order. On June 30, 1956, married monks again enthroned Song Manam as the married monastic order's highest patriarch.

Song Manam was the official highest patriarch since March 15, 1951 until to November 3, 1954 in the order and since November 3, 1954 to his death on January 10, 1957 only in the married monastic order. On March 17, 1957, married monks enthroned Guk Mukdam as the highest patriarch in their group. Twice, on February 28, 1963 and on April 17, 1968, they enthroned Guk Mukdam as the highest patriarch in the married monastic side. Upon the official registration of a new order entitled Taego Order of Korean Buddhism for married monks to the government on May 8, 1970, they enthroned Bak Daeryun (1884-1979) as the order's highest patriarch. Therefore, between November 3, 1954 and May 8, 1970, Jogye Order had had two highest patriarchs, one for married monks and another for celibate monks.

## **2. The movement's development**

The celibate monastics of the Jogye Order developed the movement from President I Seungman's 2<sup>nd</sup> presidential message on November 4, 1954 to the 1<sup>st</sup> government-endorsed national conference for celibate monks on August 12, 1955. The national conference authorized the previous four national conferences for celibate monks and the government provided unmarried monks with the hegemony of the order and its temples and allowed them to secure the management rights of the order and its temples. So, celibate monks were allowed to take the order's key positions and temple abbots. I discussed in this section how celibate monks had firmly secured the hegemony in the order and its temples after the national conference.

I arranged four subsections and discussed the movement's development in this section. For example, I discussed the movement's development from November 4, 1954 on which President I Seungman issued the 2<sup>nd</sup> presidential message to May 15, 1955 on which the 4<sup>th</sup> national conference for celibate monks was scheduled in the first subsection; from May 15 to August 2, 1955 on which the 4<sup>th</sup> national conference was hosted in the second subsection; from August 2 to August 12, 1955 on which the 5<sup>th</sup> national conference, the 1<sup>st</sup> government-recognized national conference, was held in the third subsection; and from August 12, 1955 to the April 19<sup>th</sup>, 1960 Movement based on which celibate monks lost their strong supporter President I Seungman in the fourth subsection.

## 2.1. November 4, 1954 – May 15, 1955

On November 4, 1954, President I Seungman issued the 2<sup>nd</sup> presidential message in which he requested Korean Buddhists to cleanse Japanese Buddhist elements in it.<sup>107</sup> The November 6, 1954 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun* introduced the message, “Korean Buddhism has famous Buddhist temples and halls in its splendid history. It is superior to Chinese and Japanese Buddhism and has its very peculiar and unique spirit. Many of eminent Korean Buddhist monks have casted away their riches and honors as bits of straw, have concentrated on cultivating their mind and have guided sentient beings. All monks should rouse patriotism and rally against Japanized spirit and customs of Korean Buddhism. They should nationally organize a movement against married monks and take completely back the temples and their affiliated properties. And they should guide Buddhists to repair and keep them.”<sup>108</sup>

On November 5, with the strong support from President I Seungman, 80 unmarried monks marched on the street from the Center for Seon Studies to Taego-sa Temple, the head temple of Korean Buddhism. They occupied the head temple and changed the temple title from Taego-sa Temple related with Taego to Jogye-sa Temple related with Jinul who was active on Mt. Jogye on which his resident Songgwang-sa Temple is located. They changed the order’s title board to the Jogye Order.

After the unmarried monastic group’s occupation of the Taego-sa Temple, the movement became violent. For instance, on November 10, the unmarried monastic group expelled the married monks from Taego-sa Temple and the married monastic one removed the unmarried monks from several big temples such as Tongdo-sa Temple, Beomeo-sa Temple and others on the same day. Later Ha Dongsan, Jeong Geum-o and I Cheongdam declared a public announcement to support the movement. Conflicts between two groups became intensified. On November 17, the married monastic group intruded in Taego-sa Temple. The police was sent to intervene in the dispute. Six celibate monks were injured at the time.<sup>109</sup>

Both sides began to take the cases to court and the national assembly. They violated vinaya that regulates that monks should not take their internal cases to the external institutions. Vinaya clearly mentions that monks should solve their problems in their community through their internal rules. Even so, on November 10, the married monastic group took their case to the court and on November 18, to the national assembly. On November 24, the unmarried monastic group took their case to the court.

---

<sup>107</sup> See the November 6, 1954 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.185-186.

<sup>108</sup> S.1.1.186.

<sup>109</sup> See the November 19, 1954 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.187.

On November 19, President I Seungman issued the 3<sup>rd</sup> presidential message to back up the celibate monastic group and urged Korean Buddhists to organize the Committee for Purification Buddhism.<sup>110</sup> The violence became more serious. Because of the strong support from the president's office and the celibate monastic group's aggressive actions, the married monastic one began to be violent defensively. A daily newspaper vehemently criticized violence equally used in the movement by both sides.<sup>111</sup> While celibate monks used violence aggressively with the government's support, married monks adopted it defensively.

I Seongcheol, a strong advocate of the movement and an eminent disciple of Ha Dongsan, denounced the movement's serious dependence on external government support and argued that the movement could not be justified. He declared he would not attend the 2<sup>nd</sup> national conference and entered individual intensive retreat at the Seongjeon-am Hermitage of Pagye-sa Temple for eight years. He did not follow the change of the founding patriarch but strongly advocated the Imje Seon sectarian Dharma lineage of Taego.

On December 16, President I Seungman issued the 4<sup>th</sup> presidential message and urged that married monks should be removed from the temples. On December 17, the authorities of the department of education invited the married and the unmarried monastic groups and listened to their opinions from them. Married monks did not accept the order's constitution newly revised by unmarried monks in which unmarried monks categorized married monks to lay Buddhists. Married monks asked unmarried monks to keep the order's established constitution defining the monastic order as the combination of married and unmarried monks. Each of both sides enthroned each founding patriarch of Jinul and Taego respectively.<sup>112</sup>

Unlike three previous presidential messages, President I Seungman included the government's direct intervention in the order's administration in his 4<sup>th</sup> presidential message. He strongly and directly dictated in it that temples should elect their abbots and should have them approved by the government. He clearly violated the modern democracy's constitution and laws in which religion and state should be separated. He tried to put Buddhism and accomplish the movement under the government's direct control.

On December 18, the government's departments of interior and education jointly arranged a meeting between the leaders of both sides at the office of vice secretary of education and listened to the assertions of both sides. Three leaders such as Im Seokjin, Jeong Bongmo and Gim Sangho represented the married monastic group and four leaders including Jeong Geum-o, I Cheongdam, and Sin Socheon represented the unmarried monastic group. Both sides repeated their stereotyped arguments on the classification of married monks and the

---

<sup>110</sup> See the November 20, 1954 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.187-188 and the November 21, 1954 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.188.

<sup>111</sup> See the November 22, 1954 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.188.

<sup>112</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 193.

founding patriarch.<sup>113</sup> The *Pyeonghwa sinmun* reported in its December 18, 1954 issue that the National Police Headquarters of the Department of Interior warned married monks of trading temple properties illegally and declared that it would strictly implement the law against the illegal trade.<sup>114</sup>

On December 21, the leaders of both sides discussed how to settle down the dispute in the department of education. The National Police Headquarters invited three key leaders of Jeong Geum-o, I Cheongdam and Ha Dongsan and informed them of the government's official opinion. It told them that each side should nullify its constitution, elect its representatives and let them revise and pass the new constitution. However, the leaders of unmarried monks did not accept the government's proposal.

On December 22, the National Police Headquarters invited the representatives of both sides and summarized the government's basic opinion in 12 items to them as follows:

1. We should not discuss the order's founding patriarch.
2. We should revise the order's constitution. The equal number of married and unmarried monastic leaders should participate in revising it and revise it under a mutual agreement. When they revise the constitution, we should make it passed in the current order's central assembly and announced by the order's patriarch.
3. The newly-elected representatives should elect the executives of the order's Secretariat Head Office.
4. We should classify married monks as propagation monks.
5. The monastic order is composed of two groups, ascetic monks and propagation monks. The ascetic monks, constituting celibate monks and nuns, and monastics of more than 10 years after making a divorce, should concentrate on one or two practices in the following five practices, (1) the preservation of precepts, (2) the practice of Seon, (3) the chanting of the titles of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, (4) the reading of scriptures, and (5) the chanting of spells. They should live and practice Buddhism in the praxis compounds, follow the teachings of the Seon patriarchs, and obey the monastic rules. The propagation monks should preserve ten precepts, and can practice Seon, chant the titles of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, read scriptures, or chant spells. They are also able to accomplish the mission of Mahāyāna Buddhism by dedicating themselves to propagation, education, and social affairs and to take charge of all administrative and accounting affairs.
6. Only ascetic monks can become abbots. The unmarried monks of over 45 years old with the higher Dharma degree are qualified to become the abbots of big temples and those of over 35 years old with the intermediate Dharma degree to become the abbots of small and middle-size temples. However, if the number of ascetic monks is not enough to take charge of

---

<sup>113</sup> See the December 18, 1954 issue of *Pyeonghwa sinmun*, Min Dogwang, ed., 197.

<sup>114</sup> Ibid.

temples, qualified married monks are able to become temple abbots for a while.

7. The committee consisting of six elderly eminent monks, equally recommended by each side, is supposed to examine qualifications for celibate monks and propagation monks.
8. If unmarried monks committed crimes, we should remove them in the order's monk register. If some monks report their crimes to the order, the order shall consider their voluntary report and exempt their crimes in consideration of the extenuating circumstances or reinstate their monk rights after practicing their minds for a given period of time.
9. Propagation monks should move their family members from temple boundaries to purify temples. They should by themselves practice Buddhism and work in temples. If needed, the temple authorities should remove private houses in temples. If the temples can use them for temple buildings, they should purchase them from married monks. However, before the temple authorities have enough unmarried monks to manage temples, they should allow propagation monks to live in temples in accordance with the monastic rules.
10. The qualifications for monks and nuns shall be prescribed as follows: Monks should preserve 165 prohibited precepts, three comprehensive precepts,<sup>115</sup> and 250 precepts, and nuns should keep 165 prohibited precepts, three comprehensive precepts, and 500 precepts.
11. The fixed number of the order's central assembly shall be 50. The number should be equal between ascetic monks and propagation monks, assigning the proper number of assembly monks to each province. The qualifications for the order's assembly monks shall be over the intermediate Dharma degree.
12. Both sides should not make any collective action. Collective actions mean the action of more than two monks including the demonstration of threatening.<sup>116</sup>

Representatives I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha and I Beopjang of the celibate monastic group who attended the meeting totally turned down the government's proposal.<sup>117</sup> On December 25, the leaders of celibate monks decided to make and submit a new proposal to the government in 13 items as follows:

1. We shall not recognize the married monastic order and the order's constitution that married monks drafted and passed.

---

<sup>115</sup> The three comprehensive precepts are "(1) the precepts that encompasses all the rules and standards of behavior set forth by the Buddha for Mahāyāna bodhisattvas, i.e., to observe all those precepts and prevent evil; (2) the precept that encompasses all good deeds, i.e., to strive to perform good deeds; and (3) the precept that encompasses all living beings, i.e., to instruct and benefit all living beings." See the entry of "three comprehensive precepts" in the English Buddhist Dictionary Committee, ed., *The Soka Gakkai Dictionary of Buddhism* (Tokyo: Soka Gakkai, 2002), 700-701.

<sup>116</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 199-201.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid.



2. Married monks should hand over all office matters of the order's Secretariat Head Office to the celibate monastic order.
3. We should not dispute with the order's founding patriarch for a while but would listen to the authority's historical research.
4. The order's constitution should be the constitution which unmarried monks revised and passed in the national conference for celibate monks.
5. We are able to appoint and elect the executives of the order's central and local Secretariat Head Office based on the procedures prescribed in the abovementioned constitution.
6. Married monks should be categorized as laypersons.
7. Monks and nuns should receive full ordination, preserve all full precepts, and accomplish all practice and propagation duties. Laypersons, married monks, should take five lay precepts, can become mission workers and teachers, acting temple managers (abbots) and dharma teachers in accordance with the assignment of celibate monks. However, assigned married monks should preserve same monastic rules as celibate monks.
8. General temple managers (abbots) of big temples should be celibate monks over 40 years old, take over ten intensive retreats, graduate from the highest level at the temple seminary, or have the equivalent level of qualification. The general temple managers (abbots) of intermediate and small temples should be more than 25 years old, take more than five intensive retreats, and finish the course works of the third level at the temple seminary, or have the equivalent level of qualification.
9. The committee consisting of fifteen celibate monks of taking over 10 intensive retreats, recommended by the order's central assembly, shall examine monks and nuns who did not attend the national conferences for celibate monks.
10. When celibate monks and propagation ministers commit crimes, they will be punished based on vinaya texts.
11. The propagation ministers should take their family from the temples and remove their personal houses in them. If needed and available, we can use their houses for temple buildings regardless of their ownership and transfer them to the temple properties.
12. The standard of qualifications of monks and nuns should be based on the vinaya texts.
13. The monks and nuns should stand up in union, respect presidential messages and finish the purification of the order.<sup>118</sup>

On December 27, celibate monks submitted the aforementioned proposal with the signatures of 366 monks and 441 nuns, 807 in total, to the National Police Headquarters.<sup>119</sup> On December 28, celibate monks submitted the list of unmarried monks and nuns to the National Police Headquarters.<sup>120</sup>

On December 25, the celibate monastic group held the meeting for unmarried monastics. And next day, on December 26, they pushed out the

---

<sup>118</sup> Ibid, 205-207.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid, 207.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid, 208.

married monastics from Taego-sa Temple and changed the temple's name from Taego-sa Temple to Jogye-sa Temple. The married monastic group adopted Beomnyun-sa Temple as its head temple near Taego-sa Temple.

On December 29, even though the arguments of *Sinmun ui sinmun* were not consistent, it included an editorial and strongly supported celibate monks and the movement.<sup>121</sup> The newspaper mixed two contradictory topics such as the freedom of religion and the intervention of state. If the government allows the freedom of religion, it should not intervene in the internal issues in a religion. It also introduced another paradigm of pro-Japanese married monks and anti-Japanese (traditional) celibate monks in its article. President I Seungman and celibate monks and their supporters simplified and generalized married monks to pro-Japanese and unmarried monks to traditional (anti-Japanese).

On January 1, 1955, the New Year, four representatives Ha Dongsan, I Hyobong, I Cheongdam and I Daeui of celibate monks visited the presidential office.<sup>122</sup> They presented the New Year's greetings, nine poems and several cards to President I Seungman, their strong guardian and returned to Jogye-sa Temple. Because it also was the Buddha's enlightenment day dated lunar December 8, 1954, they celebrated.

On January 5, married monks hosted the intensive training meeting for mission workers at Gaeun-sa Temple in Seoul for five days, in which more than 100 married monks participated. Unmarried monks considered that married monks hosted the meeting against the movement and reported the meeting to and asked the police to stop it. So, married monks could not continue the meeting.<sup>123</sup> On January 6, married monks tried to continue the meeting, but unmarried monks asked again the police to stop it.<sup>124</sup> On January 7, because married monks did not disband themselves, more than 50 celibate monks went to Gaeun-sa Temple from the Center for Seon Studies to remove them from the temple. However, the police told celibate monks that it would not allow married monk to continue the meeting and persuaded celibate monks to go back to the Center for Seon Studies.<sup>125</sup>

The disputes between married and celibate monks became localized and nationalized. Celibate monks tried to purify and remove married monks in Korean Buddhism in Seoul in the movement's early phase. However, as the time passed by, married and celibate monks began to fight each other even in local temples outside of Seoul. The *Joseon ilbo* reported the fighting between married and celibate monks at Tongdo-sa Temple in Yangsan in its January 9, 1955 issue.<sup>126</sup> Ha Dongsan, supreme patriarch of the celibate monastic group, issued and requested married monks to hand over the order and temple management

---

<sup>121</sup> Ibid, 210.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid, 235.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid, 236.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid, 237.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid, 240.

rights to celibate monks in the public statement dated January 9, 1955, included in the January 11, 1955 issue of *Seoul sinmun*.<sup>127</sup>

On January 16, the 20-30 policemen escorted celibate monks and let them move from the Center for Seon Studies to Jogye-sa Temple. Around 50-60 married monks, including Gim Sangho, Jo Yongmyeong and Yuk Suyeong, showed up at the temple, but they could not prohibit unmarried monks from moving to the temple because of the policemen.<sup>128</sup> So, with the support of the police, unmarried monks occupied the Jogye-sa Temple. The *Yeonhap sinmun* reported in its January 18, 1955 issue that after taking the Jogye-sa Temple, celibate monks examined to take over large and small temples across the nation.<sup>129</sup>

Married monks controlled the temples for a long time during and after Japanese occupation. The representatives of unmarried monks argued that married monks embezzled temple money and properties and took the case to the prosecution. This was the first legal step for married and unmarried monks in the movement's process.<sup>130</sup>

The law enforcement authorities asked unmarried monks to evacuate themselves from Taego-sa Temple on January 19, 1955 in the afternoon. Married monks again occupied the temple and accused two leaders I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha of invading and occupying the order's Secretariat Head Office on January 18. They sued them to the Seoul District Public Prosecutor's Office on January 21 and accused in the letter of complaint that unmarried monks invaded and occupied the order's Secretariat Head Office.<sup>131</sup> Both sides started to take the numerous legal cases to the court and spent a lot of money for them. They heavily relied upon the government and the court to accomplish their own goals. They did not settle down their issues in their religion, but relying on the external force.

On January 24, the departments of education and interior called the representatives of both sides and presented a mediation plan to them.<sup>132</sup> Both sides had a different version of the definition of monkhood. Married monks wanted to ecumenically include themselves in the monastic order, but unmarried monks tried to sectarianistically remove married monks in the monastic order. Married monks ecumenically defined the monastic order as the combined order between married and celibate monks. Unmarried monks sectarianistically defined the monastic order as the exclusive order for celibate monks. Both sides defined the monkhood from their political interests. Unmarried monks offensively attempted to dismantle the current combined order between married

---

<sup>127</sup> Ibid, 242.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid, 244-245.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid, 249.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid, 253.

<sup>131</sup> See the January 22, 1955 issue of *Seoul sinmun*, Min Dogwang, ed., 255.

<sup>132</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 257.

and unmarried monks but married monks defensively tried to keep the current order.

The government tried to revise the mediation proposal and the law enforcement authorities would examine and identify celibate monks across the nation for preparing to settle down the disputes between both sides.<sup>133</sup> The *Jayusinnmun* reported in its January 25, 1955 issue why the government would examine and identify celibate monks as follows:

According to the procurator authorities, the investigation team will examine celibate monks across the nation. In the process of disputes, the celibate and the married monastic sides questioned “who real celibate monks are” across the nation for a long time. Each side argues differently who real celibate monks are. The government prepares the case that the disputes will not be settled down, so it examines celibate monks. Accordingly, if the disputes continue and both sides do not settle down the disputes, the government will intervene in and conclude them based on the examination and force them to follow its measure.<sup>134</sup>

On January 26, 1955, the government’s education department intervened in the conflicts and convened a meeting between representatives of two groups in its vice secretary’s office. While married monks wanted to keep their financial management in temples as they did, unmarried monks asserted that they should take the post of temple abbots and their financial management in temples.<sup>135</sup>

They decided to organize the Committee for Settling down Purification Buddhist Movement (Bulgyo jeonghwa daechaek wiwon-hoe), constituting three representatives for each side. I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha and Son Gyeongsan represented unmarried monks and Im Seokjin, Gim Sangho, and Song Jeong-am represented married monks.<sup>136</sup> Both sides reached the following agreement in five items in the January 26, 1955 meeting as follows:

- (1) We should organize the committee for settling down the movement and locate its office at Taego-sa Temple.
- (2) Each side of married and unmarried monks should recommend five eminent monks to the committee respectively.
- (3) All monks across the nation should follow and cannot make an objection to the decisions of the committee
- (4) The members of the committee should be neutral and should not attend the disputes happened until to now.
- (5) If the committee needs the government’s help, the government should support the committee within its authority.<sup>137</sup>

---

<sup>133</sup> Ibid, 258.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid.

<sup>135</sup> See the January 27, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.201-22.

<sup>136</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 266.

<sup>137</sup> See the January 27, 1955 issue of *Hanguk ilbo*, Min Dogwang, ed., 266.

On January 27, three representatives of celibate monks, I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha, and Son Gyeongsan and three representatives of married monks, Im Seokjin, Gim Sangho, and Song Jeong-am, discussed how to organize the committee and did not arrive in an agreement. Some government officials also attended the meeting as observers.

On January 28, two representatives of the celibate monastic group, I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha visited the presidential office and asked President I Seungman to support them.<sup>138</sup> Ha Dongsan, the highest patriarch of the celibate monastic side, argued that even though the government's secretary of education promised him to support the celibate monastic group, his subordinates did not follow his superior and support his side. He also criticized the officials of education department as spokesmen for the married monastic group.<sup>139</sup>

On January 29, 38 celibate monks visited Secretary I Seon-geun of Education at 8:00 am and waited for him at his office until to 3:00 pm. The secretary visited the presidential office and came to his office. He met with five representatives of celibate monks. He told them that married monks should hand over the order's management rights to celibate monks and should leave the priesthood.<sup>140</sup>

On January 31, the representatives of celibate monks visited the department of education and Secretary I Seon-geun of Education suggested them to have a meeting with them in a later time. They defined the monkhood in four as follows: "First, monks should not make four major offenses of (1) killing beings, (2) stealing, (3) having sexual relations, and (4) lying; second, they should cultivate their minds; third, they should practice Buddhism for more than three years before January 31, 1955; and fourth, even though they are celibate monks, if they have a job, they should not be considered as monks."<sup>141,</sup>

However, married monks defined the monkhood differently from unmarried monks as follows:

First, the fully-ordained monks should be over 20 years old and receive and preserve 250 precepts; second, Bodhisattvas should receive and preserve 58 precepts regardless of age and social standing; and third, monks should shave their heads, wear the monastic robes, and keep a dignified manner and even though monks manage worldly affairs, they should consider Buddhist teachings.<sup>142</sup>

Married monks listed famous married monks in the history of Korean Buddhism such as Wonhyo (617-686), Byeokgye and Han Yongun for

<sup>138</sup> See the January 29, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.202.

<sup>139</sup> See the January 29, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.202-203.

<sup>140</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 269-270.

<sup>141</sup> Ibid, 279.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid, 283.

defending themselves.<sup>143</sup> Han Yongun, a leader of independence movement and a married monk, theorized married monasticism and considered it as the process of modernizing Korean Buddhism. He regarded celibate monasticism as being outdated and married monasticism as being modernized.

On February 4, five representatives of each group reached in eight agreements on the definition of the monkhood under the negotiation of the government's education secretary I Seon-geun. I Hyobong, Bak Ingok, I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha and Son Gyeongsan represented celibate monks and Gwon Sangno, I Hwaeung, Im Seokjin, Song Jeong-am and Gim Sangho married monks.

They defined the monkhood in eight as follows. First, monks should be unmarried. Second, they should shave their heads and wear gray monastic robes. Third, they should not be handicapped. Fourth, they should practice Buddhism. Fifth, they should live with more than three monks. Sixth, they should not kill sentient beings, not steal belongings from others, not have sexual intercourses, and not lie. Seventh, they should not drink alcohol, not smoke cigarettes and not eat meat. And, eighth, they should be over 20 years old.<sup>144</sup>

The majority of the married monastic group could not accept the agreements and they suggested married monks be included in the monastic order. The unmarried monastic group rejected this and urged the government to investigate whose monastics should fit in the definition of the monkhood agreed by the representatives. After examination, the government declared that the number of celibate monastics was 1189.<sup>145</sup> Celibate monks sided with married monks are also included in the number.

On February 13, Gim Sangho, a leader of married monks, sent to the celibate monks a letter in which he requested celibate monks in four as follows:

- (1) Celibate monks should return to the Center for Seon Studies and carry out step by step what we can do as water flows.
- (2) Unmarried monks should accept the definition of the monkhood in the order's established constitution which categorized married monks as the propagation monks.
- (3) The order can appoint unmarried monks who are the followers of the Dharma lineage of National Master Taego as the positions in the order and temples.
- (4) Celibate monks should not enthrone National Master Jinul as the order's founding patriarch.<sup>146</sup>

On February 15, Secretary-General Im Seokjin rejected the meeting that unmarried monks asked and announced a public statement in which he refuted the agreement arrived between both sides with the government's negotiation on

---

<sup>143</sup> Ibid.

<sup>144</sup> See the February 6, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.204-205 and the February 6, 1955 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.205.

<sup>145</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 324.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid, 295.

February 4 and argued that married monks should be classified as the propagation monks, not the laypersons.<sup>147</sup>

On February 22, I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha visited the National Police Agency and on February 24, met Jo Wonhwan, the newly appointed director of the bureau of culture in the government's department of education who would be in charge of the Purification of Buddhism. On February 25, the two leaders of celibate monks also visited the National Police Agency and discussed with its officials for the government how to examine celibate monks and make the list of celibate monks. On March 2, the two leaders visited the departments of education and interior and discussed the same issue with the government officials.

As the *Joseon ilbo* reported the dispute between married and celibate monks at Tongdo-sa Temple in its January 9, 1955 issue,<sup>148</sup> the *Busan ilbo* also reported another case of dispute between both sides at Beomeo-sa Temple in its February 26, 1955 issue.<sup>149</sup> Both sides fought to take the main hall at the temple. The disputes between both sides gradually became nationwide. The disputes between both sides began from the order's level and became popularized at the national level.

On March 1, Ha Dongsan accompanied around 20 Buddhist representatives and on behalf of Buddhists, he presented a memorial address for the March 1<sup>st</sup>, 1919 Movement and offered an incense for the deceased patriots at Seoul Stadium.<sup>150</sup> He also attended a memorial service at Pagoda Park at which the nationwide massive movement was initiated.

On March 3, the *Sinmun ui sinmun* introduced the historical background for married monasticism in Japanese Buddhism and its influence on Korean Buddhism during Japanese occupation, 1910 – 1945 and positively evaluated the movement in an editorial as follows:

Ten years ago, Korea was liberated from Japan on August 15, 1945. Our independent Korea still has several wrong points that we need to overcome and remove. Even though we should de-Japanize Korean Buddhism, we still have Buddhist disputes unsettled and unmarried monks are still attempting to take the order's hegemony.

Emperor Meiji (r. 1868-1912) of Japan changed Buddhist doctrine and vinaya, legalized married monasticism, and allowed and urged more than one million of celibate monks and nuns to marry in its 5<sup>th</sup> reign year of 1872. He legalized married monasticism, non-vegetarianism and no-shaving of their heads. He allowed married monasticism to increase population and aimed to expand Japanese imperialism to neighboring nations. So, with the measure, destructive married monks showed up.

---

<sup>147</sup> Ibid, 301.

<sup>148</sup> Ibid, 240.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid, 308.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid, 311.

Therefore, Japan annexed Korea in 1910 and during its occupation, 1910-1945, it Japanized Korean Buddhism originated from splendid Sillan Buddhism and culture. It produced married Japanized Buddhist monks and deteriorated 31 parish head temples and more than 1,300 temples in Korean Buddhism.<sup>151</sup>

Married monks, including Secretary-General Im Seokjin, sued 71 unmarried monks for illegally entering Taego-sa Temple. On March 6, the Jongno District Police Station in charge of Taego-sa Temple ordered them to appear for examination. On March 7, seven representatives of unmarried monks, including I Cheongdam, Bak Ingok, Bak Beomnyong, and Choe Wonheo, appeared at the police station for examination. On March 9, Gim Seoun argued against the case in the Seoul District Court that the plaintiffs are not qualified. He asserted that defendants entered the temple legally, married monks are fake monks, and celibate monks are real monks.

On March 13, unmarried monks questioned in the Seoul District Court that Secretary-General Im Seokjin of the order's Secretariat Head Office is not qualified as a plaintiff for the case. Married monks counter-argued that he is qualified as a plaintiff for the case. They considered that Korean Buddhists legally elected Im Seokjin as the secretary-general of the order's Secretariat Head Office based on the order's constitution and he was properly representing Korean Buddhism. The judge questioned whether the department of education approved his position. Both sides legally and logically argued against each other. On April 15 and 26, May 10 and 28, the judge postponed the trial. The judge wanted to get an official letter from the department of education on whether the department authorized Im Seokjin as the abbot of Taego-sa Temple to proceed to his ruling. However, he did not receive it, so he postponed the trial several times.

On March 13, four representatives I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha, Gim Daewol, and Mun Jeong-yeong of celibate monks visited the department of education to see Director Jo Wonhwan of its bureau of culture and to ask him whether the department approved Im Seokjin as the abbot of Taego-sa Temple and sent an official letter to the court. On May 14, the four representatives also visited the department of education and met the director Jo Wonhwan. Director Jo answered them that the department was necessary to call Im Seokjin as the representative of a religious corporation.

On March 9, more than 400 Buddhists celebrated the Buddha's Nirvāṇa Day and the fourth anniversary of Bang Hanam (1876-1951) at Jogye-sa Temple.<sup>152</sup> Korean Buddhists used to celebrate the special day on lunar February 15. Patriarch Ha Dongsan, Jeong Jeon-gang (1898-1975),<sup>153</sup> Sin Socheon and Gim Tanheo had a series of lectures for the special date. Celibate monks also

---

<sup>151</sup> Ibid, 314.

<sup>152</sup> Ibid, 324.

<sup>153</sup> I Jeong, ed., 186-187.



had the intensive prayer of 18 days between March 9 and March 26 for a civilian dictator and their own strong patron, President I Seungman's 80<sup>th</sup> birthday.<sup>154</sup>

On March 12, three representatives I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha, and Gim Seoun of celibate monks visited and met Jo Wonhwan, the director of the bureau of culture in the department of education and discussed with him how and when they should convene the national conference for celibate monks. They scheduled to host the national conference in the middle of April to settle down all disputes in Buddhism.

On March 12, Secretary I Seon-geun of Education expressed his opinion in the press conference that 1,189 celibate monks should follow the presidential messages and purify all temples. He also told in the conference that if the celibate monks convene the national conference and pass some resolutions in it, the government should accept them.<sup>155</sup>

On March 15, two representatives I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha of unmarried monks visited the department of education.<sup>156</sup> On March 16, three representatives I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha and Gim Seoun again visited the department of education. Two representatives Im Seokjin and Gim Sangho of married monks also visited the department of education.<sup>157</sup> On March 18, I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha and Gim Seoun again visited the department of education.<sup>158</sup> On March 19, the representatives of each side visited the department of education. I Cheongdam and Son Gyeongsan represented celibate monks. Im Seokjin, Gim Sangho and Song Jeong-am represented married monks. The government suggested both sides to reach an agreement and settle down the disputes.<sup>159</sup> On March 22, three representatives I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha and Son Gyeongsan visited the department of education and met the director Jo Wonhwan of the bureau of culture. While he suggested them to cooperate with each other, they strongly protested against him and presented the arguments of the celibate monastic side.<sup>160</sup>

On March 22, the national assembly organized an investigation committee named the Investigation Committee for Illegal Invasion upon Taego-sa Temple and assigned three national assemblymen, Pyo Yangmun (1907-1962), I Jae-ung and Jo Man-gam to the committee. The national assembly, more neutral than the government, began to intervene in the movement.<sup>161</sup> Some married monks were the national assemblymen and supported the married monastic side.

<sup>154</sup> See the March 27, 1955 issue of *Seoul sinmun*, in Min Dogwang, ed., 339.

<sup>155</sup> See the March 13, 1955 issue of *Jayu sinmun*, and the March 14, 1955 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, Min Dogwang, ed., 329, 330.

<sup>156</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 330.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid, 331.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid, 331-332.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid, 332.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid, 333.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid.

On March 23, celibate monks sent an official letter to summon the preparatory committee for the national conference for celibate monks across the nation.<sup>162</sup> On March 24, the leaders I Hyobong, Ha Dongsan, Yun Wolha, I Cheongdam, and Gim Seoun of celibate monks recommended Go Gyeongdeok to the chair of the Supreme Committee for Carrying out Purification Buddhist Movement (Bulgyo jeonghwa chujin choego wiwon-hoe). They sent an official letter to invite him as the committee's chair with all relevant documents enclosed.<sup>163</sup>

On March 24, celibate monks were busy to make a longevity lamp and a placard for celebrating President I Seungman's 80<sup>th</sup> Birthday until to 12:00 at night.<sup>164</sup> On March 25, celibate monks made and established a gigantic lotus lantern in front of the Central Government Building.<sup>165</sup> When they lighted the lantern, the lantern became bright beautifully. Except them, nobody made the congratulatory lanterns. They composed two poems and wrote them on two hanging scrolls in commemoration of his 80<sup>th</sup> birthday. On behalf of celibate monks, Gim Seoun delivered it to the presidential office.

On March 26, celibate monks hosted the special service to celebrate President I Seungman's 80<sup>th</sup> Birthday at Jogye-sa Temple.<sup>166</sup> On behalf of the celibate monastic side, three representatives Ha Dongsan, Choe Wonheo and I Cheongdam attended the special ceremony for the president's 80<sup>th</sup> birthday at Seoul Stadium. Five representatives Ha Dongsan, I Cheongdam, Bak Ingok, I Yongbong and Choe Wonheo visited the presidential office for celebrating the president's birthday. They discussed the movement with President I Seungman as follows:

President I Seungman: How is the movement?

Ha Dongsan: Celibate monks of the celibate monastic group and celibate monks of the married monastic group could not arrive at an agreement. We could not process the movement very successfully. (Married monks arranged their supportive celibate monks to represent them).

President I Seungman: I hope that you will reasonably resolve the issues of the movement. I earnestly wish that Korean Buddhists should practice hard and many of them should become eminent monks.

I Cheongdam: If both sides, celibate and married monastics, agree with each other on differing issues and host the (national) conference (for monastics) to confirm the agreements, they can solve all disputes. However, because the married monastic side opposes it, we celibate monks cannot process the next steps. I strongly request you to order (the government and Buddhism) to speed up to organize the conference. On February 4, with the mediations of the government's department of education, (representatives of both sides)

---

<sup>162</sup> Ibid, 334.

<sup>163</sup> Ibid, 336.

<sup>164</sup> Ibid.

<sup>165</sup> Ibid, 338.

<sup>166</sup> Ibid, 338-339.

determined the definition of monkhood (at the education secretary I Seongeun's office) and registered the list of celibate monks (to the government).<sup>167</sup> (Even though five representatives<sup>168</sup> of the married monastic sides) agreed with the definition of monkhood in eight items<sup>169</sup>, married monks do not accept the agreements. (So), we can proceed to next steps to purify Buddhism.

President I Seungman: I know very well how hard you continue the movement. I hope all of you will smoothly resolve the issues of the movement.<sup>170</sup>

The abovementioned dialogues between President I Seungman and leaders of celibate monks clearly show the extent how seriously celibate monks relied on state, particularly President I Seungman to make the movement successful. They did not proceed with the movement independently of the government's interventions. Their reliance on the government made them not speak up for social democratization, but to support the civilian dictatorship. To accomplish their own religious interests, they ignored social issues such as democratization, unification, social justice, and others, and became loyal supporters of the government.

On March 26, celibate monks convened a meeting for the order's central assembly at an annex to the Center for Seon Studies from 7:00 pm. The order's 28 assemblymen attended the meeting, accepted the resignations that the executives submitted, and elected the key posts of the celibate monastic side. They elected Go Gyeongdeok to the general manager, Gim Seoun to the secretary of general affairs, Seo Gyeongbo (1914-1996) to the secretary of religious affairs and Gim Hyejin (1908-1984) to the secretary of financial affairs. The executives submitted their resignations because they were tired from hard work for around nine months. Unmarried monks needed to substitute incoming executives for outgoing executives and to revitalize the movement.<sup>171</sup> On March 31, outgoing executives of the celibate monastic side handed over all administrative affairs to incoming executives at Jogye-sa Temple.

---

<sup>167</sup> See the February 21, 1955 issue of *Seoul sinmun*, in Min Dogwang, ed., 304.

<sup>168</sup> Each of married monastic side and celibate monastic side dispatched five representatives respectively. The five representatives of married monastic side are Gwon Sangno (1879-1965), I Hwaeung, Im Seokjin, Song Jeong-am and Gim Sangho and the five representatives of celibate monastic side I Hyobong, Bak Ingok, I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha and Son Gyeongsan.

<sup>169</sup> The eight definitions of monkhood are as follows: First, monks should be unmarried. Second, they should shave their heads and wear gray monastic robes. Third, they should not be handicapped. Fourth, they should practice Buddhism. Fifth, they should live with more than three monks. Sixth, they should not kill sentient beings, not steal belongings from others, not have sexual intercourses, and not lie. Seventh, they should not drink alcohol, not smoke cigarettes and not eat meat. And, eighth, they should be over 20 years old.

<sup>170</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 338-339.

<sup>171</sup> Ibid, 340.

On March 27, celibate monks organized the preparatory committee for the national conference for celibate monastics. They appointed Gim Seoun as its secretary of general affairs, Gim Daewol as its secretary of proceedings, Yun Wolha as its secretary of reception, Gim Hyejin as its secretary of financial affairs, and Seol Seogu (1875-1958) as its chair. They also assigned several monks under and let them help each secretary respectively.<sup>172</sup>

On March 29, celibate monks decided to establish the order's official praxis complex at Jogye-sa Temple. Korean Buddhists generally establish some praxis complexes at their major temples located on mountains. The praxis complex is composed of four centers, i.e., a Seon center, a vinaya center, a Pure Land center and a doctrinal center. They also appointed or enthroned the key posts of the complex as follows:

Ha Dongsan, the order's highest patriarch  
 I Hyobong, the complex's spiritual leader  
 I Cheongdam, the complex's leader  
 Yun Wolha, the complex's general manager  
 Bak Dong-am, the Seon center's director  
 Son Gyeongsan, the Seon center's discipliner  
 Gim Wongwang, the Seon center's vice discipliner  
 Gim Wolhyeon, the manager of the complex's kitchen  
 Gim Gyeong-u, the chanting master<sup>173</sup>

They also recommended seven to eight monk scholars to be in charge of the doctrinal center affiliated with the complex. They initiated the complex immediately upon their appointing or enthroning of the complex's key posts. Celibate monks argued that the complexes disappeared during Japanese occupation period, 1910-1945 and they recovered the Seon oriented tradition upon the establishment of the order's praxis complex at its head temple of Jogye-sa.<sup>174</sup>

The next day, on March 30, celibate monks set up a signboard saying, "The Central Praxis Complex of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism" at the main gate of Jogye-sa Temple.<sup>175</sup> By doing so, they tried to remove the Japanized married monasticism and recover Seon oriented tradition in Korean Buddhism. Because there were no lecture halls at Jogye-sa Temple, they bought and installed a big tent for several days in front of the temple's kitchen.<sup>176</sup> Buddhists could take lectures from monk scholars inside the tent.

On April 8, the education committee of the National Assembly rejected the order's constitution that celibate monks revised and passed. The committee

---

<sup>172</sup> Ibid, 344.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid, 345.

<sup>174</sup> Ibid, 568-569.

<sup>175</sup> Ibid, 345-346.

<sup>176</sup> Ibid, 347.

argued that because a modern and democratic nation should allow the freedom of faith for all citizens, it should not recognize or authorize the constitution of a particular denomination. It actually and politically supported the married monastic side. Married monks criticized President I Seungman's presidential messages and his government for constitutionally violating the separation of state and religion.

On April 10, Supreme Patriarch Ha Dongsan delivered his preaching at Jogye-sa Temple. On April 11, the incoming general manager Go Gyeongdeok of the celibate monastic group visited the department of education to make an inaugural address to its secretary. However, because the secretary of education went to the country on official business, Go Gyeongdeok could not see him. On April 30, celibate monks assigned I Cheongdam to prepare the national conference for celibate monastics under his responsibility.

## 2.2. May 15 – August 2, 1955

On May 4, celibate monks prepared the 4<sup>th</sup> national conference scheduled on May 15<sup>177</sup> and sent liaison monks to various provinces. On May 6, they mailed an official notice and notified the conference to the temples across the nation. On May 7, Gim Seoun went to and applied for a meeting permit at Seoul City Hall. On May 11, several married monks visited the city hall and told the officials that if the city allows the meeting for the national conference, the meeting will result in bloodshed. The law enforcement authorities did not allow the conference. On May 12, celibate monks mailed an official notice and notified that they would postpone it. On May 14, the representative Im Seokjin of married monks sent a letter to two representatives Ha Dongsan and I Hyobong and indicated the unreasonableness of the national conference. On May 14, Secretary I Seon-geun hosted a press conference and told that only unmarried monks could become temple abbots.

The celibate monastic group argued that they have 979 unmarried monks to support themselves. However, the married monastic group also asserted that they also have 7,000 married monks and 210 unmarried monks support them. The celibate group asserted that only 979 unmarried monks could represent celibate monks and that even 210 unmarried monks sided with the married

---

<sup>177</sup> Since the movement's beginning, celibate monks hosted three national conferences for monastics and implemented the movement. They elected the members to draft their own order's new constitution at the 1<sup>st</sup> conference held on August 24 – 26, 1954. They passed the order's new constitution and appointed the order's key post members based on the newly passed constitution at the 2<sup>nd</sup> conference hosted on September 28, 1954. They appointed the temple abbots across the nation based on the constitution on December 11 – 13, 1954. Refer to the May 15, 1955 issue of *Jayu sinmun*, in Min Dogwang, ed., 373.

monastic group could not represent celibate monks. They argued even 210 unmarried monks are not real celibate monks but just unmarried monks.

On May 16 – 18, 119 monks, 179 nuns, and 50 laypersons, 347 Buddhists in total went on silence and hunger strike and protested against the government's measure which did not allow the 4<sup>th</sup> national conference for celibate monks.<sup>178</sup> On May 17, more than 120 lay Buddhists went on a stay-in demonstration in and protested against the department of education. Government officials orally notified celibate monks of the directives from President I Seungman that all married monks should walk out from their resident temples by the end of June, all temple abbots should be celibate monks, and the order should replace married abbots with celibate monks. According to the directives, if the order cannot appoint all temple abbots with celibate monks because of their shortage, it can alternatively and tentatively appoint laypersons as temple abbots.<sup>179</sup>

On May 18, leaders of celibate monks tried their best to resolve the deadlocked situation.<sup>180</sup> Five representatives I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha, Jeong Geum-o, Gim Daewol, and Son Gyeongsan of the celibate monastic side visited the government's Department of Education and discussed the movement with three representatives Im Seokjin, An Deogam (1913-2003)<sup>181</sup> and I Hwaegung of the married monastic side. Ha Dongsan, I Hyobong, Gim Wongwang, and Jeong Geum-o visited the presidential office. But, they could not meet with President I Seungman and returned to Jogye-sa Temple.

On May 20, celibate monks elected five representatives I Hyobong, I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha, Son Gyeongsan and Gim Seoun for the purification of temples. On May 21, celibate monks submitted the list to the department of education. On May 23, celibate monks hosted a meeting in the central assembly that 30 assemblymen attended. They assigned the abovementioned five representatives to fully charge the movement and to discuss with the five representatives of the married monastic side. They provisionally and unanimously suspended the duties of the general manager from Go Gyeongdeok.

On May 29, lunar April 8, celibate monks celebrated the Buddha's Birthday at Jogye-sa Temple.<sup>182</sup> They hanged many lotus lanterns along streets near the temple. They also installed many different kinds of decorations at the temple. Before noon, they had the special service and celebrated the Buddha's Birthday at Jogye-sa Temple. After noon, layman Hwang Uidon (1890-1964)<sup>183</sup> delivered a public lecture and the Supreme Patriarch Ha Dongsan preached to lay persons.

---

<sup>178</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 374-382.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid, 378.

<sup>180</sup> Ibid.

<sup>181</sup> *Chongnam*, 563.

<sup>182</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 389. While celibate monks celebrated the Buddha's Birthday at Jogye-sa Temple, the displaced married monks also did it at Changgyeong Palace. Each side celebrated the Buddha's Birthday separately. See the May 29, 1955 issue of *Seoul sinmun*, in Min Dogwang, ed., 393.

<sup>183</sup> I Jeong, ed., 363.

They marched along the street in downtown Seoul. In the evening, they presented congratulatory songs. The National Classical Music Institute presented a Korean traditional musical performance and a famous female lay choreographer Ha Hyeja performed a traditional Buddhist dance. They marched along the street near the temple, holding lotus lanterns in their hands. More than 10,000 Buddhists attended the evening events. Ha Dongsan supervised the Buddha's Birthday celebration as the order's supreme patriarch.<sup>184</sup>

On June 2, representatives visited the department of education and discussed how to solve the purification of temples based on President I Seungman's detailed rules.<sup>185</sup> On June 4, three representatives I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha and Son Gyeongsan visited and asked the National Police Headquarters to prohibit married monks from reacting against the movement.<sup>186</sup> On June 5, two representatives I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha visited and asked the Jongno District Police Station to protect Taego-sa Temple from married monks.<sup>187</sup> On July 6, two representatives I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha visited and requested the National Police Headquarters to help celibate monks purify temples. Celibate monks asked the government bodies to support them.<sup>188</sup>

On June 7, three representatives I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha and Son Gyeongsan visited and asked the National Police Headquarters and the Department of Education not to allow any meeting for married monks. The law enforcement authorities ordered married monks to move out from temples across the nation by the end of June. Married monks rejected the order from the government.<sup>189</sup> So, on June 8, married monks hosted their order's assembly meeting at Gaeun-sa Temple in Seoul.<sup>190</sup> More than 300 married monks were assembled at the temple.<sup>191</sup> The celibate monastic side organized its action corps of 70 celibate monks guided by I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha.<sup>192</sup> It dispatched its advance team of more than 20 celibate monks selected from the action corps to Gaeun-sa Temple in order to block the married monastic side's assembly.

On June 9, more than 200 celibate monks counter-hosted a meeting at Jogye-sa Temple and entered a hunger strike in its Main Hall.<sup>193</sup> Celibate monks had continued the hunger strike from June 9 to June 15 for seven days. On June

---

<sup>184</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 390-391.

<sup>185</sup> Ibid, 399.

<sup>186</sup> Ibid, 399-400.

<sup>187</sup> Ibid, 400.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid.

<sup>189</sup> Ibid, 401-402.

<sup>190</sup> See the June 10, 1955 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.211-212.

<sup>191</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 403.

<sup>192</sup> The list of its action corps of 70 celibate monks is seen in Min Dogwang, ed., 404-405.

<sup>193</sup> Ibid, 406-407. See the June 10, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.212.

13, the Seoul district military hospital dispatched nurses and forced seven monks and three nuns being in a critical condition to be hospitalized.<sup>194</sup>

On June 10 at 4 o'clock in the early morning, more than 300 married monks intruded into the Main Hall at Jogye-sa Temple and beat unmarried monks who were doing a hunger strike.<sup>195</sup> The Jongno district police station and the Seoul municipal police station dispatched more than 200 armed policemen and suppressed the intruded married monks. Gim Jiho, a disciple of Ha Dongsan, disemboweled himself, saying that he would kill himself rather than let them kill him. 21 celibate monks became hospitalized. Ha Dongsan himself was injured and received medical treatment. They changed the temple's title board from Jogye-sa Temple to Taego-sa Temple. The police took 50 married monks among them to a nearby police station and confined more than 300 married monks in Beomnyun-sa Temple, the head temple of the married monastic side. Celibate monks re-changed the temple's title board from Taego-sa Temple to Jogye-sa Temple.<sup>196</sup>

On June 11, the law enforcement authorities arrested and detained 11 representatives of married monks, Seo Sang-in, Hong Gyeongsik, Gim Jonghak, Gim Namhyeon, Gim Jeonggi, Bak Byeongsu, Gim Yangtaek, Gim Yongjun, Jo Yongmyeong, An Deogam, and Gim Yeonggu. They also transmitted 38 married monks to a summary trial for the crime of a riot.<sup>197</sup> The majority of detained married monks are provincial leaders of the married monastic group. The government authorities told that they would punish them based on laws. President I Seungman ordered the government authorities to thoroughly investigate and punish them and their wire-pullers. On June 12, the law enforcement authorities additionally transmitted 8 married monks to a summary trial for the crime of a riot.<sup>198</sup>

On June 11, married monks submitted a memorial to the National Assembly in three as follows: (1) Even though the constitution describes the separation of state and religion, President I Seungman and his government attempted to remove married monks from temples and to authorize only celibate monks; (2) the government's administrative and discriminative measures on religion is undemocratic; and (3) the government's consideration and definition of married monks to be pro-Japanese was subject to the violation of human rights.<sup>199</sup> Married monks took the case of Buddhist disputes to the assembly to sympathetic to and supportive of themselves. They could not request their help to the government's administration who had extensively supported celibate monks under the patronage of President I Seungman but asked the national assembly to support themselves.

---

<sup>194</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 422.

<sup>195</sup> Ibid, 407-411.

<sup>196</sup> See the June 11, 1955 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.213-214.

<sup>197</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 413.

<sup>198</sup> See the June 14, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, Min Dogwang, ed., 427.

<sup>199</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 412.



On June 12, lay supporters of celibate monks submitted a petition to President I Seungman and the National Assembly in two and asked them to help expedite the movement as follows: (1) We hope that you should punish violent married monks in accordance with law and if married monks again use violence in group, you should disband them; and (2) we wish that you should allow 1,189 unmarried monks examined and defined by the government based on eight principles to convene the national conference for celibate monks and to finish the movement.<sup>200</sup> Unmarried monks organized the National Association for Lay Buddhists and advertized in the June 13, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo* a slogan, “We shall purify religion through the purification of Buddhism. We shall purify nation through the purification of religion. We shall purify the world through the purification of nation.”<sup>201</sup>

On June 13, the National Assembly discussed the disputes between married and celibate monks. Some assemblymen, including Mun Jongdu (1916-1987) and Jo Byeong-ok (1894-1960), argued for the married monastic side. Because there were some married monks and no unmarried monks in the National Assembly, the National Assembly was supportive of and sympathetic to married monks. Especially, Assemblyman Gim Beomnin who served as the chair of the Committee of Education in the National Assembly was a married monk and strongly supported married monks.

On June 15, the government’s two secretaries attended a meeting in the National Assembly, answered the questions of assemblymen and defended the presidential messages and the government’s administrative measures.<sup>202</sup> On June 16, the general meeting of the National Assembly turned down the proposal of the Education Committee that the government should return Korean Buddhism to November 5, 1954 and let Korean Buddhists settle down their problems by themselves but it should not intervene in Buddhist disputes. 57 of 111 attended assemblymen voted against the proposal. More than 60 celibate monks and more than 150 married monks and their supporters observed the meeting. The education committee of the national assembly did not succeed to nullify the government administrative measures for celibate monks and their movement.

On June 16, President I Seungman issued the 5<sup>th</sup> presidential message to support celibate monks and their movement. He strongly asked married monks to give up monkhood and to become laypersons. He clearly considered married monks as being originated from the side effects of Japanese imperialism and Japanese Buddhism.<sup>203</sup> On June 17, four representatives I Cheongdam, Jeong Geum-o, Son Gyeongsan and Yun Wolha of celibate monks visited the government’s department of education and director Jo Wonhwan of the bureau of culture. Director Jo told them that the department carefully reviews the 5<sup>th</sup>

---

<sup>200</sup> Ibid, 418-419.

<sup>201</sup> Ibid, 424.

<sup>202</sup> See the June 16, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, Min Dogwang, ed., 441.

<sup>203</sup> Min Dogwang, ed. 439.

presidential message and would announce the government's appropriate measures next Monday on June 20.<sup>204</sup>

On June 20, three representatives I Cheongdam, Son Gyeongsan and Yun Wolha visited the National Police Agency and submitted the list of unmarried monks to it.<sup>205</sup> On June 21, the delegation of celibate monks visited two departments of education and interior and discussed how to host the 4<sup>th</sup> national conference for celibate monks. They again submitted the list of celibate monks and its summarized table to the National Police Agency. According to its summarized table, the number of unmarried monks is 693 and the number of unmarried nuns is 674, making the number of celibate monastics to be 1367 in total.<sup>206</sup>

On June 23, more than 50 celibate monks prepared to host the 4<sup>th</sup> national conference for unmarried monastics and elected the sixty-six committee members for preparing the conference. The 66 members are Ha Dongsan, I Hyobong, Jeong Geum-o, Bak Ingok, I Dongheon (1896-1983), Gim Hwanbong, Yun Goam, I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha, Choe Wonheo, Gim Wanseok, Bak Geumbong, Gim Jeogeum, Gim Jiwol, Gim Daeui, I Daehwi (1907-1992), Bak Beomnyong, Gang Seokju, Son Gyeongsan, Bak Yonghwa, Bak Seonggwon, Seo Gyeongbo, So Gusan, Go Gyeongdeok, Yu Subon, Min Cheongho, Mun Iljo, Seol Seogu, Baek Gyeongbal, Gim Guha, Gim Honggyeong, Gim Bogyong, Min Dogwang, Jo Geumdam, Yu Seogam, Gim Hyanggok, I Seongcheol, Sin Bomun, Song Manam, Guk Mukdam, I Seokjin, Im Seokjin, Gim Sangho, Bak Daeryun, I Inhong, Jeong Suok, I Seong-u, Bak Hyeeyeon, Jeong Seongmun, Bak Hyeok, Jeong Geumgwang, I Dojin, I Wonseon, Yu Hyeon-geuk, Gim Hyejin, Gim Tanheo, Ma Byeokcho (1899-1986), I Chunseong (1891-1977), Gim Ildo, Gim Gosong (1906-2003), Gu Jeoksong, Bak Chudam, Sin Socheon, Jeong Bonghan, Gim Jiho and Gim Seoun.<sup>207</sup> They also tactically included in the committee unmarried monks, Song Manam, Guk Mukdam, Im Seokjin, Gim Sangho and Bak Daeryun who supported married monks. They included them in the committee and attempted to easily facilitate the national conference.

On June 25, celibate monks appointed the executives in the committee meeting for preparing the 4<sup>th</sup> national conference for unmarried monks at Jogyesa Temple. For example, they appointed I Cheongdam as the secretary of general affairs, Sin Socheon as the secretary of publicity, I Daeui as the secretary of financial affairs, So Gusan as the secretary of recruitment, Yun Wolha as the secretary of public relations, Bak Dong-am as the secretary of facilities, and Son Gyeongsan as the secretary of inspection.<sup>208</sup>

---

<sup>204</sup> Ibid, 442.

<sup>205</sup> Ibid, 451.

<sup>206</sup> Ibid, 452-453.

<sup>207</sup> Ibid, 457-458.

<sup>208</sup> Ibid, 459.

On June 26, they also held the committee meeting for preparing the 4<sup>th</sup> national conference and completed to appoint the executives in the committee. They also appointed bureau directors under each department secretary. For example, they appointed I Hyeon-geuk as the director of general affairs and Gim Wanseok as the director of planning in the department of general affairs; Gim Wonhyeon as the director of receipts and disbursements and Mun Jeong-yeong as the director of accounting in the department of financial affairs; Gim Jiyeong as the director of communication and Gim Ilhyeon as the director of recording in the department of recruitment; Gim Hwanbong as the director of negotiation and I Dongheon as the director of reception in the department of public relations; Gim Gyeryun as the director of maintenance, Seo Hyecheol as the director of cleaning and Seo Jongsu as the director of facilities in the department of facilities; and Bak Beomnyong as the director of examination, Gim Wolhyeon as the director of information and Jo Gagun as the director of security in the department of inspection.<sup>209</sup>

On June 29, two representatives I Cheongdam and Son Gyeongsan visited the department of education. The joint meeting between three government departments, education, interior and justice was held in the department of education to discuss Buddhist disputes. The representatives representing the married and the celibate monastic sides met and discussed how to settle down the disputes at the Center for Seon Studies.<sup>210</sup> The representatives of celibate monks argued that both sides absolutely should accept the Buddhist principles and the qualifications for monkhood and decide the methods to purify temples, the order's constitution and regulations in the 4<sup>th</sup> national conference, they should not allow married monks but let them work in the sectors of temple administration and business, and they should respect the presidential messages and the government's administrative measures and reasonably settle down the disputes.<sup>211</sup> The representatives of married monks counter-argued against the representatives of celibate monks as follows:

1. It is illegal for the government to intervene in religious affairs based on the constitutional principle prescribing the separation of religion and state.
2. President I Seungman and Vice President Ham Taeyeong (r. 1952-1956) are not Buddhists but serious Christians. How can they support Buddhism? Do they design against Buddhism? They will not support but destroy Buddhism. They will completely and finally attempt to Christianize the Korean Peninsula in two or three years.
3. Because the department of education actually has the final decision rights, the married monastic side does not need to make the committee members for preparing the 4<sup>th</sup> national conference.
4. Korean Buddhism should keep married monasticism.

---

<sup>209</sup> Ibid, 460.

<sup>210</sup> Ibid, 463.

<sup>211</sup> Ibid, 463-464.

5. The order's Central Assembly should be organized by assigning half members to the married monastic side and half to the unmarried monastic side.
6. The categorization of married monks as pro-Japanese monks is wrong.
7. Married monks shall not move out from temples by the end of June in 1955. Even though they do not go out from temples, the police will not shoot them to death.<sup>212</sup>

President I Seungman issued his 5<sup>th</sup> presidential message in June 16, 1955 and the *Pyeonghwa sinmun* analyzed and discussed the movement's development after the 5<sup>th</sup> presidential message on June 16 in its June 29, 1955 issue.<sup>213</sup>

On June 30, the department of education summoned the representatives of married monks and strongly ordered them to investigate how to purify Buddhism. On July 1, representatives I Cheongdam and Son Gyeongsan of unmarried monks visited the department of education. The department of education told them that it would adopt the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples, made by Japan's Occupational Forces in 1911, to control Korean Buddhism, under the condition that the regulations do not contradict the government's constitution, naturally remove married monks from temples without a grudge, replace married monks with unmarried monks, and appoint unmarried monks as temple abbots.<sup>214</sup> The government loyally modeled after Japanese imperialism which made a law and controlled Korean Buddhism.

On July 2, two representatives Ha Dongsan and I Cheongdam of celibate monks visited the National Police Agency and reported to them that on July 3, lay Buddhists would establish Seoul District Lay Buddhist Association and support the movement.<sup>215</sup> On July 3, they elected Choe Chang-un to be an honorary president, Jin Muchakhaeng to be a honorary vice-president, Yang Muguhaeng to be the president and Gim Beomnyeonhwa to be the vice-president of the Seoul District Lay Buddhist Association. They authorized the newly elected president and vice-president to appoint the association's executives.<sup>216</sup>

Two representatives Son Gyeongsan and Mun Jeong-yeong of celibate monks visited the department of education and submitted an official notice including the 4<sup>th</sup> national conference date. The order's Secretariat Head Office of married monastic side sent an official notice and requested married monks to make a divorce.<sup>217</sup> Married monks appointed five representatives Gim Sangho, Jeong Bongmo, I Hwaeung, Guk Mukdam and Bak Daeryun as the committee

---

<sup>212</sup> Ibid, 464.

<sup>213</sup> Ibid, 465.

<sup>214</sup> Ibid, 468.

<sup>215</sup> Ibid, 472-475.

<sup>216</sup> Ibid, 474.

<sup>217</sup> See the July 2, 1955 issue of *Pyeonghwa sinmun*, Min Dogwang, ed., 473.

members for settling down the Buddhist disputes and submitted the list to the department of education.<sup>218</sup>

On July 4, three representatives Jeong Geum-o, I Cheongdam and Son Gyeongsan visited the department of education. Married monks argued that President I Seungman and Vice President Ham Taeyeong (1873-1964) initiated the movement and supported celibate monks to destruct Buddhism and to help Christianity prosper.<sup>219</sup> They actually had not taken any measure to de-Japanize Christianity which supported imperial Japan during Japanese occupation period. They had a double-measure. They asked Buddhists to de-Japanize Buddhism but did not ask Christians to de-Japanize Christianity. Even though the allegations of married monks could not be easily proved, celibate monks utilized pro-Christian government, removed married monks and accomplished their political interests under the name of the movement.

On July 5, two representatives I Cheongdam and Son Gyeongsan of celibate monks visited the department of education and the National Police Agency.<sup>220</sup> On July 9, five representatives I Hyobong, I Cheongdam, Choe Wonheo, Jeong Geum-o, Son Gyeongsan, and Yun Wolha visited the department of education and met the director of the bureau of culture. On July 11, celibate monks slightly revised and submitted the list of five representatives, I Hyobong, Ha Dongsan, I Cheongdam, Jeong Geum-o and Yun Wolha, as the committee members for settling down the Buddhist disputes to the department of education. Married monks slightly revised and submitted the list of five representatives including Bak Daeryun, I Hwaeung, Guk Mukdam, Won Bosan, and Gim Sangho to the department of education.<sup>221</sup>

On July 13, the five representatives I Hyobong, Jeong Geum-o, I Cheongdam, Yun Wolha and Choe Wonheo of celibate monks attended the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting for the Committee for Preparing Buddhist Purification (Bulgyo jeonghwa daechaek wiwon-hoe) in the department of education. The five representatives I Hwaeung, Gim Sangho, Bak Daeryun, Guk Mukdam and Won Bosan of married monks also attended the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting. The government's secretary of education, director of culture, director of the National Police Agency, two national assemblymen, and some reporters also observed the meeting. They resolved the following items in the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting:

1. Venue: Jogye-sa Temple's Main Hall
2. Chairs: two chairs who represent each side. Each chair who takes the chair in rotation
3. Quorum: 7 committee members
4. Resolutions: the majority of votes
5. Title: the committee of 10 members

---

<sup>218</sup> See the July 3, 1955 issue of *Yeonhap sinmun*, Min Dogwang, ed., 473.

<sup>219</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 476.

<sup>220</sup> Ibid, 477.

<sup>221</sup> Ibid, 483.

6. Range of discussions: based on the government's written instructions on May 18
7. Decisions: secret votes
8. Form: roundtable discussions
9. Attendance: committee members and relevant persons
10. Procedures: Two recorders shall record the proceedings. The committee members shall sign and seal on them.
11. Meeting dates: Meetings shall begin from 2:00 pm everyday. No meeting on Sunday.<sup>222</sup>

On July 14, they hosted the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting and discussed how to host the national conference.<sup>223</sup> On July 15, they held the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting and voted for the convocation of the 4<sup>th</sup> conference at 5 versus 4. Because Bak Daeryun did not attend the meeting because of sickness, only five representatives of celibate monks voted for the convention of the 4<sup>th</sup> national conference for unmarried monks.

Celibate monks interpreted the voting for authorizing the convention of the national conference for celibate monks. Married monks interpreted the voting as being valid.<sup>224</sup> On July 22, the department of education sent an official letter to the National Assembly's secretariat office and asked whether the voting in the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting was valid or not. On July 25, the secretariat office of the National Assembly responded that the voting was not valid.<sup>225</sup>

On July 16, they could not convene the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting because of lack of a quorum.<sup>226</sup> On July 17, they did not have a meeting on Sunday.<sup>227</sup> On July 18, they could not host the meeting because five representatives of married monks did not attend the meeting. Two representatives I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha visited the department of education and the department of interior.<sup>228</sup> On July 19, two representatives I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha visited the National Police Agency and the secretariat office of the National Assembly and explained that they are able to convene the national conference for celibate monks. Celibate monks mailed an official notice 289 times across the nation.<sup>229</sup>

On July 20, two representatives I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha of celibate monks visited the department of education and the National Police Agency.<sup>230</sup> On July 21, two representatives I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha visited the National Police Agency.<sup>231</sup> On July 22, two representatives I Cheongdam and

---

<sup>222</sup> Ibid, 486.

<sup>223</sup> Ibid, 487.

<sup>224</sup> Ibid, 489.

<sup>225</sup> See the July 26, 1955 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, Min Dogwang, ed., 507.

<sup>226</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 493.

<sup>227</sup> Ibid, 493-494.

<sup>228</sup> Ibid, 496.

<sup>229</sup> Ibid, 497.

<sup>230</sup> Ibid, 498.

<sup>231</sup> Ibid, 499.

Son Gyeongsan visited the Attorney General's office. Celibate monks visited the government offices to receive the support from them.<sup>232</sup> On July 23, married monks sent an official letter to the department of education, the department of interior, the department of justice and the National Assembly and vindicated why they should negate the national conference.<sup>233</sup>

On July 24, more than 500 laypersons attended the Sunday service. I Cheongdam reported activities of the committee of 10 members for purifying Buddhism, Sin Socheon explained the movement and Korean Buddhism's future, and layperson Hyeon O delivered a public lecture entitled the attitude of Korean Buddhism's laypersons on the movement.<sup>234</sup> They justified and popularized the movement to laypersons.

On July 24, celibate monks announced the national conference on August 1 – 5 at Jogye-sa Temple. The agenda for the conference was the election of the order's assemblymen, the revision of the order's constitution, and the appointment of temple abbots. Only celibate monks recognized by the government authorities are eligible to attend the conference.<sup>235</sup>

On July 27, the Jongno District Police Station notified two representatives I Cheongdam and Yun Wolha of not allowing the national conference. I Cheongdam, chair of the committee for purifying Korean temples, issued an official statement and strongly defended that the voting procedures for the convocation of the national conference for monks in the July 15, 1955 meeting between representatives of married and celibate monks are proper and valid.<sup>236</sup>

On July 28, Seoul District Lay Buddhist Association hosted a public lecture for criticizing married monks. The Jongno District Police Station dispatched a policeman and asked the association to focus on a lecture on Buddhist doctrine, not to criticize the counterpart of married monks. However, two lay speakers such as Gim Hancheon and a wife of Hwang Sandeok (1917-1989), a renowned specialist in law, criticized married monks, considered them to violate monastic precepts, and clearly defined them as not monks. They stopped their lectures. Three representatives I Cheongdam, Jeong Geum-o and I Hyobong of celibate monks visited the presidential office but did not see President I Seungman.

The *Yeonhap sinmun* reported married monks began to make a divorce and tried to keep the status of monkhood and their established rights in its July 28, 1955 issue as follows:

After the temple purification movement, there is a rising in public opinion that married monks should be evacuated from temples. The order's Secretariat Head Office, affiliated with married monks, frantically made efforts to preserve

---

<sup>232</sup> Ibid, 500.

<sup>233</sup> Ibid, 502.

<sup>234</sup> Ibid, 504.

<sup>235</sup> See the July 26, 1955 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, Min Dogwang, ed., 507.

<sup>236</sup> See the July, 29, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, Min Dogwang, ed., 514.

their monkhood. So, married monks massively began to make a divorce not to lose their monkhood.

Nowadays, married monks in the capital and the country are making a divorce. For example, 167 monks of more than 600 resident monks at Tongdo-sa Temple in Yangsan, South Gyeongsang Province massively made a divorce. The collective divorce became the subject of a conversation in these times.

A source (leader) of the order's Secretariat Head Office told in the government's department of education on July 26 that they tried to do all they could to make at least 2,000 married monks of more than 7,000, all Korean monks, get divorced in order to preserve the monkhood and as a result the abbotship of more than 1,200 temples across the nation.

Even though the Secretariat Head Office attempts to host the national conference for unmarried monks on July 30, we do not know whether or not the government authority will allow them to hold the conference.

When a reporter asked an official of the department of education whether or not the education department recognizes divorced monks to be qualified for temple abbots, he declined to comment on the issue. He just mentioned that celibate monks should cultivate their mind and practice Buddhism and reminded him of the presidential messages.<sup>237</sup>

On July 29, more than 200 monks came from here and there. Four delegates I Hyobong, Son Gyeongsan, Choe Wonheo and So Gusan of celibate monks visited the presidential office but did not see President I Seungman.<sup>238</sup> On July 30, 257 celibate monks and 230 celibate nuns, 487 monastics in total, arrived in Seoul to attend the national conference.<sup>239</sup> Secretary I Seon-geun of the Department of Education had a press conference on July 30 and mentioned, "With regard to divorced monks, a lot of married monks got divorced and became unmarried monks. I really welcome them. I cannot ignore them. However, we will decide whether or not they are able to become temple abbots based on the qualifications for monkhood in seven items which both sides accepted in a meeting."<sup>240</sup>

On July 31, more than 600 monastics and more than 400 laypersons attended a Sunday service at Jogye-sa Temple. Three representatives I Cheongdam, Son Gyeongsan and Yun Wolha of celibate monks visited the Jongno District Police Station and met the director of the National Police Agency.<sup>241</sup> The director told them that the government might allow them to host the national conference from August 2, not on August 1.

---

<sup>237</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 513.

<sup>238</sup> Ibid, 514.

<sup>239</sup> Ibid, 515.

<sup>240</sup> See the July 31, 1955 issue of *Jayu sinmun*, Min Dogwang, ed., 518.

<sup>241</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 516.



### 2.3. August 2 – 12, 1955

On August 2 – 5, celibate monks hosted the (4<sup>th</sup>) national conference. 350 celibate monks and 423 celibate nuns, 773 in total, attended the conference. 44 celibate monks and 140 celibate nuns, 184 in total, consented to the conference with their written consent submitted. On August 2, they unanimously passed a vote of no confidence in the executives of the order's Secretariat Head Office. They elected 58 assembly members in the order's Central Assembly. So Gusan read a petition in blood to President I Seungman. It was one foot wide and fifteen feet high and included 429 characters in it and strongly advocated the movement. More than 1,000 participants shook the world with their sound of mourning. Gim Daewol explained the movement's purport, prospect and duties to the public. He also idealized the legendary martyr I Chadon (501-527) who sacrificed himself to propagate Buddhism and to let Buddhism accepted in his homeland of Silla. They decided to submit the original copy of letter in blood to the presidential office and to photocopy the copy and eternally preserve its photocopy.

On August 3, 58 assembly members in the order's Central Assembly discussed the revised constitution and other issues at the Center for Seon Studies. They listened to the movement's proceedings from I Cheongdam.<sup>242</sup> They passed the order's revised constitution in the conference. It consisted of one preamble, 18 chapters, 101 articles, and additional clauses.<sup>243</sup> They appointed Ha Dongsan as the highest patriarch, I Cheongdam as the Secretary-General, Go Gyeongdeok as the secretary of general affairs, Gim Sangho as the secretary of education, Bak Gijong (1907-1987)<sup>244</sup> as the secretary of finance, Jeong Geum-o as the inspector general and Gim Seoun as the vice inspector general.<sup>245</sup> Now, Ha Dongsan became the spiritual leader of the group of celibate monks for the 2<sup>nd</sup> time.

On August 4, they discussed the order's revised constitution, the election of its executives and the appointment of its temple abbots.<sup>246</sup> They fired the executives of the order's Secretariat Head Office that married monks appointed. They passed the resolution that they should autonomously define the qualifications of monkhood by themselves and not according to the standards of the government authorities.<sup>247</sup> Ha Dongsan gave a lecture on the *Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch Huineng* (638-713). He had continued to lecture on the text until August 6. They had group photos.

---

<sup>242</sup> Ibid, 525.

<sup>243</sup> See the August 4, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, in Min Dogwang, ed., 531.

<sup>244</sup> I Jeong, ed., 251-252.

<sup>245</sup> See the August 4, 1955 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.241-242 and the August 4, 1955 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.242.

<sup>246</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 531.

<sup>247</sup> Ibid, 531.

President I Seungman, a civilian dictator, issued the 6<sup>th</sup> presidential message based on his emotional sentiments of nationalism in his regular press conference in which he stated the Pro-Japanese monastics should be removed from Korean Buddhism. Even though married monasticism originated from Japanese Buddhism under the Japanese rule, he did not develop his arguments in the message based on solid facts and evidences but in accordance with his fabrications in many cases. He utilized and even maximized Korean public sentiments of nationalism to accomplish his political goal of the movement. He also utilized anti-Communist sentiments among Koreans just after the Korean civil war, 1950-1953 and skillfully and with fabricated facts mixed the sentiments with anti-Japanese nationalism among Koreans.

On August 5, President I Seungman issued the 7<sup>th</sup> presidential message and celibate monks unanimously decided to visit the presidential office and the department of education and to report the proceedings of the national conference for celibate monks to President I Seungman and Education Secretary I Seon-geun. So, delegates Ha Dongsan, I Cheongdam, Bak Byeogan, So Gusan, Gim Jihyo, I Inhong, Hyeon O and I Jeongsu visited the presidential office. Delegates Gim Tanheo, Yang Cheong-u, Song Hakgeun, Sin Socheon, Gim Daewol, Yun Wolha, Gim Gyeong-u, Baek Hogwang, I Susan (b. 1922), and Jeong Suok attempted to and did not succeed to visit the department of education.<sup>248</sup> They appointed 628 celibate monks as temple abbots and ended the national conference.<sup>249</sup>

On August 6, thirteen celibate monastic representatives and more than ten lay Buddhist representatives rushed to the Education Department building entreated the government to develop the movement's process with the resolutions passed at the 4<sup>th</sup> national monastic conference, and protested against the recognition of the conference as being illegal.<sup>250</sup> They defended the conference's legitimacy at the Education Department office.

On August 7, the secretary of education, its director of the bureau of cultural affairs, its head of the section of cultural preservation, its fourth grade official, the chief of the Jongno District Police Station, and others visited the Jogye-sa Temple at which they discussed how to solve the deadlocked movement with celibate monks.<sup>251</sup> I Seon-geun, Secretary of Education, presented his ideas to celibate monks as follows:

1. The government should follow the presidential messages.
2. Because the executives of the Secretariat Head Office of the married monastic side are not married monks, the government cannot refuse them.
3. The government would make the Council of Elder Monks and let it determine all cases of Purification Buddhist Movement.

---

<sup>248</sup> Ibid, 534.

<sup>249</sup> See the August 6, 1955 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.243-244.

<sup>250</sup> Min Dogwang, ed., 536.

<sup>251</sup> Ibid, 538 – 539.

4. The celibate monastic side should dispatch its lawyers and messengers to the government's Department of Education and legally elucidate what it needs.
5. Even though the government might morally accept the conference's determinations, it could not legally admit them based on laws. It should discuss how to legally accept them at a dialogue tomorrow.<sup>252</sup>

On August 8, representative Won Bosan of married monks visited Jogye-sa Temple, mentioned that he walked out from the meeting room and abandoned the vote, and wrote a confirmation letter that he abandoned the vote. He defected from the married monastic side to the celibate monastic side. The authorities of the department of education can accept the validity of a quorum in the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on July 15 if the celibate monastic side secures one more representative from the married monastic side who confirms that he abandoned his vote in the meeting, making the quorum of 7 committee members for the Committee for Preparing Buddhist Purification.<sup>253</sup>

On August 10, monastic representatives I Cheongdam and Son Gyeongsan and lay representative I Susan of the celibate monastic group visited and met Secretary I Seon-geun in the department of education. The secretary suggested them to make one more representative of the married monastic group to defect to their side. Director Jo Wonhwan of the bureau of culture presented a plan to them as follows:

1. The department of education will convene ten committee members for purifying Buddhism. It will guide them to accept the convocation of the national conference for unmarried monks and pass the issue by the majority of votes with the committee members enough for a quorum attended.
2. They should legally apply for hosting the national conference and receive the permit from the government authorities. In the future national conference for unmarried monastics, they are able to refer to the resolutions which they passed in the (4<sup>th</sup> national monastic) conference which they hosted on August 2-5.<sup>254</sup>

On August 11, the government convened an official meeting between the married and the celibate monastic sides at the Central Institute for Education affiliated with the government's Education Department.<sup>255</sup> Both sides were 5 representatives respectively. 5 representatives of the celibate monastic side and 4 of the married monastic side attended the meeting with I Seon-geun, secretary of education, and some officials of the departments of education and internal affairs attended. Representative Guk Mukdam of the married monastic side did not attend the meeting. The government manipulated the meeting and made two

---

<sup>252</sup> Ibid.

<sup>253</sup> Ibid, 540.

<sup>254</sup> Ibid, 543.

<sup>255</sup> See the August 13, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.245.

representatives Won Bosan and I Hwaeung of the married monastic side to defect from the married monastic side and vote for the celibate monastic side. The secretary of education intentionally kicked out Representative Gim Sangho of the married monastic side, considering him as having abandoned his voting right. Representative Bak Daeryun of the same side voted against the convention of the national monastic conference. They passed the resolution with 7 vs. 1 in the meeting so that they could convene the national conference for celibate monks. Seven representatives voted for and authorized the hosting of the national conference for celibate monastics.

#### 2.4. August 12, 1955 – April 19, 1960

On August 12, 813 unmarried monks held the 1<sup>st</sup> government-authorized and recognized national conference in which they fired the order's Patriarch Song Manam, its administrative cabinet members and all of the administrative executives. They reconfirmed the 4<sup>th</sup> national monastic conference held on August 2-5. Even several relevant key government officials attended and supervised it.<sup>256</sup> Because President I Seungman strongly encouraged two secretaries of education and internal affairs to back up the movement at the time, the two secretaries very positively intervened in the movement and gave a favor to the celibate monastic side.<sup>257</sup>

At the (5<sup>th</sup>) national conference for celibate monks, Ha Dongsan, the highest patriarch of the celibate monastic group, delivered an opening address. I Cheongdam reported the movement's proceedings. The conference attendants recited a presidential message written by I Seungman. They had ratified even all of afore-held four national monastic conferences that they did not get approval from the government but hosted. The government authorized and recognized all four national monastic conferences held only by celibate monks, not by married monks.

They appointed Seol Seogu as the order's supreme patriarch, I Cheongdam as its Secretary-General, Gim Seoun as its secretary of general affairs, Sin Socheon as its secretary of education, Bak Gijong as its secretary of finance, Jeong Geum-o as its inspector general, and Gim Jihyo as the vice inspector general.<sup>258</sup> It elected the order's 56 central assembly representatives and revised the order's constitution. The government's secretary of education delivered even a congratulatory speech.

The order's newly-elected 56 central assemblymen are Ha Dongsan, I Hyobong, Bak Ingok, I Daeui, Yun Wolha, Sin Socheon, Min Cheongho, Min Dogwang, I Daehwi, Jeong Geum-o, Gim Hyanggok, Jeong Bongmo, Gim Jihyo,

---

<sup>256</sup> See the August 13, 1955 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.245-246 and the August 13, 1955 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.246.

<sup>257</sup> See the August 13, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.245.

<sup>258</sup> See the August 14, 1955 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.246.

Gim Jeogeum, Bak Beomnyong, I Yongbong, Gim Gyeong-u, Gim Daewol, Gim Tanheo, So Gusan, Jo Geumdam, Mun Jeong-yeong, Choe Wolsan, Yu Seogam, I Seongcheol, I Cheongdam, Bak Seongsu, Gang Seokju, Son Gyeongsan, Gim Daewol, Guk Mukdam, Won Bosan, Yun Goam, Im Seokjin, Gim Seoun, Gim Honggyeong, Bak Munseong (1897-1997), Song Seoam (1917-2003), Go Gyeongdeok, Gim Hyejin, Gim Wanseok, I Dongheon, I Inhong, Gim Jaun, I Seong-u, Jeong Suok, Bak Hyeok, Gim Beobil, Jeong Jeonghaeng, Chae Byeogam, Bak Byeogan, Yang Cheong-u, Gim Gosong, Gu Hansong and Yu Subon. Interesting enough, they included three leaders Guk Mukdam, Won Bosan and Im Seokjin of married monks in the order's central assemblymen.

Because only the Secretariat Head Office of the celibate monks got an approval from the government, it could appoint temple abbots across the nation and manage temple properties. With the strong support of the government, the celibate monks officially completed the movement. The conference passed a resolution that the Secretariat Head Office of the celibate monastic side should take over the order's management from the Secretariat Head Office of the married monastic side and recommended newly appointed abbots to charge their respective temples immediately.

The order's executives that the celibate monastic side elected at the August 3, 1955 national conference were naturally dismissed. Of course, Ha Dongsan had also served as the order's highest patriarch of the celibate monastic side only for 10 days. They appointed Seol Seogu, 82 years old, the then spiritual leader of Haein-sa Temple, as the order's highest patriarch. Even though Ha Dongsan was just the highest patriarch of the celibate monks, Seol Seogu became the highest patriarch of Korean Buddhism authorized and recognized by the government.

On August 17, the celibate monastic group submitted to the Department of Education the list of 19 newly appointed abbots including three major temples of Korean Buddhism such as Haein-sa, Tongdo-sa and Beomeo-sa Temple. At the time, it appointed Ha Dongsan as the Abbot of Beomeo-sa Temple, Gim Guha as the Abbot of Tongdo-sa Temple and I Hyobong as the Abbot of Haein-sa Temple. Later they could have secured the management of temples from married abbots by relying on the government's bodies, mostly the departments of education and internal affairs.<sup>259</sup> On September 1, Ha Dongsan successfully took over the abbotship of Beomeo-sa Temple from the married monastic side.

The 5<sup>th</sup> national monastic conference held on August 12, 1955 made the movement a great turning point since May 20, 1954, on which President I Seungman issued his 1<sup>st</sup> presidential message. The celibate monastic group made their own administration and obtained the management of the major temples and of the provincial offices across the nation. They also secured their order's authorization over the married monastic group from the government. Both sides

---

<sup>259</sup> See the August 18, 1955 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.248.

began to split one major Korean Buddhist order into two separate orders, the married monastic order and the unmarried monastic one.

The government authorized and recognized the 5<sup>th</sup> national conference for celibate monks on August 12, 1955 and allowed celibate monks to take over the order's hegemony and to officially appoint celibate monks to temples across the nation. However, the celibate monastic group must have had a difficulty to remove so many married monks from temples and to appoint celibate monks to so many temple abbots because of shortage of celibate monks. The *Dong-a ilbo* reported the situation in its August 22, 1955 issue.<sup>260</sup>

On November 3, 1954, Ha Dongsan was appointed to the highest patriarch at the order's 2<sup>nd</sup> central assembly meeting at the Center for Seon Studies and became the patriarch only for celibate monks. And he continued to serve as the highest patriarch until to August 12, 1955. He was one of five key architects of the movement along with I Cheongdam, I Hyobong, Jeong Geum-o and Yun Wolha.

Even though celibate monks got the order's hegemony with the government's strong support, they could not remove the majority of married monks from the temples across the nation. According to the report of a daily newspaper,<sup>261</sup> while the number of married monks at the time was more than 5,000, that of celibate monks was around 800, i.e., around 400 monks and around 400 nuns in total. Even though they picked up 623 traditional temples of numberless temples across the nation and appointed abbots, they could not secure them. So, celibate monks requested the government to approve only 19 temple abbots whom they newly appointed. Even the spokesman of the Center for Seon Studies, the head office of celibate monks, stated that if need, the order would appoint married monks to acting abbots.<sup>262</sup>

Upon the approval of 19 temple abbots from the government's department of education, celibate monks tried to take over the management of the temples from married monks. The celibate monastic order dispatched around 50 celibate monks to Beomeo-sa Temple and Haein-sa Temple and around 100 celibate monks to Tongdo-sa Temple. Married monks also gathered to protect the temples from celibate monks. On August 28, celibate monks took two temples Bongseon-sa Temple and Gaeun-sa Temple near and in Seoul.<sup>263</sup> They also took Bongseon-sa Temple, Yongju-sa Temple, Daegak-sa Temple and Jeondeung-sa Temple in Gyeonggi Province.<sup>264</sup>

On September 3, around 80 resident married monks of Haein-sa Temple defined themselves as advocates of civilian Buddhism and celibate monks as supporters of pro-government's institutional Buddhism.<sup>265</sup> They declared that

<sup>260</sup> S.1.1.248-249.

<sup>261</sup> See the August 22, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.248-249.

<sup>262</sup> Ibid.

<sup>263</sup> See the August 30, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.249-250.

<sup>264</sup> See the August 30, 1955 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.250.

<sup>265</sup> See the September 5, 1955 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.250-251.

they should fight against institutional Buddhism and protect independent civilian Buddhism from improper government intervention in Buddhism. They claimed that they should purify Buddhism by themselves independently from and without relying on the government's intervention and support. They also argued that they should democratically recommend and elect their abbots by themselves. They criticized celibate monks for creating a new form of institutional Buddhism and for appointing abbots against the monastic masses and obtaining the approval of their abbot appointments from the government.

11 resident celibate monks affiliated with a Seon center at the temple hoped the celibate monastic order to take over the temple as soon as possible. The temple's authorities arranged several ten students of Haein University, affiliated with the temple and prepared to protect the temple from the intrusion of celibate monastic forces. The authorities of Haein-sa Temple argued that they should protect the temple from pro-government institutional Buddhism that obtained the order's power through the backing up of the government and should proceed and complete various ongoing temple projects.

Seol Seogu, 81 years old, newly enthroned highest patriarch of the celibate monastic order and a resident monk of Haein-sa Temple, was a moderate supporter of the movement. He disagreed with the celibate monastic side's adoption of violence to take the temple management and suggested both sides to have a conversation with each other and finish the disputes.<sup>266</sup> However, I Cheongdam, the actual manager of the movement and newly appointed Secretary-General of the celibate monastic order, was a radical activist for the movement. He clearly declared that he would send the celibate monastic forces in seven days and would completely remove married monks in the temple.<sup>267</sup>

In the night of September 12, several hundreds of monks and lay Buddhists began to assemble near the temple. In the early morning of September 13, they moved into the temple under the escort of more than 60 police and took over the temple management from married monks.<sup>268</sup> At 2:30 pm, they hosted the inauguration ceremony for the 1<sup>st</sup> abbot at the main hall of Haein-sa Temple. The order appointed I Seongcheol as the abbot.<sup>269</sup> However, he did not become the abbot.

According to the September 26, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*,<sup>270</sup> the celibate monastic order completed to take over the management of three temples of Korean Buddhism such as Haein-sa, Tongdo-sa and Songgwang-sa Temples, 19 major temples and provincial secretariat offices by September 25. It planned to take the management of small and middle-sized 700 and some temples across the nation.

---

<sup>266</sup> Ibid.

<sup>267</sup> Ibid.

<sup>268</sup> See the September 19, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.251-252.

<sup>269</sup> See the September 19, 1955 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.252.

<sup>270</sup> Refer to S.1.1.252.

The November 21, 1955 issue of *Dong-a ilbo* analyzed the order's situation after celibate monks took back its hegemony from married monks.<sup>271</sup> Because celibate monks took back the order's hegemony without proper preparation, they had various problems in managing the order and temples. It summarized the problems in the following items.

First, even though celibate monks took over the management of 324 temples, they did not have quality celibate monks enough to be appointed as the abbots of the temples. For example, they entrusted married monks to the abbots of 52 temples in the total number of 324 temples as they had done. Even though they tried to appoint celibate monks as the abbots of the remaining 272 temples, they just could appoint them as the abbots of 126 temples. Because married monks kicked out by newly appointed celibate monks took out foodstuffs without being left, celibate monks should emergently secure them.

Second, married monks managed more than 13 large corporations, affiliated with the order. Those are (1) Mokpo Oil and Fat Manufacturing Corporation, (2) Jeonnam Bus Passengers and Transport Corporation, (3) Gangwon Bus Passengers and Transport Corporation, (4) Chungnam Bus Passengers and Transport Corporation, (5) Cheongsong Bus Passengers and Transport Corporation, (6) Jeonbuk Rice Mill, (7) Bupyeong Bearing Mill, (8) Bulil Industrial Company, (9) Daegu Liberty Theatre, (10) Milyang Textile Company, (11) Masan Ceramics Company, (12) Tongyeong Shipbuilding Company, and others.

Married monks, members of the current Board of Trustees, managed the corporations and did not hand over the management of them to celibate monks. Celibate monks defined the purification of temples as the taking over of temples as well companies. Married monks literally interpreted the purification of temples as the taking over of temples, not corporations to celibate monks and did not hand over the management of companies. Moreover, celibate monks did not have human resources to manage the large companies because they were not qualified to manage them but they just practiced Seon meditation in Seon centers located at mountain temples.

The same case could be applicable to the 11 education foundations. The order funded and established those foundations in order to propagate Buddhism through making schools and educating students. Married monks did not hand over the management of the school foundations to celibate monks by interpreting the purification of temples. Even so, because celibate monks were not qualified to manage them, they could not take over them.

On December 8, 1955, President I Seungman issued his 8<sup>th</sup> and last presidential message to two secretaries of internal affairs and education and guided them to support celibate monks and the movement. He issued the 1<sup>st</sup> presidential message on May 20, 1954, the 2<sup>nd</sup> presidential message on November 4, 1954, the 3<sup>rd</sup> presidential message on November 19, 1954, the 4<sup>th</sup>

---

<sup>271</sup> See S.1.1.1.252-253.



presidential message on December 16, 1954, the 5<sup>th</sup> presidential message on June 16, 1955, the 6<sup>th</sup> presidential message on August 4, 1955, the 7<sup>th</sup> presidential message on August 5 and the 8<sup>th</sup> and final presidential message on December 8, 1955. He issued the presidential messages eight times and strongly supported the movement.

On January 26, 1956, the celibate monastic order's Secretariat Head Office allowed married monks to return to the temples.<sup>272</sup> The order's authorities clarified that they would allow married monks to take important positions in small and middle-sized temples and order-affiliated corporations except the order's Secretariat Head Office and important and big temples.

On June 15, 1956, the Seoul District Court ruled the legal case in favor of Song Manam and married monks.<sup>273</sup> Immediate after the 5<sup>th</sup> national conference for celibate monks hosted on August 12, 1955, Song Manam filed a complaint for married monks that the resolutions of the conference were invalid and the determinations of the Committee for Preparing Buddhist Purification based on which celibate monks convened the 5<sup>th</sup> national monastic conference were illegal. On June 21, 1956, I Cheongdam and celibate monks appealed the case to the Seoul Higher Court.

Immediately after I Seon-geun, strong supporter of celibate monks, stepped down from the secretary position of education on June 6, 1956, the married monastic side issued a long public statement on June 16. It enlisted what the celibate monastic side had wrongfully done in the movement and indirectly indicated that celibate monks could not manage the large number of temples across the nation as follows.<sup>274</sup> (1) It listed the constitution's 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> articles and criticized the government's improper intervention in religious affairs. (2) It denounced the unjust selling of Liberty Theatre in Daegu, Wonhyo Foundation in Busan and other corporations, and the misappropriation of Haedong High School in Busan by celibate monks. (3) It condemned advance sale of standing trees in temple forests. (4) It claimed the fire of a temple at which national treasures were preserved. (5) It reproached the burglary of an important treasure named Fungmadong at Magok-sa Temple in South Chungcheong Province. On June 22, celibate monastic side counter-issued a lengthy public statement and claimed that the arguments that married monks presented in the public statement were wrong.

On June 29, the unmarried monastic order hosted its central assembly's regular session at Jogye-sa Temple in downtown Seoul and discussed how to take confiscated temple farm lands and to restore a burned temple.<sup>275</sup> The representatives talked in the assembly about how to handle the dispute issues against the married monastic side and resolved that they could not accept the

<sup>272</sup> See the January 28, 1956 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.253.

<sup>273</sup> See the June 22, 1956 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.253-254.

<sup>274</sup> See the June 26, 1956 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.254.

<sup>275</sup> See the June 29, 1956 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.254 and the June 30, 1956 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.254-255.

June 15, 1956 ruling on the validity of the August 12, 1955 national monastic conference in the Seoul District Court. They decided in the assembly meeting that, based upon the result of incoming ruling on the case that they appealed on June 21, they would discuss how to defend themselves from married monks and keep their hegemony over them in the order.

On the same day, the married monastic order held a meeting for more than 70 provincial representatives at Sinheung-sa Temple, also known as Heungcheon-sa Temple in Seoul and discussed whether they would either collaborate with celibate monks or completely recover their hegemony over celibate monks in the order.<sup>276</sup> They decided in the meeting that they would request their strong supporter Choe Gaphwan and let him discuss with his colleague congress representatives I Gibung (1896-1960), speaker of the national assembly, and I Jaehak (1904-1973) and the government secretaries of education and internal affairs and settle down the disputes based on their three major principles, which are (1) purification of temples, (2) establishment of praxis complexes, and (3) praxis of Buddhism for the masses. They shall deliberate how to compromise the disputes with celibate monks and organize the subcommittees to actualize the compromise. They considered how to take the order's hegemony from celibate monks.

After the Seoul District Court's ruling on June 15, 1956 that all resolutions that celibate monks passed in the national conference on August 12, 1955 were invalid, while married monks contended that they wanted to solve the disputes based on the ruling, celibate monks ignored the ruling and would not compromise the disputes with their counterparts.<sup>277</sup> Married monks argued that if celibate monks would not compromise the disputes with them, they would take the temples and properties that they handed over to their counterparts. On June 30, the secretary of education clearly stated that the government might not intervene in the disputes as possible as it could and advised them to compromise with each other.

On July 27, married monks got a court's provisional injunction from the court that celibate monks should transfer the management of Jogye-sa Temple to married monks until to the final decision in the court on the legal case.<sup>278</sup> Celibate monks disliked to evacuate the temple and transfer its ownership to married monks. On July 28, the court implemented its decision and evacuated celibate monks and their properties from the temple.<sup>279</sup> On the same day, married monks occupied the temple and changed the sign board from Jogye-sa Temple to Taego-sa Temple.

On July 30, they officially started their administrative works at the temple. Even so, they could not evict celibate monks from the temples. Both sides stood face to face with each other in the temple. Married monks also appointed abbots

---

<sup>276</sup> Ibid.

<sup>277</sup> See the July 23, 1956 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.256.

<sup>278</sup> See the July 29, 1956 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.256-257.

<sup>279</sup> See the July 30, 1956 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.257.

of 33 representative and parish temples across the nation, of course, including three major temples of Haein-sa, Tongdo-sa and Beomeo-sa Temples in Korean Buddhism and took over the management of those temples from celibate monks.<sup>280</sup>

During the time, celibate monks began to assemble at the Center for Seon Studies in downtown Seoul from all over the nation. They were scheduled to arrive at the center by July 31 and they would discuss how to break through the ongoing problem. Based on the discussions, they would present their solution methods to the government authorities. If the government authorities did not accept them, they would stage the sit-in demonstrations and/or enter hunger strikes.<sup>281</sup>

On July 30, the government's secretary of education Choe Gyu-nam (1898-1992) strongly backed up celibate monks regardless of the legal case unfavorable for them.<sup>282</sup> He stated that regardless of the court's ruling and temporary injunction, the government still backed up the movement based on I Seungman's presidential messages. He also considered that because the ruling and injunction were not final, the government should not change its pro-celibate monastic policy. He strongly argued that celibate monks should take hegemony in the order and lead Korean Buddhism. He declared the highest patriarch of the celibate monastic side as being still authentic.

On July 31, the Seoul District Court implemented its provisional injunction and removed celibate monks from the offices and buildings of Jogye-sa Temple. Celibate monks began to come to the Center for Seon Studies from various directions and to discuss how to handle this situation.<sup>283</sup> On August 4, the executives of the Secretariat Head Office and their assistants of the married monastic side, 10 in total, attempted to move in the buildings of Jogye-sa Temple. Laypersons affiliated with the celibate monastic side drove them out from the temple. The ten monks of the married monastic side are Im Seokjin, Bak Jangneung, Yu Dongsan, I Hwaeung, Gim Sunho, Gim Hwangong, Jo Bowol, I Gwang-un, Yuk Suyeong and I Namchae.<sup>284</sup> The leader Im Seokjin was hospitalized at Jung-ang Clinic.

The government authorities remained indifferent to the disputes at the time even though the departments of internal affairs and education had intervened in the disputes since the movement's initiation.<sup>285</sup> They observed two different groups in celibate monks on the movement, a radical group and a moderate group. The radical group de-ontologically asserted that it should completely remove married monks from the temples and the moderate one realistically claimed that it should allow married monks to manage temples for a while

<sup>280</sup> See the July 31, 1956 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.257.

<sup>281</sup> Ibid.

<sup>282</sup> See the July 31, 1956 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.258.

<sup>283</sup> See the August 1, 1956 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.258-259.

<sup>284</sup> See the August 6, 1956 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.259-260.

<sup>285</sup> See the August 6, 1956 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.260.

because celibate monks could not take care of them. They sided with the moderate group and argued that the celibate monks could not manage Korean Buddhism only by themselves without married monks for that time.<sup>286</sup>

On August 6, Secretary-General I Cheongdam of the Secretariat Head Office of the celibate monastic side, along with two other representatives, visited the government's department of education. Director Gim Sangpil of the Bureau of Culture mentioned that we could not make the tradition of Korean Buddhism only with celibate monks.<sup>287</sup> I Cheongdam told in the department of education that he would deposit a bond with the court for the provisional injunction ruling, submit a formal objection to the eviction suit and desperately defend Jogye-sa Temple.<sup>288</sup>

On August 14, 1956, the Seoul District Court cancelled for celibate monks the temporary transfer injunction of the temple's management issued on July 27 and ordered married monks to re-hand over the temple's management to celibate monks.<sup>289</sup> The court justified celibate monks to continuously manage the temple and keep the movement's momentum. Both sides should wait for the court's ruling on the original case.

The Education Department authorities scheduled to convene the meeting for elder celibate monks, even including some elder celibate monks who supported and sympathized with married monks, on September 5 at Bongeun-sa Temple in Seoul.<sup>290</sup> The government authorities worried about the huge fees for legal complaints between both sides and they should have protected temple properties that they had sold out to secure the legal fees. They tried to intervene in the disputes and settle down legal cases through mutual agreements between both sides and decided to convene the meeting.

However, on September 4, I Cheongdam, Secretary-General of the celibate monastic Jogye Order, issued a manifesto and declared that celibate monks would not attend the meeting for elder celibate monks convened by the Department of Education.<sup>291</sup> He argued in the manifesto that because the national conference for monks held on August 12, 1955 was legitimate, the government did not need to convene the meeting for elder celibate monks of both sides and to let them discuss the case once again on the national monastic conference.

On September 5, even though I Cheongdam, the order's highest administrator, rejected the government's convocation, the government convened the meeting for elder monks and requested them to give advice to it on how to settle down the disputes.<sup>292</sup> Since then, representatives of both sides unofficially

---

<sup>286</sup> See the August 7, 1956 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.261.

<sup>287</sup> See the August 7, 1956 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.261.

<sup>288</sup> See the August 7, 1956 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.261-262.

<sup>289</sup> See the August 15, 1956 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.262.

<sup>290</sup> See the August 30, 1956 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.263.

<sup>291</sup> See the September 5, 1956 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.263.

<sup>292</sup> See the October 26, 1956 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.264.

met thirteen times and tentatively agreed that the order shall appoint celibate monks as abbots of major temples and shall appoint married monks as acting abbots of remaining minor temples and let them take care of them. If they manage temples very well for three years, the order shall appoint even married monks as temple abbots. And, the order shall assign married monks to manage all mission schools and corporations. However, the tentative and unofficial agreements between two sides had not been implemented.

On September 18, one day before the traditional Korean Thanksgiving Day on lunar August 15, the Busan District Court enforced the transfer injunction of the management of South Gyeongsang Provincial Secretariat Head Office of the Jogye Order in Busan and evacuated married monks and their family from the head office and its residential quarters.<sup>293</sup> The September 21, 1956 issue of *Dong-a ilbo* reported the case in detail.<sup>294</sup> According to the issue, the court evicted 10 family members of a married monk Yun Giwon who had served for the office for three years while he went to his hometown Hadong County of South Gyeongsang Province to serve a memorial service for his deceased ancestors in the traditional Korean Thanksgiving Day, so they did not have places to go and stay. It also reported that a tenant named Yu Changmo argued that even though he paid a deposit of 90,000 won for the provincial secretariat office several years ago, the court removed him on the ground that he did not have a contract to prove his deposit payment.

In the mid-March 1957, Gim Dong-o, also known as Gim Jin-u, 40 years old, abbot of Jogye-sa Temple, demolished four buildings in the temple without the government's official permissions and was constructing a building.<sup>295</sup> Because the temple did not have the budget, he commissioned a construction company to build a theatre under the name of Memorial Hall for Purification Buddhist Movement without payment and suggested it to co-manage the theatre income with the temple for ten or fifteen years and gradually take construction fees from the income. Later, when Buddhists knew the abbot's plan for building a theatre in the temple, they began to criticize him and his plan strongly.

Around March 20, the abbot suddenly disappeared. Being embarrassed from the Buddhists' antagonisms, the order's high officials convened an emergency meeting and decided in the meeting to build one two-floor stone building and initiated to fundraise 30,000,000 won from 10,000 Buddhists, i.e., 3,000 won from each Buddhist across the nation because they could not return the demolished four buildings to normal.<sup>296</sup> They continued the construction along the fundraised amount and the order's budget. Married monks criticized the plan for constructing a theatre in Jogye-sa Temple for profit and recreation, not for nonprofit and religious cultivation. The government also denounced the illegal

---

<sup>293</sup> See the September 21, 1956 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.263-264.

<sup>294</sup> S.1.1.264.

<sup>295</sup> See the April 9, 1957 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.265.

<sup>296</sup> Ibid.

construction. Celibate monks defended that they were building up the memorial hall for purification of Buddhism, not a theatre.

On June 4, 1957, while waiting for a ruling of the higher court on which side has the order's power, the celibate monastic Jogye Order hosted the 2<sup>nd</sup> regular session at Jogye-sa Temple.<sup>297</sup> They resolved in the session that if the court would rule the order's power belonged to married monks, they would fight against the court and would not hand over the order's power to married monks at all. Even though celibate monks requested the department of education to submit to the court the pledge of married monks previously submitted to the department that they would hand over the order's power to celibate monks upon the presidential messages, the department declined to submit it to the court. By passing the resolution, celibate monks pressed the department to submit it and support them.

In mid August, the Jongno District Police in charge of Jogye-sa Temple stopped the illegal construction and demolished even the constructed concrete portion because the order was constructing the so-called memorial hall with the budget of around 100,000,000 won without the government permission.<sup>298</sup> The order lost around 10,000,000 won fundraised from lay Buddhists. The order dismissed Yun Haeun from the director position of the order's bureau of finance, who was in charge of the construction and its finance since early April, and decided to forward his case to the order's disciplinary committee.

On September 17, the Seoul Higher Court determined that the celibate monastic order should have the legitimate power in the order and requested married monks to pay for all of the legal fees related to the case.<sup>299</sup> It ruled that the national monastic conference hosted on August 12, 1955 and the resolutions passed in the conference should be valid.

According to the September 24, 1957 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, the celibate monastic order's Central Assembly hosted a meeting, devised the thirty-year plan of purifying Buddhism and would enforce the plan from that year of 1957. The plan intended to remove married monks and establish the order's system. On September 23, the department of education authorities did not react on the plan. The newspaper issue summarized the plan as follows: "(The order plans) to purify (1) the order by establishing the religious order's system and cleansing married monks in the order, (2) the monastic order by rearranging temples and nunneries, reeducating monks and nuns, reinstructing lay Buddhists, and modernizing propagation methods, (3) the temples by cleaning up non-Buddhist elements in temples and disorganizing pseudo-Buddhist organizations, (4) the civilians in the nation by establishing their ethics and stabilizing economically their lives, and (5) the world by building up international ethics and suggesting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy."<sup>300</sup>

<sup>297</sup> See the June 7, 1957 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.265-266.

<sup>298</sup> See the August 25, 1957 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.266.

<sup>299</sup> See the September 19, 1957 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.267.

<sup>300</sup> See the September 24, 1957 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.267.

The July 17, 1958 issue of *Dong-a ilbo* was very critical on the movement.<sup>301</sup> Even though celibate monks took back the order's hegemony from married monks, they did not succeed in actualizing the order's important projects that they promised during the movement of taking back the order's hegemony. They told that if they took back the power from married monks, they would propagate Buddhism by enforcing (1) the translation of all of Buddhist texts in the vernacular Korean language, (2) the establishment of a memorial hall for the purification of Buddhism, (3) the revitalization of nation-level praxis complex, and (4) the increase of the number of propagation centers. However, celibate monks had not done anything else that they promised.

During the disputes, both sides squandered Buddhist properties.<sup>302</sup> The temple properties consisted of farming lands, forests, corporations, schools, and others. Many profit corporations almost became bankrupt during the disputes and education foundations became independent from the order and temples. The temple forests became deforested. The government confiscated farm lands and returned some of them to the temples. Even though they got rent from tenant farmers, they could not support 7,342 missionary workers that the government's department of education estimated in January 1958 and could not manage 1,244 temples with the rental fees.

A newspaper was very skeptical for celibate monks to implement their promises.<sup>303</sup> The number of Buddhists since the liberation from Japan in 1945 until to the recent time was fixed at 3,850,000 without increase. The current number of temples decreased since the independence. On the other hand, the current number of Protestant and Catholic churches was 4,385 and 155 respectively and rapidly increased since August 15, 1945. While Christianity increased rapidly its believers and churches since the liberation, Buddhism decreased its followers and temples. We could not ignore the fact that the diminution originated from the movement. Korean Buddhists could not concentrate their energy on propagating Buddhism to the masses and serving for the society during the movement period because they were divided into two groups, celibate monks and their lay supporters and married monks and their lay supporters, and fought against each other.

On November 12, married monks filed a petition to the South Gyeongsang provincial government in which after celibate monks got the order's power on August 12, 1955, they could not manage temple properties, national treasures, historical sites, temple forests, and so on very well and they lost 661,640,000 won from their mismanagement.<sup>304</sup> Married monks estimated the amount. Even though we could easily guess that married monks exaggerated the amount, celibate monks should have sold out temple properties for many reasons, of course, including the legal cases and did not manage temples very well because

---

<sup>301</sup> S.1.1.268-269.

<sup>302</sup> See the July 17, 1958 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.269-270.

<sup>303</sup> Ibid.

<sup>304</sup> See the November 15, 1958 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.271.

they were not trained how to manage them. Celibate monks were Seon practitioners and did not have an experience on how to manage temples. Because young celibate monks were recently ordained, they did not know how to manage them.

On November 18, 1958, President I Seungman hosted the regular cabinet meeting at his presidential office at which he ordered the cabinet members to expedite the purification of Buddhism.<sup>305</sup>

During the movement, 31 young students majoring in Buddhism at Dongguk University, a Buddhist mission university, hated the tedious disputes between two sides and tried to reform Korean Buddhism.<sup>306</sup> In November 1958, they thought that they should purify the order's disputes and decided to organize the Committee to Establish a Beacon Mound. They made a beacon mound in Gimhae Plain located in South Gyeongsang Province as a symbol for purifying the disputes and scheduled to have an opening ceremony for a 12 feet Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva image on it on April 5, 1959, Arbor Day. The Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva image stands for compassion and holds a nectar bottle and a green willow in a left hand and a hoe in a right hand. They symbolized the hoe as a medium to cultivate our mind land and purify the disputes. Dongguk University purchased 36,000 *pyeong* for the enshrining site and they fundraised to establish the image.

According to the July 12, 1959 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, both sides wasted several ten million won for legal cases.<sup>307</sup> The government's Department of Education recognized the 69 cases that married monks sued against married monks, including the case on the legal validity of the national monastic conference held on August 12 1955, and the 10 cases which celibate monks appealed the lost cases to the higher courts. The most representative cases on the temple properties between two groups were on Woljeong-sa Temple in Pyeongchang County, Gangwon Province and Hwaom-sa Temple in Gurye County, South Jeolla Province. Celibate monks lost the both cases and when married monks took the management of temple properties, they appealed them to the higher courts.

On August 12, 1959, celibate monks celebrated at Jogye-sa Temple the 4<sup>th</sup> anniversary of taking over the order's hegemony from married monk on August 12, 1955 on which they hosted the national conference for celibate monks.<sup>308</sup> Patriarch Ha Dongsan and Secretary-General I Cheongdam also attended the anniversary ceremony and congratulated the movement's success. Even though celibate monks took back the management of major temples, married monks still took the management of 900 temples while celibate monks took care of 1,400 temples. While the number of married monks was 4,000, that of celibate monks

---

<sup>305</sup> See the November 18, 1958 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.271.

<sup>306</sup> See the March 13, 1959 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.272-273.

<sup>307</sup> S.1.1.277.

<sup>308</sup> See the August 13, 1959 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.277-278.



was 1,500. Both sides were fighting against each other on the management of schools and incorporations in courts.

### 3. The April 19<sup>th</sup>, 1960 Movement and the movement

President I Seungman who issued eight presidential messages from May 20, 1954 to December 8, 1955 and strongly supported the movement resigned his presidential position due to a national massive demonstration on April 19, 1960. He had gained office through a corrupted national election. The resignation of President I Seungman, strong and unconditioned supporter to the celibate monastic group, made the married monastic group take aggressive actions. Married monks counterattacked celibate monastic group and positively tried to take the temple managements from celibate monks. They argued that President I Seungman illegally issued presidential messages and would take the temple managements. Unlike married monks, celibate monks argued that because the president officially issued his presidential messages, the messages would be valid.

On April 27, more than 80 married monks attempted to take the Jogye-sa Temple, the order's head temple. On April 27, married monks attempted to occupy three temples such as Dae-an-sa Temple, Daeseong-sa Temple and Bohyeon-sa Temple in Daegu<sup>309</sup>; on April 28, Ssanggye-sa Temple in the County of Hadong, South Gyeongsang Province; on April 28 – 29, Pyochung-sa Temple in the County of Milyang, South Gyeongsang Province; on April 30, Daegak-sa Temple in Busan<sup>310</sup>; on May 1, Beomeo-sa Temple in Busan<sup>311</sup>; on May 4, Gap-sa in the County of Gongju, South Chungcheong Province; on May 6, Beopju-sa Temple in the County of Boeun, North Chungcheong Province; and others.

After April 26, 1960 on which President I Seungman resigned his presidency, married monks seriously attempted to take the temple management rights from celibate monks. The *Joseon ilbo* introduced the disputes between married and celibate monks in its May 3, 1960 issue as follows:

Stagnant Buddhist disputes began to increase since President I Seungman resigned on April 26, 1960. Married monks evicted from temples began to take their temples and forced celibate monks removed from the temples. When President I Seungman was in office, he issued the presidential messages to purify Buddhism and to support celibate monks. Married monks lost the temple management rights to celibate monks.

After President I Seungman's resignation (on April 26), married monks relied on violence on order to take the temple management rights. Both sides got seriously involved in internal trouble. Until May 2, married monks took

<sup>309</sup> See the May 3, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.279.

<sup>310</sup> See the May 1, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.278.

<sup>311</sup> See the May 3, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.279.

over three temples such as Hwaam-sa Temple, Seonam-sa Temple and Cheoneun-sa Temple and were under the taking back of Haein-sa Temple.

However, the suit on the order's disputes between both sides was under trial in the Supreme Court. Married monks won the case at the first trial and unmarried monks won it at the second trial.

Regardless of married and unmarried monks, all Buddhist monks made efforts to receive the patronage from the ruling party of Jayu (Liberty) in the President I Seungman's regime. Both married and celibate monks fervently conducted a campaign for the presidential and vice presidential candidate of the Liberty Party in the fraudulent March 15, 1960 Election.<sup>312</sup>

While the *Joseon ilbo* introduced Buddhist disputes in Seoul at the order's level in the above-cited article, the *Dong-a ilbo* introduced Buddhist disputes in Busan and Daegu at the order's local and provincial level in its May 3, 1960 issue as follows:

Buddhist disputes began to be reignited between married and celibate monks after the democratic revolution on April 26, 1960 on which President I Seungman resigned his presidency. President I Seungman and his government patronized celibate monks and the movement, so celibate monks took over the order's hegemony and the temple management rights from married monks. However, the legal solution is under trial in the Supreme Court. After this democratic revolution, married monks unanimously counterattacked against unmarried monks across the nation. This article introduces representative Buddhist disputes in Busan and Daegu as follows:

(Busan) 70 married monks visited Beomeo-sa Temple in Cheongnyong Village, Buk Town, Dongnae County, at 10:00 am on May 1 and asked that celibate monks should move out from the temple or that if they dislike to move out from the temple, they should retreat to and practice Seon at the Seon center. Married monks asked unmarried monks to hand over the temple management rights. The disputes between both sides recurred. Celibate monks prepared bamboo spears to confront with married monks for cases that married monks might use violence. The situation became dangerous. At 6:00 pm, for now, both sides continue to compromise with each other without conflict.

(Daegu) On April 27 at 9:00 am, Principal Gim Yeonghwan of Neungin Junior High School and his 50 students affiliated with the married monastic side attacked three temples Dae-an-sa, Daeseong-sa and Bohyeon-sa temples in Daegu and requested celibate monks to hand over the temples and to sign on the papers to transfer the ownership of the temples to them. They beat several celibate monks, including Gim Jongwon. Married monks had a conference at their base temple of Eungwon-sa Temple located in Namsan-dong, downtown Daegu and along with laypersons, decided to take decisive action to remove nuns on the Buddha's birthday (May 3). On May 1, in the morning, celibate monks were worried about the anticipated action of violence by married monks and asked the police to take care of them.<sup>313</sup>

---

<sup>312</sup> S.1.1.278-279.

<sup>313</sup> S.1.1.279.

On May 3, after the Buddha's Birthday celebration ceremony, the married monastic group held a street demonstration, carrying a placard saying the celibate monks should be removed. In the middle of May, married monks drove celibate monks from Hwaeom-sa Temple in Gurye, South Jeolla Province. Fifteen evicted celibate monks visited the local Martial Law Command and the local Police Agency and asked them to help move in the temples. On May 12, the police escorted married monks to the temple and celibate monks asked married monks to withdraw from the temple.<sup>314</sup>

On June 5, at 10:40 am, more than 60 married monks and laypersons of Eungwon-sa Temple invaded and occupied Daean-sa Temple in Daean-dong, Daegu and removed celibate monks in the temple. The military dispatched troops and put down the fighting between both sides. The military mediated both sides and let them compromise with each other.<sup>315</sup>

On June 9 – 11, the married monastic group held their own order's regular central assembly meeting at Cheongnyeon-sa Temple. At that time, they declared that eight presidential messages issued by President I Seungman were illegal and they defined the celibate monastic group's order as a pro-government institution. They declared that they would return Korean Buddhism to the status it had before the movement's beginning.

On June 16, the unmarried monastic group changed the system of the order's central assembly in order to accept married monastics' demand in the changed political situation. They proposed that the order's central assembly has two levels, that is, the upper house of celibate monks and the lower house of lay Buddhist representatives.

On July 15, 1960, the married monastic group applied to the district court in Seoul for an injunction to stop the duties of the major officials in the unmarried monastic order's administration and to prohibit unmarried monks from entering Jogye-sa Temple. On August 7, however, the court declined the married monastic group's request.

Before April 19, 1960, the married monastic group questioned in court the legitimacy of the national monastic conference, held by only the unmarried monastic one on August 12, 1955, which paved a road for the unmarried monastic one to accomplish their movement's goal. On November 24, the final decision by the Supreme Court on the legitimacy of the national monastic conference was supposed to be ruled.

On November 19, 800 celibate monks hosted the national monastic conference at Jogye-sa Temple and propagated the legitimacy of the national monastic conference, held on August 12, 1955 and to lead the Supreme Court to rule the case in favor of their side.<sup>316</sup> They marched in the streets to advertise

---

<sup>314</sup> See the May 14, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.279.

<sup>315</sup> See the June 6, 1960 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.279-280.

<sup>316</sup> See the November 20, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1. 280-281.

their demand to be right and proper. The order's Secretary-General of the celibate monastic side delivered an opening speech and asked Korean Buddhists to follow the Buddha's original teachings and preserve the celibate monasticism. They passed a resolution in five items. Two of them are as follows: "Without regard to the result of the Supreme Court's ruling, celibate monks should not withdraw themselves from temples and should protect the temples from married monks' intrusion"; and "If the Supreme Court rules against justice and makes married monks to take the leadership in Korean Buddhism, all of celibate monks will fight against the ruling and will be martyred." They unanimously resolved them and issued messages to all of Koreans and the World Fellowship of Buddhists (WFB).

However, married monks argued that celibate monks got a favor from civilian dictator I Seungman and the support from the dictator was improper and illegal.<sup>317</sup> They concluded that the movement's success was illegally and unreasonably possible through the dictator's strong support. They defined the movement as an institutional movement and a government-sponsored movement. Bak Daeryun, Secretary-General of the married monastic side's order, strongly argued that celibate monks should not intervene in the near-future Supreme Court's ruling anymore and the national conference for celibate monks was anti-revolutionary, reactionary, and anti-democratic.<sup>318</sup>

On November 21, 700 celibate monks and 200 lay Buddhists marched in the streets in downtown Seoul, carrying a placard saying "promotion of celibate monasticism."<sup>319</sup> They requested the Supreme Court to give a favor for themselves in its ruling on November 24. On November 22, 700 unmarried monastics as well as 200 lay Buddhists demonstrated and encouraged the unmarried monastic atmosphere at Jogye-sa Temple. On the same day, around 300 celibate monks and nuns demonstrated in downtown Busan, carrying placards describing "No Married Monks in Buddhism" and "No Married Monks in Temples."<sup>320</sup>

On November 23, around 700 unmarried monastics began a hunger strike and on November 24, they voiced up their demand to the court from 4:00 am early in the morning at Jogye-sa Temple. Arguing that religion should be separated from state, they requested jurisdiction not to intervene in the movement. Even though unmarried monks implemented and developed the movement with the strong support of President I Seungman and his government, they asked the court to follow the constitution's principle of the separation of state and religion for their favor. They manipulated the constitution's principle for their political interests. They asserted that they were only the followers of the Buddha's fundamental teachings.<sup>321</sup>

<sup>317</sup> See the November 19, 1960 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.280.

<sup>318</sup> See the November 20, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.280-281.

<sup>319</sup> See the November 22, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.281.

<sup>320</sup> See the November 24, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.282.

<sup>321</sup> See the November 23, 1960 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.281-282.

On November 24, the Supreme Court returned the case for the higher court in Seoul to review and did not confirm the positive ruling to the unmarried monastic group, which won the case in the higher court. On the same day, 400 celibate monks protested against the ruling and intruded into the Supreme Court and 6 monks attempted to disembowel themselves in the Secretariat Office of the Chief Justice. Six monks were Yu Woltan (b. 1937), 25 years old; Seok Dohyeon, 21 years old; Seok Seong-u, 35 years old; Seok Jinseong, 25 years old; Seok Domyeong, 33 years old and Mun Seonggak (1932-1977), 35 years old.<sup>322</sup> Before they disemboweled, they read a message, "If this ruling is disadvantageous for celibate monks and the court extends the ruling and returns the case to the higher court, the fight between two groups will not finish. If we maintain the fight continued for seven years, we will die as martyrs for our faith rather than we cannot cultivate our mind because we should fight again."<sup>323</sup> The attendants of Chief Justice told them that because Chief Justice and justices went out, they could not meet them. They disemboweled and stood up, saying that they would wait until to meet them.<sup>324</sup>

On November 24, 1960, after people heard news that six monks disemboweled in the Supreme Court, more than 400 monks intruded into the Supreme Court building and shouted to find out the Chief Justice. While the police and the staffs of the Supreme Court attempted to prohibit them from intruding to the office of the Chief Justice, unmarried monks tried to get into it. The police took 335 people to police stations in Seoul and officially arrested 333 people by releasing two.<sup>325</sup>

On November 24, the police arrested 333 Buddhists who intruded into the Supreme Court. It classified them into three groups, (1) 13 people into the 1<sup>st</sup> group of prime movers, (2) 156 people into the 2<sup>nd</sup> group that damaged the facilities in the court building, and (3) 160 people into the 3<sup>rd</sup> group that collided with the police outside of the court building. The number of monks was 236, that of nuns 93 and that of laywomen 4. The majority of arrested Buddhists went on the hunger strike in detention houses.<sup>326</sup>

On November 25, the court issued arrest warrants for 133 and the police released the remainder of them. It arrested and detained I Cheongdam, Secretary-General of the celibate monastic order.<sup>327</sup> It considered him as the mastermind for celibate monks to intrude the Supreme Court.<sup>328</sup>

On November 26, around 1,000 celibate monks gathered at Jogye-sa Temple finished their demonstration. They issued a manifesto and publicly apologized people for their intrusion to the Supreme Court. They declared to

<sup>322</sup> See the November 25, 1960 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.287.

<sup>323</sup> Ibid.

<sup>324</sup> Ibid.

<sup>325</sup> See the November 25, 1960 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.287-289.

<sup>326</sup> See the November 25, 1960 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.287-289.

<sup>327</sup> See the November 26, 1960 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.296.

<sup>328</sup> See the November 26, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.297.

endeavor to make detained 133 celibate monks released.<sup>329</sup> On December 2, the Prosecutor Office did not prosecute but released 73 celibate monks of the remained 125 detainees and on December 3, it prosecuted 52 celibate monks.<sup>330</sup>

On December 4, six monks who attempted to intrude and disembowel themselves in the Supreme Court entered the hunger strike in the Seoul District Prison.<sup>331</sup> On December 8, the Seodaemun District Police who investigated the intruders to the Supreme Court did not arrest I Haengwon (1927-2004), abbot of Hwagye-sa Temple but remanded him to the Prosecutor Office.<sup>332</sup> The district police suspected that he told that (disemboweled) monks were dead and agitated celibate monks who were demonstrating against the Supreme Court ruling on November 24. It also regarded that if they arrest and investigate him, they could find out wire-pullers of the demonstration and the connection between celibate monks and some politicians.<sup>333</sup> He hid themselves in various temples and showed up to the district police on December 7 in the afternoon and received an investigation from the police.<sup>334</sup>

On December 15 at 9:00 am, Daegak-hoe (Society for Great Enlightenment) hosted a public hearing in the City Hall of Seoul on how to settle down Buddhist disputes in which nine speakers prominent in society and Buddhism presented their opinions.<sup>335</sup>

On December 21, the Prosecutor Office indicted only the 24 monks among them, of course including six monks who disemboweled.<sup>336</sup> It released all detained monks except 24 monks and even I Cheongdam, one of key leaders of the movement. The indicted 24 monks, most of whom are 20s and 30s, are Mun Seonggak, Gwon Taehyeon, Yu Woltan, Jeong Seong-u, Gim Doheon, I Seongseop, Gim Seoncheon, Choe Gyutae, Gwon Yeongsik, Hong Jaeho, Gim Jongman, Bak Yonghwan, Choe Mugap, Na Jeonghwan, Choe Gapseong, I Heoncheol, Bak Sunman, Jeong Geunbae, Gim Bangmun, Gim Jeong-o, Gim Hakjo, Choe Manyun, Bak Sujin and Bak Jeongneung. The age of six indicted monks of them range from 18 to 20.<sup>337</sup> It did not indict the senior and key leaders but minor and young monks.

On December 24, a judge and a prosecutor began to examine the 24 defendants in the Seoul District Court, who disliked the Supreme Court's ruling and guided and intruded the Supreme Court. More than 60 celibate monks and more than 200 laypersons observed the trial. The court accepted I Cheongdam as

<sup>329</sup> See the November 27, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.299.

<sup>330</sup> See the December 3, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.301.

<sup>331</sup> See the December 6, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.301.

<sup>332</sup> See the December 9, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.301.

<sup>333</sup> See the December 2, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.300.

<sup>334</sup> See the December 9, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.301.

<sup>335</sup> See the December 12, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.301.

<sup>336</sup> See the December 22, 1960 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.301-302.

<sup>337</sup> See the January 24, 1961 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.302.

a witness.<sup>338</sup> On January 31, the judge sentenced them to serve from 2 years to eight months in prison.<sup>339</sup>

On February 7, 1961, the court sentenced one year's imprisonment with a stay of execution for 3 years to six disemboweled monks and eight month imprisonment with probation for two years to the remainder of them.<sup>340</sup>

On February 13, Bak Daeryun, Secretary-General of the Secretariat Head Office of the married monastic side, alleged that Abbot Bak Jeseon of Gwanchok-sa Temple in Nonsan, South Chungcheong Province sold out a natural crystal enshrined in the Maitreya Buddha Stone Statue, National Treasure # 346, estimated as 1,000 won, and asked the department of education to investigate him. Abbot Bak Jeseon was affiliated with the celibate monastic side. Upon the request, the department began to examine the case.<sup>341</sup>

Bak Daeryun argued that Na Inchang, a married monk, served as its abbot, handed over the crystal to the abbot, an unmarried monk, in front of many persons seven years ago. The celibate abbot lost it. However, Son Gyeongsan, Secretary-General of the Secretariat Head Office of the unmarried monastic side, counter-argued that the abbot of a celibate monk did not receive the crystal from the abbot of a married monk at all. He regarded that the married abbot should be responsible for the loss of the crystal. The director of the bureau of culture of the department of education told that the married monastic side exaggerated its cost of 1,000 won and the case was the side effects of Buddhist disputes. He also said that the department speedily dispatched a relevant official to and were investigating the case in the temple.<sup>342</sup>

On February 19, married and celibate monks fought against each other again to take Bulguk-sa Temple in Gyeongju, North Gyeongsang Province. Sixteen married monks guided by Sim Boyeon went to occupy the temple. Celibate monks successfully protected the temple from the attack of married monks with the help of the police.

On March 25 – 26, the National Association of Lay Buddhists held a national conference for its representatives. It urged the movement's completion and the reconstruction of a pure monastic order. They also requested the order to implement the two level system of its central assembly, that is, the upper house of the celibate monks and the lower house of the lay Buddhist representatives. The order did not accept their request at all.

Even though celibate monks received the strong support from lay Buddhists, after taking back the order's hegemony, they completely excluded lay Buddhists from the order and temple management rights. Celibate monks monopolized the order and temples for themselves and did not share the management rights in the

<sup>338</sup> See the January 25, 1961 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.303-304.

<sup>339</sup> See the January 31, 1961 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.304.

<sup>340</sup> See the February 7, 1961 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.305 and the February 7, 1961 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.305-306.

<sup>341</sup> See the February 14, 1961 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.306.

<sup>342</sup> See the February 15, 1961 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.306-307.

order and temples with laypersons. Laypersons did not have their representatives and could not voice up their opinions in the order's central assembly. The Jogye Order of the celibate monastic side became an undemocratic and anachronistic religious organization. They only had the assemblymen for celibate monks, even not including celibate nuns.

#### 4. The May 16<sup>th</sup>, 1961 Coup and the movement

General Bak Jeonghui (1917-1979) obtained power through the May 16, 1961 coup. The military government treated both groups equally in the beginning. The government measure was supposed to recognize the married monastic group in the order. On September 16, 1961, the unmarried monastic group held the 19<sup>th</sup> extraordinary meeting at its order's central assembly and decided not to accept the government's policy. They did not recognize the married monastics.

On October 19, 1961, the Supreme Court ordered its district and higher courts to suspend the legal cases related to Buddhist disputes, following requests from the committee of society and education of the Supreme Council of Reconstructing a Nation (Gukga jaegeon choego hoeui). The committee tried to find out methods on how to settle down the legal cases between celibate and married monks continued since August 1955. The cases related to Buddhist disputes in courts across the nation were around 75. The most central case dealt with the validity of the special meeting of the Committee for Preparing Temple Purification held on February 4, 1955 and the definition of the monkhood in eight determined in its meeting. Several hours prior to the request, the Supreme Court confirmed three cases in favor of the married monks. It legitimated only the abbots whom married monks had appointed before the national conference for celibate monks on August 12, 1955.<sup>343</sup>

On November 9, military ruler Bak Jeonghui issued the 1<sup>st</sup> official statement in which he strongly urged the two groups to solve the conflict by themselves. On December 8, the military government stopped legal cases in the Supreme Court regarding the movement and passed a government ordinance to organize the Committee for Reconstructing Buddhism (Bulgyo jaegeon wiwon-hoe) in the cabinet meeting.

According to the ordinance, the committee was supposed to have five respective representatives from both sides and three representatives of high reputation in the society appointed by the Secretary of Education and in one month after the committee was initiated, all of conflicts in the Buddhist order should be resolved and both sides should withdraw all legal cases, unite with each other and initiate the order's new and legal administration. It also clarified the qualifications for the representatives, i.e., they should be monks before 1955, the beginning year of comprehensive disputes between two groups; they should

---

<sup>343</sup> See the October 22, 1961 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.307-308.



not have worked as executives for either of two groups; they should not participate in politics; they should not have wives; and others.<sup>344</sup>

While the married monastic group accepted the qualifications for the representatives, the celibate monastic group contended that if only the monks ordained before 1955 can become representatives, their qualifications are favored to the married monastic side and rejected the government's mediation. The celibate monks suggested that the government should differentiate between lay Buddhists and celibate monks and should clarify the condition that the representatives of both sides should be celibate monks.<sup>345</sup>

On December 9, General Bak Jeonghui issued the 2<sup>nd</sup> official statement in which he urged that the conflicts between two groups should be settled down as soon as possible. On December 19, the Department of Education presented the government ordinance to both sides and asked them to submit their own committee candidate members by December 25. Even though the married monastic group accepted the government's offer with a condition that the committee should exclude three government-recommended representatives, the unmarried monastic side did not accept it but submitted its own revised version. The celibate monks contended that the government ignored their assertion that married monks were actually not monk and that the government misunderstood the movement's characteristics. Even though the government regarded the fight between two sides as internal disputes, the celibate monks argued that their movement was revolutionary and legitimate.<sup>346</sup>

On January 9, 1962, the celibate monastic order held the regular assembly meeting at Jogye-sa Temple and passed a resolution that it would accept the department of education's measures if the government admits the legitimacy and tradition of Korean Buddhism's celibate monasticism based on Buddhism's original teachings. If the government exclusively accepts their assertions, the order will follow the government's mediation. If not, it will not follow the government's arbitration. Celibate monks indirectly and diplomatically rejected the government's measures.<sup>347</sup>

Celibate monks told the government that if the government selects and recommends the three representatives who favor them, they would accept the government's ordinance.<sup>348</sup> If so, it was not fair between two groups. However, on January 10, because the government secretly promised them that it would not recognize married monks as monks, they submitted their memorandum to the government.<sup>349</sup> Married monks requested the government to exclude three government-recommended representatives from the Committee for Reconstructing Buddhism.

---

<sup>344</sup> See the January 10, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.311.

<sup>345</sup> Ibid.

<sup>346</sup> See the December 29, 1961 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.309-310.

<sup>347</sup> See the January 10, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.310-311.

<sup>348</sup> See the January 10, 1962 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.312.

<sup>349</sup> See the January 11, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.314.

On January 13, 1962, General Bak Jeonghui issued the 3<sup>rd</sup> official statement in which he declared that if the conflicts continued, he would punish those responsible very severely because the government's request that the two groups organize the committee was not successfully implemented. He wished in it that Korean Buddhists should settle down the internal disputes and revitalize Buddhism in particular and Korean culture in general as soon as possible.<sup>350</sup>

On January 17, the Department of Education again urged both sides to organize the Committee for Reconstructing Buddhism. On January 18, both sides agreed to organize the committee in the Secretary's Office of the Department of Education and made the committee's rules. They passed a resolution that the committee be comprised of eleven members, i.e., five representatives respectively from each side and one representative from the Department of Education. They also determined that the committee should resolve all issues regarding the Purification of Buddhism. They decided to exchange the list of five representatives with each other by January 20 and to have the committee's 1<sup>st</sup> meeting on January 22. If the committee is organized, it will announce public promises, will organize in one month the order's Emergency Assembly for Reconstructing Buddhism (Bulgyo jaegeon bisang jonghoe), will let it lead the order, and will let it withdraw all suits.<sup>351</sup>

On January 20, based on article # 3 of the Special Law to Reorganize Old Laws and Regulations, the government abolished the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples, devised under Japanese Occupation in 1911, except article # 5 among its seven articles. The Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples had not been removed even after Korea's liberation from Japan. Instead, they were very tactically used to control Korean Buddhism by the US military government and the I Seungman regime.

Article # 5 of the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples is as follows: "One cannot sell any temple properties such as land, forest, buildings, Buddha images, stone architects, old manuscripts, old calligraphies and paintings and other precious materials without permission from the Governor-General."

Thus, the new Bak Jeonghui regime did not abolish the regulations completely, keeping the most important article for the government to effectively control Korean Buddhism in its hands. The South Korean government completely replaced the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples with the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties on May 24, 1962.

On January 21, both sides exchanged the list of five representatives. Five representatives of the celibate monastic side were I Cheongdam, Son Gyeongsan, I Haengwon, Choe Wonheo and Bak Chudam. The leader of five was I Cheongdam. Five representatives of the married monastic side were Jo

---

<sup>350</sup> See the January 13, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo* and the January 13, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.315.

<sup>351</sup> See the January 18, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo* and the January 18, 1962 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.315-316.

Yongmyeong, Bak Seungnyong, Hwang Seongnyong, An Deogam, and I Namchae, and the leader of five was Jo Yongmyeong.<sup>352</sup>

On January 20, based on the suggestion by the Education Minister, Ha Dongsan, the highest patriarch of the unmarried monastic group and Guk Mukdam, the highest patriarch of the married monastics, officially signed a written oath to organize the Committee for Reconstructing Buddhism to establish the united Korean Buddhist order in the Office of the Department of Education. This event paved the road for the order's united administration in Korean Buddhism. As shown above, the movement's completion was completely dependent on the government's intervention.

On January 22, the two groups, respectively represented by five representatives, held the 1<sup>st</sup> committee meeting in the Office of Public Information with the Education Secretary in attendance. They began the 1<sup>st</sup> committee meeting with the oath sworn by two highest patriarchs, Ha Dongsan and Guk Mukdam that they would preserve the committee regulations.<sup>353</sup> Both patriarchs promised to make efforts to settle down all disputes and to establish the united and harmonized order as soon as possible. The 10 representatives elected I Cheongdam and Jo Yongmyeong as co-chairs. The Committee for Reconstructing Buddhism passed its regulation constituting a preamble and 9 articles and its detailed regulation composed of a preamble, 25 articles and additional rules in the meeting. Gim Sanghyeop (1920-1995), education secretary, delivered a pep talk and asked both sides to harmonize each other and build up the order's new and legal (officialized) administration.<sup>354</sup>

They also reconfirmed that they would initiate the order's emergency assembly in one month, would pass its constitution in it and would make the order's united administration (tonghap jongdan) completed. They declared that two highest administrative secretariat offices representing the married and the celibate monastic sides should be defunct from the initiation of the Committee of Reconstructing Buddhism on January 22, 1962. Until to the beginning of the order's new administration, the emergency assembly's secretariat office would provisionally serve as the order's highest administrative office.<sup>355</sup>

The regulations that the two patriarchs swore were as follows: (1) immediately after establishing the committee, the committee should announce its public promises. After the emergency order is organized, it should withdraw all legal suits. (2) The committee should organize the order's emergency assembly for reconstructing Buddhism in one month. (3) The committee is composed of ten representatives without including any representative appointed by the government. Each side should respectively appoint five based on the following qualifications: "They should have been monks for more than twenty years. They should have attended intensive retreats more than ten times at Seon

<sup>352</sup> See the January 22, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.316.

<sup>353</sup> See the January 22, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.316-317.

<sup>354</sup> See the January 23, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.320.

<sup>355</sup> See the January 23, 1962 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.321.

centers, or they should have finished the highest courses at monastic seminaries or at modern universities. They should not have made serious problems since August 1955, the beginning of internal disputes in Buddhism. They should not have participated in secular politics. They also should not have gotten a sentence with an infamous crime.<sup>356</sup>

On January 25, 1962, the committee hosted the 2<sup>nd</sup> committee meeting and unanimously passed a public pledge with six articles as follows:

- (1) We should purify the order based on our tradition and doctrine, reconstruct Korean Buddhism and let it be prosperous.
- (2) We should learn the Buddha's fundamental teachings, correct the order's rules, practice Mahāyāna Buddhism suitable to the demands of the times, and positively should participate in reconstructing a nation.
- (3) We should mirror splendid accomplishments that our Korean Buddhists had affected our culture across the history, and make efforts to educate Buddhist monks and laypersons, propagate Buddhism and translate Buddhist texts in the Korean language in order to create our nation's culture.
- (4) We should thoroughly protect temples, preserve cultural properties, and manage the order's finance.
- (5) We should extend Korean Buddhism's influence in society, strengthen our ties with other foreign Buddhist traditions, internationally exchange with other national cultures, and improve human welfares.
- (6) We should organize the order's emergency assembly in one month, disband the Committee for Reconstructing Buddhism, and finally accomplish the mission of reconstructing the order.<sup>357</sup>

On January 27, 1962, it hosted the 3<sup>rd</sup> committee meeting and made the emergency assembly's regulations in it. The celibate monastic representatives conceded the qualifications of the emergency assemblymen. Two groups agreed with them and did not give restrictions for them. For example, they opened the qualifications even for married monks, celibate monks, single monks, and divorced monks to become the emergency assemblymen. Each side elects 15 assemblymen respectively, totaling 30 assemblymen in the order's emergency assembly. They limited the duration of the assembly to six months. They determined that each side should elect each side's 15 assemblymen and exchange the list with each other by January 31. They would convene the emergency assembly on February 12.<sup>358</sup>

On January 29, the committee hosted the meeting and passed the rules how to organize the order's emergency assembly in an office affiliated with the Department of Education. The rules consisted of a preamble, 21 articles and

---

<sup>356</sup> See the January 22, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.316-317.

<sup>357</sup> See the January 25, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo* and the January 25, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.324-325.

<sup>358</sup> See the January 28, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.326.

additional rules. According to the rules, the emergency assembly consisted of 30 assemblymen would devise the new constitution, make the order's central administration, arrange the problems unsettled down in both organizations, i.e., the married and the celibate monastic orders. If the emergency assembly was organized, it would charge all administrative affairs of two monastic orders and administer the order's major affairs such as the propagation of Buddhism, the translation of Buddhist texts in Korean, the management of temple properties, and the arrangement of the order's credits and debits.<sup>359</sup>

According to the rules, the emergency assembly would be the highest decision-making body in the order of Korean Buddhism as follows: "(1) It should make the constitution and laws of the Jogye Order; (2) it should make and revise its central assembly's rules; and (3) it should pass resolutions regarding the reconstruction of Buddhism."<sup>360</sup> It would be existent until to the initiation of the new central assembly.

On January 31, both sides exchanged and examined the list of 15 assembly representatives at the 4<sup>th</sup> committee meeting. 30 representatives in total will be the members of the emergency assembly and they will pass the order's constitution and elect the order's new Secretary-General held at the assembly's 1<sup>st</sup> meeting on February 12.<sup>361</sup>

The 15 representatives that the celibate monastic side submitted were I Cheongdam, Bak Chudam, Son Gyeongsan, I Haengwon, Mun Jeong-yeong, Chae Byeogam, I Neungga, Choe Wolsan, O Nogwon (b. 1928), Yun Wolha, Bak Munseong, Gim Seoun, Bak Beomnyong, Gim Ilta (1929-1999)<sup>362</sup> and Gim Jihyo.<sup>363</sup>

The 15 representative that the married monastic side submitted were Gwon Han-gyeong, Jo Yongmyeong, Byeon Bong-am, Yu Dongsan, Yun Geumsong, Song Jeong-am, I Wolha, Choe Dacheon, An Deogam, I Namchae, Bak Seobong, I Jaebok (1918-1991), Yun Gibong, I Waun, and Hwang Seonggi.<sup>364</sup>

## 5. The movement's discontinuation: The establishment of the order's united administration

The two groups had four committee meetings and set the cornerstones for the establishment of the united administration of the Jogye Order. On January 22,

---

<sup>359</sup> See the January 29, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo* and the January 30, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.326.

<sup>360</sup> See the January 30, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.326-327.

<sup>361</sup> See the January 31, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.327.

<sup>362</sup> *Chongnam*, 538.

<sup>363</sup> See the January 31, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo* and the January 31, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.327.

<sup>364</sup> *Ibid.*

the two groups, respectively represented by five representatives, held the 1<sup>st</sup> committee meeting in the Office of Public Information with the Education Secretary in attendance. They made detailed operational rules for the committee in 14 items. They organized subcommittees, elected the chairman for each subcommittee and assigned members to it.

On January 25, 1962, they declared a public pledge with six articles and made an operation plan in the 2<sup>nd</sup> committee meeting. On January 29, they passed the rules for the order's Emergency Central Assembly with a preamble, seven chapters and twenty articles in the 3<sup>rd</sup> committee meeting. On January 31, they elected the fifteen representatives of the order's emergency central assembly respectively from each side in the 4<sup>th</sup> committee meeting.

On February 12, the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the order's emergency assembly was held. On behalf of Education Secretary Gim Sanghyeop, vice secretary I Seung-u attended the meeting and encouraged them to settle down the disputes.<sup>365</sup> They assigned an assembly to rebuild Buddhism in six months. They elected I Cheongdam of the unmarried monastic group as chairman and Jo Yongmyeong of the married monastic one to vice chairman. They also elected five committee chairs, for example, I Namchae to the chair of the committee of general affairs, I Jaebok to the chair of the committee of education and propagation, An Deogam to the chair of the committee of financial affairs, Son Gyeongsan to the chair of the committee of laws and regulations and Yun Wolha to the chair of the committee of inspection.<sup>366</sup>

On February 14, they held the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting for the order's Emergency Assembly for Reconstructing Buddhism at Jogye-sa Temple, revised some rules of the assembly, and passed them. Based on the revised rules, they established the steering committee that manages the five subcommittees. The steering committee consisted of 12 people, i.e., one chair, one vice chair, five chairs and five vice chairs of the subcommittees in the order's Emergency Assembly.<sup>367</sup>

On February 20, the committee of laws and regulations devised the constitution. We can summarize the draft constitution consisted of a preamble, 18 chapters, 109 articles, and 4 additional rules as follows:

- (1) The order shall adopt the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism as the title of the united Korean Buddhist order.
- (2) Doui of the United Silla Dynasty shall be the order's founder and Jinul and Taego of the Goryeo Dynasty its successors.<sup>368</sup>

<sup>365</sup> See the February 13, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.329.

<sup>366</sup> See the February 13, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.328.

<sup>367</sup> See the February 15, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.330.

<sup>368</sup> Doui (d. 821) transmitted the Linji Chan sectarian lineage from China for the first time. They solved the issue regarding the order's founding patriarch by considering Doui as its founder and equally accepting Jinul and Taego as two transmitters in its order.

- (3) The order shall accept the *Diamond Sūtra* as the order's authoritative text and the analects of Chan patriarchs as the supplementary texts.
- (4) The order shall consider Śākyamuni Buddha as its major Buddha and shall conventionally enshrine other images.
- (5) The highest patriarch's term shall be the five years. The order shall re-enshrine the highest patriarch based on the recommendation. The assembly shall make the rules on how to enshrine the order's highest patriarch. The patriarch shall be enshrined through the central assembly's recommendation.
- (6) The members of the Council of Elder Monks shall have the lifelong term. The members of the Council of Elder Monks shall consist of former patriarchs and the central assembly shall recommend them to be the members. The council shall not have the fixed number.
- (7) The Central Assembly shall consist of 53 members.
- (8) The order shall assign some temples to the direct affiliates of the order's Secretariat Head Office.
- (9) The temple abbots and secretaries shall serve for four years.
- (10) The temples and propagation centers shall be used only for religious and praxis purposes.
- (11) The Emergency Assembly for Reconstructing Buddhism that devises and promulgates this constitution shall be considered to the order's united administration's 1<sup>st</sup> central assembly.<sup>369</sup>

On February 21, they discussed the definition of monkhood. However, both sides argued over it very vehemently. The celibate monastic group contended that the order should consist of monastics and lay Buddhists and argued that married monks should not be included in the category of monks. The married monastic group asserted that the order should constitute monastics and lay Buddhists and it divided monastics into two groups, the group of practicing monks and the group of propagation monks, assigning celibate monks to practicing monks and married monks to propagation monks.<sup>370</sup>

On February 24, the government authorities asked both sides to define the qualifications of monkhood by February 28. They also told them that if they could not settle down the disputes by the end of February, they could implement their own direct measures to solve them. The government officials presented their opinions on the definition of monkhood in the emergency assembly, "(1) Korean Buddhist tradition accepts (celibate) monks and nuns; (2) we should accept the established rights of monks married during and after Japanese occupation; (3) we should recognize unmarried monks from now on; and (4) married monks should decide whether they continue their monkhood as unmarried monks or become laypersons."<sup>371</sup>

Celibate monks interpreted the suggested opinions that they could accept the established rights of married monks after they became unmarried monks in

<sup>369</sup> See the February 21, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.330-331.

<sup>370</sup> See the February 22, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.332.

<sup>371</sup> See the February 25, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.334.

the order's new administration. They also understood that the order's new administration should be composed of celibate monks. However, married monks argued that there are contradictions between the second condition and the third and fourth conditions in the suggested opinions of the government officials. They suggested that the new administration should consider the situations of married monasticism.<sup>372</sup>

On February 28, the emergency assembly agreed on the order's constitution with the condition that it would accept the interpretation of the monastic order by the government's Education Department. The constitution was composed of the preamble, nineteen chapters and one hundred sixteen articles. Both sides argued over the definition of the monastic order.

On March 5, the department of education interpreted the established rights of married monks that married monks could have established rights when they keep unmarried status and live in temples. If not, married monks should not be monks and could not have established rights as monks but could serve as mission workers and acting abbots. The government-defined the new order should consist of unmarried monks without accepting married monks. It informed its official interpretation to both sides. While married monks did not accept the interpretation but asked the government to re-interpret monkhood, unmarried monks welcomed the interpretation.<sup>373</sup> So, on March 6, the representatives of the unmarried monastic group passed a constitution and speedily attempted to organize the new order.<sup>374</sup>

On March 6, the representatives of the unmarried monastic group passed a constitution. The education department interpreted the monkhood as the celibate monks. With the strong backup from the government, they excluded married monks from the monastic order. The constitution could not be effective because of the resistance from the married monastic group. Chairman I Cheongdam of the Emergency Assembly signed and promulgated the constitution with only 11 celibate monastic representatives in attendance and without 15 married monastic representatives in attendance. Married monastic representatives questioned the validity of the promulgated constitution because only 11 celibate monastic representatives signed it and the chair promulgated it.<sup>375</sup>

They could not convene the emergency assembly meetings three times due to the government's interpretation of monkhood. If married monks accept the government's interpretation, they could not be monks anymore and could not have voting rights as monks. On March 10, the department of education officials suggested in the emergency assembly that the new order could allow voting rights for married monks after training them for a while and both sides should cooperate with each other. The government officials suggested the new order

---

<sup>372</sup> Ibid.

<sup>373</sup> See the March 6, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.339.

<sup>374</sup> See the March 1, 1962 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1337-338.

<sup>375</sup> See the March 7, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.340.



should have trained married monks for three months per year and during three – four years and let them have voting rights.

Both sides rejected their suggestion. Married monks would not accept any definition that restricts voting rights from them but considered the order's constitution promulgated only by the celibate monastic side as not being valid. Celibate monks regarded that even though married monks received the training for a certain period, they would not be monks and could not have voting rights as monks. So, they argued that they could manage the emergency assembly by themselves, excluding married monks.<sup>376</sup>

On March 12, the 15 married monastic representatives of the emergency assembly asserted that the constitution that I Cheongdam and 11 celibate monastic representatives signed and promulgated on March 6 was not valid and they reported their arguments to the chair I Cheongdam. Next day, they delivered their same arguments to the government's Department of Education as follows:

- (1) The chair of the emergency assembly should open its meeting with two third of its representatives in attendance and should pass a resolution with the favor of half of attended representatives. However, even though the chair did not get favor votes on the constitution from more than half of its representatives, he lied that all representatives supported it.
- (2) More than 16 representatives should attend and examine the constitution in the assembly meeting. The celibate monastic group argued that because 15 representatives agreed to the constitution (at the February 28, 1962 assembly meeting), he passed it. However, we could not accept the arguments of the celibate monastic group (because 15 celibate monastic representatives voted for it and 14 married monastic ones against it while one married monastic representative was absent).<sup>377</sup>

On March 13, married monks sent a notice to celibate monks that the constitution which celibate representatives passed in the emergency assembly's meeting on February 28 was invalid. In the afternoon, the department of education invited both sides and persuaded them to compromise with each other. It hinted at them that if both sides do not compromise with each other, it would use a tough stance on the issue.<sup>378</sup> On March 14, the education department issued a directive to provinces and cities and did not allow each temple within their jurisdiction to sell its property arbitrarily. The government thought that while negotiating and settling down disputes between two sides, some abbots might sell, take, and appropriate their properties.<sup>379</sup>

On March 14, the celibate monastic side of the emergency assembly issued a written refutation to the married monastic side. The celibate monastic

---

<sup>376</sup> See the March 11, 1962 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.341.

<sup>377</sup> See the March 14, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.341.

<sup>378</sup> See the March 14, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.342.

<sup>379</sup> See the March 15, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.342.

representatives argued in it that the assembly passed the constitution on February 28 and promulgated it on March 6 and that even though the married monastic representatives submitted a memorandum to the department of education, they did not accept the department's interpretation but furthermore rejected the constitution. They notified both sides that they would convene the assembly's general meeting on March 15 at 3:00 pm. They argued that if the married monastic representatives do not attend the meeting, they would declare a public statement.<sup>380</sup>

On March 15, because the married monastic representatives did not attend the general meeting convened by the unmarried monastic representatives, the general meeting was adjourned. The unmarried monastic representatives asked the married monastic representatives to have the general meeting on March 16 in the afternoon. They announced that if the married monastic representatives did not attend the general meeting again, they would consider they gave up their positions and would ask the government to appoint other 15 representatives and replace them.<sup>381</sup>

On March 19, the education department persuaded both sides to organize the new order autonomously by March 24. The government authorities told them several times that if not possible, the government would intervene in Buddhism and manage temples. Both sides attempted to compromise with each other at the individual level and did not find out the methods to settle down the deadlocked situation.<sup>382</sup>

On March 20, the Department of Education revised the rules of the order's emergency assembly. On March 21, the Department of Education intervened in the deadlock and revised the rules of the order's emergency assembly, based on which it fired 30 representatives and appointed fifteen representatives, five from each group, and the five of high reputation in society. The emergency assembly was composed of 30, evenly divided to 15 by both sides. If one side, i.e., the married monastic group, boycotted the meetings in the emergency assembly, the government could not organize the new order.<sup>383</sup>

The government urged two sides to organize the order by March 22 and announced that if they do not organize it autonomously by the day, it would intervene in, supervise and settle down it. Even though the 5 married monastic representatives do not attend official meetings held in the future, the government can enforce to convene them. On March 21, the government convened the meeting of the emergency assembly and passed the revised rules of the assembly. However, because the 5 married monastic representatives walked out on the debate when they reviewed the constitution, they could not continue the meeting.<sup>384</sup>

---

<sup>380</sup> See the March 15, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.342-343.

<sup>381</sup> See the March 16, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.343.

<sup>382</sup> See the March 19, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.343.

<sup>383</sup> See the March 22, 1962 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.344.

<sup>384</sup> See the March 22, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.344.

On March 22, the assembly held the meeting at the Education Department. Before the official conference, 15 representatives discussed the qualification criteria of monks and the voting rights. Married and unmarried monastic representatives repeated their own definition of monkhood respectively. The married monastic group boycotted the meeting and walked out of the room. Even though the government could continue the meeting, it adjourned it until to the next day.<sup>385</sup>

After the government actually nullified the order's Emergency Assembly, it initiated the new Emergency Assembly with 15 representatives. The 5 celibate monastic representatives were I Cheongdam, Bak Chudam, Yun Wolha, I Haengwon and I Neungga. The 5 married monastic representatives were I Namchae, Yun Giwon, Yun Jonggeun, Hwang Seonggi and Bak Seungnyong. The 5 celebrity representatives were Choe Munhwan (1916-1975), dean of the College of Commerce of Seoul National University; Gim Giseok, president of Danguk University; Bak Jonghong (1903-1976), dean of the Graduate School of Seoul National University; I Sang-eun (1905-1976), professor of Korea University; and Yun Taerim (1908-1991), professor of the College of Education of Seoul National University.<sup>386</sup>

On March 23, military dictator Bak Jeonghui got the explained report from the committee member Jeong Se-ung of the Supreme Council of Reconstructing a Nation on the process of the emergency assembly. He ordered the government's secretary of the department of education and the chair of the committee of society and education of the Supreme Council to actively intervene in the case and to settle down it as soon as possible.<sup>387</sup>

Next day, on March 24, military dictator Bak Jeonghui issued the 4<sup>th</sup> official statement on Buddhist disputes between two sides. He stated in it that conflicts between the two groups should be settled down as soon as possible. He recommended both sides to sacrifice their own personal interests for the higher goals. He also mentioned that regardless of married and unmarried monks, they should purify themselves in advance. He strongly asked them that they should cooperate with each other and accept the constitution that they adopted in the emergency assembly.<sup>388</sup>

Based on the strong recommendation of military ruler Bak Jeonghui, on March 25, the government strongly intervened in the case and the emergency assembly passed and promulgated the new constitution in a preamble and 116 articles. The assembly slightly revised and adopted the constitution that it passed on February 28. The revised constitution moderated the qualifications of monkhood for married monks. It stipulated the monkhood in the following three items:

---

<sup>385</sup> See the March 23, 1962 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.345.

<sup>386</sup> See the March 22, 1962 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.344.

<sup>387</sup> See the March 24, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo* S.1.1.345-346.

<sup>388</sup> See the March 25, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.346.

- (1) A monk shall be an actual resident residing in a temple without being accompanied by family members and shall dedicate himself to cultivate his mind and to propagate Buddhism to the public.
- (2) A monk shall not be responsible for supporting his family.
- (3) A monk shall not live as a secular person's daily life.<sup>389</sup>

Even though it prescribed the monkhood as above, if a married monk followed the definition of monkhood, he could get the monastic qualifications and rights without any restrictions. If not, he would be an associate monastic member and he could be appointed to various positions in Buddhist temples and organizations.<sup>390</sup>

On March 27, the Emergency Assembly for Reconstructing Buddhism hosted the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting at the conference room of the government's Department of Education.<sup>391</sup> It passed and promulgated the order's three major laws, i.e., the regulations on how to elect and recommend the order's highest patriarch, the law of the order's secretariat office, and the law of the order's central assembly. However, the 5 married monastic representatives did not attend the meeting. The laws prescribed that the highest patriarch should be more than 60 years old in his biological age and 35 years old in his monastic age and that the Secretary-General more than 45 years old in his biological age and 20 years old in his monastic age.

On March 28, the members of the emergency assembly announced a public statement in which they told that the new constitution aimed to settle down current problems in Buddhism based on the tradition and doctrine of Korean Buddhism. It also suggested monks and nuns across the nation to cultivate their minds without any problems.<sup>392</sup> The 5 married monastic representatives of the emergency assembly appealed to important figures and offices that the definition of married monks as not being monks in the constitution was not based upon the doctrine of Mahāyāna Buddhism and the considering of married monks as vestiges of Japanese imperialism was not accurate and not historical. They told that because they did not attend the emergency assembly but the assembly passed the constitution, they did not need to accept the constitution.

On April 1, all 15 representatives, including boycotting married monastic representatives, attended the emergency assembly. The emergency assembly elected I Hyobong as the order's highest patriarch and Im Seokjin as its Secretary-General. The patriarch came from the unmarried monastic group and the secretary-general from the married monastic one.<sup>393</sup> Five celebrity representatives held the casting votes. They voted for I Hyobong as the highest

---

<sup>389</sup> See the March 25, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.346.

<sup>390</sup> Ibid.

<sup>391</sup> See the March 28, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.350.

<sup>392</sup> See the March 29, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.350-351.

<sup>393</sup> See the April 2, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.351.

patriarch along with the celibate monastic representatives and for Im Seokjin as the Secretary-General with the married monastic representatives. They made a balance between two groups.<sup>394</sup>

Because celibate monastic representatives strongly insisted that they would take the positions of the highest patriarch and the Secretary-General, the emergency assembly could not continue to elect the order's key executives such as four secretary positions and inspector-general. Celibate monastic representatives claimed that Im Seokjin was not qualified for the position of the order's secretary-general.<sup>395</sup> However, because the order's secretary-general has actual power to handle the order's administration, celibate monastic representatives could not accept the election of Im Seokjin to be the order's secretary-general. While celibate monks argued that the election of Im Seokjin was backward in the movement, married monks counter-argued that it was proper.

On April 6, the assembly convened the meeting and elected the order's other six major cabinet members in an office of the government's department of education.<sup>396</sup> The order's eight major officials including the highest patriarch and the Secretary-General previously elected are as follows:<sup>397</sup>

Highest Patriarch	I Hyobong (representing celibate monks)
Secretary-General	Im Seokjin (representing married monks)
Inspector-General	Bak Munseong (representing celibate monks)
Vice Inspector-General	An Deogam (representing married monks)
Secretary of General Affairs	Yun Wolha (representing celibate monks)
Secretary of Social Affairs	I Namchae (representing married monks)
Secretary of Education	Mun Jeong-yeong (representing celibate monks)
Secretary of Finance	Bak Gijong (representing celibate monks)

On April 11, the order held an inauguration ceremony for its united administration at Jogye-sa Temple and implemented the system of 25 parish head temples. The newly elected patriarch and secretary-general were inaugurated.<sup>398</sup> Gim Sanghyeop, secretary of education, other high government officials, many distinguished guests, monks and laypersons attended the ceremony. The current Jogye Order has preserved the parish system since the establishment of the order's united administration and considered it as its historical beginning. So, the order considers I Hyobong as its 1<sup>st</sup> supreme patriarch. If so, it is logically subject to negate the order's historicity and authenticity from its official establishment in 1941 to the official inauguration of the order's united administration in 1962 for twenty one years.

<sup>394</sup> See the April 3, 1962 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.352-353.

<sup>395</sup> See the April 2, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.351-352.

<sup>396</sup> See the April 7, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.353-354.

<sup>397</sup> See the April 7, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.354.

<sup>398</sup> See the April 12, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.356.

On April 13, both sides conceded their own administrative rights to the order's united administration and on April 14, the order's united administration registered itself to the Department of Education. This made the sectarian movement for unmarried monks as being interrupted.<sup>399</sup> The new cabinet members began to run the order's administration. The government included married monks and officialized the hegemony of celibate monks in the order. Even though celibate monks developed sectarianism and attempted to remove married monks and make the established Jogye Order as a sectarian order in the movement's earlier times, they included married monks in the order's new cabinet and did not consistently continue the sectarian movement in the order's united administration.

After taking the hegemony in the order and temples since the 5<sup>th</sup> national conference for celibate monks, considered as the 1<sup>st</sup> government-recognized national conference, held on August 12, 1955, celibate monks changed their sectarian attitude and attempted to include married monks in the order as possible as they could. Unlike celibate monks, married monks changed their ecumenical attitude and attempted to partition the order in two orders representing two different groups, married and unmarried monastics. So, unmarried monks administratively included married monks in the order's united administration under their hegemony not to make them to establish a sectarian order for married monks.

Even though celibate monks developed sectarianism for themselves from the movement's early stage in the ecumenical Jogye Order, they changed their sectarian attitude upon which they obtained the order's hegemony and attempted to include married monks in the order, maintaining the order still as an ecumenical one. While married monks officially established the ecumenical Jogye Order under their hegemony in 1941 and included celibate monks in it, celibate monks established the order's ecumenical administration under their hegemony in 1962 and included married monks in it.

So, I defined the establishment of the order's united administration as the discontinuation of the sectarian movement for celibate monks and as the return to the ecumenical order. The united administration was backward, not forward, in the sectarian movement for celibate monks. Because the minority of celibate monks needed support from the majority of married monks after taking the order's hegemony in August 1955, they mitigated their sectarianism and attempted to include married monks in the order and manage the temples which they could not handle. So, they politically developed ecumenism and successfully included married monks in the order's united administration in 1962.

Unlike the celibate monks, after the loss of the order's hegemony in 1955, the majority of married monks did not advocate their ecumenism but

---

<sup>399</sup> See the April 14, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo* and the April 14, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.356.

strengthened their sectarianism. The married monks officially established and included celibate monks in the Jogye Order in 1941 and managed it under their hegemony between 1941 and 1955 for fourteen years. After the celibate monks took the hegemony in the order in 1955, married monks changed their fundamental principle from ecumenism to sectarianism and began to completely negate the ecumenical spirit of the order which they actually established and officially partition it in two orders, each of which was supposed to represent married monastics and celibate monastics respectively. They could not officially partition the Jogye Order into two, making each order represent each side but established the sectarian Taego Order for them and completed their sectarian mission in 1970.

Both sides were not continuously loyal to their fundamental principles but inconsistently advocated sectarianism and ecumenism depending on situations for their political interests. Even though the movement's fundamental principle was sectarianism for celibate monks and was to recover celibate monasticism in the order, celibate monks discontinued the sectarian movement upon successfully taking the order's hegemony. Like the celibate monks, upon the actual loss of the order's hegemony in 1955, the married monks also did not keep ecumenism which they had preserved since the official establishment of the ecumenical Jogye Order in 1941 but developed sectarianism and established a new order named Taego Order for themselves in 1970, making the established Jogye Order a sectarian order for celibate monks.

## **6. The movement's positive effects**

After celibate monks took the order's hegemony from married monks, they positively attempted to modernize the order by publicizing and making official its three major missions, (1) propagation of Buddhism, (2) translations of Buddhist texts in vernacular Korean, and (3) education of lay Buddhists and monastics. After taking the hegemony in the order and temples, while celibate monks actively participated in internal power struggles between themselves in the same order, they also attempted to modernize it in 1960's. However, before they took the order's hegemony from married monks, celibate monks concentrated their powers and energies on taking the hegemony of the order and temples.

For example, on August 13, 1966, the central assembly of the celibate monastic side hosted a symposium on the theme of the modernization of Korean Buddhism on August 11 – 13 at Jogye-sa Temple in which it passed a proposal in four items to modernize Korean Buddhism and transferred the proposal to the order's department of education and propagation for its implementation as follows:

First, the order should strictly apply two systems of grade and examination in the order's doctrinal seminaries. It should educate students based on their

own proper grade(s). It should properly introduce to the students the diversity of classes in Buddhism and in other disciplines, for example, the histories of Korean, Indian, and Chinese Buddhism, the history of philosophy, English, mathematics, and so on. It should remove the system of a lecturer who teaches all classes and of professional lecturers each of whom teaches each subject. It should establish a central monastic university and a scholarship.

Second, the order should change the translation style. Translators have generally used a lot of Chinese terms and vocabularies and translated Buddhist texts in Korean. They should make their translations faithful to the original texts and readable among common readers. The project of making and compiling the complete collection of Buddhist texts in Korean translation might need a lot of time, budget and energy. We should select and translate important texts without error and with enough time, make them readable among public readers and provide them with edification and impression. We should translate them in the mixture form of classical Chinese and vernacular Korean.

Third, the order should remove shamanistic elements and monks who specialize in the art of divination and the theory of geomancy. It should eliminate various non-Buddhist cults in a mountain god, the Dragon God, the Big Dipper, temple-protecting gods, and other gods in Korean Buddhism.

Fourth, the order should let its monks disuse their formalistic and ritualistic monastic robes and use the more informal and convenient outer coat that Korean men traditionally used to wear. They should use the lighter color than the grey color for the clothes. The order should make its monks not to use leggings. It should standardize a shoe and let its monks take yellow rubber shoes. It also should unify the hat style or should not allow monks to wear the hat.<sup>400</sup>

The order's central assembly also determined the surplice's color from a reddish brown color to a yellowish brown color and adopted the Buddhist era and flag which the WFB (World Fellowship of Buddhists) internationally standardized.

On October 15, 1966, I Hyobong, the then highest patriarch of the celibate monastic side and the 1<sup>st</sup> patriarch after the order's united administration, passed away.<sup>401</sup> On November 28, the order's central assembly convened the meeting, organized a committee for recommending the supreme patriarch to be enthroned and elected 21 members for the committee. The candidates for the patriarch should be more than 60 years old in their biological age and more than 35 years in the Dharma age and have the highest Dharma degree in the order. The assembly elected Bak Byeogan to its chair, Jo Yongmyeong and Mun Jeongyeong to its vice chairs.

On November 30, the order unanimously recommended I Cheongdam to the order's highest patriarch in its central assembly.<sup>402</sup> Jogye Order officially

---

<sup>400</sup> See August 18, 1966 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.398-399.

<sup>401</sup> See the October 24, 1966 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.400.

<sup>402</sup> See the December 1, 1966 issue of *Joseon ilbo* and the December 1, 1966 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.401-402.



considered I Hyobong as the 1<sup>st</sup> patriarch and I Cheongdam as the 2<sup>nd</sup> patriarch.<sup>403</sup> On December 31, 1966, the order hosted the inauguration ceremony for the highest patriarch I Cheongdam.

However, the then newspaper mentioned I Cheongdam as the 6<sup>th</sup> highest patriarch.<sup>404</sup> Nobody mentioned I Hyobong as the 1<sup>st</sup> highest patriarch or the 5<sup>th</sup> patriarch in the then newspapers, but I Hyobong was mentioned just as the patriarch of the order's united administration at the time. The fact that he was considered the 6<sup>th</sup> highest patriarch proved that the celibate monastic group began to make the lineage of highest patriarchs from the movement's beginning. The lineage verified the strong sectarian spirit of the celibate monastics. We should examine when the Jogye Order officiated the lineage of highest patriarchs continued from the establishment of the order's united administration on April 11, 1962.

The patriarchs are the 1<sup>st</sup> patriarch Ha Dongsan (November 3, 1954 – August 12, 1955), the 2<sup>nd</sup> patriarch Seol Seogu (August 12, 1955 – February 5, 1958), the 3<sup>rd</sup> patriarch I Hyobong (April 1958- August 13, 1958), the 4<sup>th</sup> patriarch Ha Dongsan (August 13, 1958 – April 11, 1962), the 5<sup>th</sup> patriarch I Hyobong (April 11, 1962 – October 24, 1966) and the 6<sup>th</sup> patriarch I Cheongdam (November 30, 1966 – July 26, 1967).

On April 1, 1967, the celibate monastic Jogye Order held a meeting for temple abbots and lay representatives affiliated with the order's Seoul and Gyeonggi Provincial Districts and disregarded the declaration of the married monastic side's Jogye Order.<sup>405</sup> They resolved to continue the drive for uniting and harmonizing two groups. It decided to host the national conference for lay Buddhists at Jangchung Gymnasium to back up the uniting and harmonizing movement.

It also determined to make the Buddha's birthday a national holiday and to legalize the system of Buddhist military chaplains. Buddhists began to decolonize discriminate measures imposed by the US military government and its puppet I Seungman regime. The movement was initiated to decolonize Japanese Buddhist influence to Korean Buddhism. When Korean Buddhists almost completed the movement, they moved towards deconstructing discriminated policies against Buddhism by the US military government and its puppet Christian I Seungman regime.

During the three years between 1945 and 1948, the US military government discriminated against Buddhism and traditional religions in favor of their own religion, Christianity.<sup>406</sup> In October 1945, the Christianity-oriented US military

---

<sup>403</sup> See the entry “Daehan bulgyo Jogye-jong” (Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism), in *Chongnam*, 205-208.

<sup>404</sup> See the December 1, 1966 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.402.

<sup>405</sup> See the April 1, 1967 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.411.

<sup>406</sup> See the Education Board of Korean Buddhist Jogye Order, ed., *Jogye jongsae: Geun-hyeondae pyeon* (The History of Korean Buddhist Jogye Order: Modern and Present Periods) (Seoul: Jogye-jong chulpan-sa, 2001), 172-174.

government abolished national holidays that Japan had included during its occupation period, recognizing only Christmas as a national holiday and even excluding the Buddha's birthday.<sup>407</sup> The pro-US and Christianity I Seungman regime established the military chaplain system for only Christianity, including its two major traditions, Protestantism and Catholicism, which was made under the US military's strong influence in 1951 during the Korean War, 1950-1953.

On May 25, both groups hosted the conferences for Buddhist representatives respectively.<sup>408</sup> The celibate monastic side held the national conference for Buddhists to which around more than 2,600 temple abbots and lay association presidents and other organization representatives participated. It passed resolutions as follows:

- (1) Buddhists should remove superstitious shrines, the Big Dipper Shrine and the Mountain God Shrine in temples, associated to Daoism, not directly related to Buddhism.
- (2) They should not offer incenses, flowers, teas, cookies, rice and others in front of Buddhist images, but modernize the offering rites.
- (3) They should modernize the monastic robes, for example, they should allow monks to wear the synthetic fiber monastic robes.
- (4) They should endeavor to make the Buddha's birthday as a national holiday.
- (5) They should establish a modernized monastic university for monks to study social sciences and a Buddhist Assembly Hall for lay Buddhists to get educated in Buddhism.
- (6) They should cause the government not to discriminate Buddhism but to accept and appoint Buddhist military chaplains in the Korean army.
- (7) They should organize a Korean Buddhist nongovernment peace corps, dispatch it to Vietnam stricken with war, and help Vietnamese Buddhists.
- (8) They should emphasize the translation of Buddhist texts in the vernacular Korean language and should make the masses to access Buddhism easily.
- (9) They should edit and publish the history of the Jogye Order and the order's textbooks.
- (10) They should establish a radio station and let Buddhism popularized.
- (11) They should strengthen lay Buddhist organizations. They should have regular service(s) more than one time per week in order to educate lay Buddhists properly. They should enlarge the number of propagation centers.<sup>409</sup>

The celibate monastic group constructively changed its concern direction from the internal conflicts to the external issues in the national conference. The group dedicated its energy to return from Japanized married monasticism to traditional celibate monasticism. Even though the slogan seemed like very

---

<sup>407</sup> Ibid, 172.

<sup>408</sup> See the May 25, 1967 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, the May 25, 1967 issue of *Dong-a ilbo* and the May 25, 1967 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.411-412.

<sup>409</sup> I itemized the resolutions by referring to the above-cited two articles, i.e., the May 25, 1967 issue of *Joseon ilbo* and the May 25, 1967 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*.

plausible, the group adopted various non-Buddhist methods to accomplish its goal. After the movement was nearly completed, celibate monks needed to newly devise and systematize its new goals. The celibate monks categorized their new goals in three, (1) propagation of Buddhism, (2) text translations, and (3) education of lay Buddhists and monastics. They declared they should modernize Korean Buddhism and participate in social issues actively.

On July 26, 1967, the central assembly accepted the resignations of the order's highest patriarch I Cheongdam and its secretary-general Son Gyeongsan and elected Yun Goam as the order's highest patriarch and Bak Gijong as its Secretary-General. Yun Goam was the director of Yongtap Seon Center, affiliated with Haein-sa Temple and Bak Gijong was the abbot of the same temple.<sup>410</sup> It recommended I Cheongdam to the chair of the Council of Senior Monks and Son Gyeongsan to the chair of the Committee of Legal Principles. I Cheongdam was retired to Doseon-sa Temple in the vicinity of Seoul and Son Gyeongsan to Jeokjo-am Hermitage in Donam-dong, Seoul.

In an interview with the daily newspaper reporter Gim Gyeong-ik,<sup>411</sup> Yun Goam would enforce the order's three major projects, i.e., education of monks, propagation of Buddhism, and translation of Buddhist texts in Korean after clearing off the debts. He highly respected Wonhyo of the Silla Dynasty (traditionally dated, 57 BCE – 936 CE), Jinul of the Goryeo Dynasty (918-1392) and Hyujeong (1520-1604) of the Joseon Dynasty. He got a strong influence from the *Diamond Sūtra*, particularly from its famous sentence, "All forms are empty. If we understand the formlessness of all forms, we can understand the Buddha." He anticipated lay Buddhists to be interested in the order's projects and planned to frequently talk with the married monastic group on various topics. He emphasized the harmony in Buddhism.

The reporter Gim Gyeong-ik also reported the newly appointed Secretary-General Bak Gijong.<sup>412</sup> Bak Gijong, generally known as Bak Yeong-am, was born in Susan Village, Geumnam Town, Uljin County, North Gyeongsang Province. In 1924, at his age of 19, he became a monk under Ju Cheongdam at Tongdo-sa Temple and Gim Guha ordained him as a vinaya preceptor. Later, he went to Woljeong-sa Temple in Dongsan Village, Jinbu Town, Pyeongchang County, Gangwon Province and learned how to manage temple economy and property under I Jong-uk (1884-1969). He finished the highest level of Great Learning at the monastic seminary affiliated with Tongdo-sa Temple. In April 1933, he received the full ordination and the Bodhisattva Precepts from Bang Hanam at Woljeong-sa Temple.

In 1933, he became the abbot of Bulyeong-sa Temple on Mt. Cheonchuk in Uljin County, North Gyeongsang Province. In 1941, he obtained the great master rank. During the time, he negotiated with officials of the Japanese

---

<sup>410</sup> See the July 27, 1967 issue of *Dong-a ilbo* and the July 27, 1967 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.415.

<sup>411</sup> See the August 8, 1967 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.418-419.

<sup>412</sup> Ibid.

Government-General as the temple's secretary of general affairs and protected the forest of Woljeong-sa Temple from the persons who deforested the temple's mountains. In 1955, he became the finance secretary of the order of unmarried monastic side during the movement and in 1962, again the finance secretary of the order's united administration. In 1960, he became the abbot of Haein-sa Temple and normalized the temple's finance.

According to the interview article,<sup>413</sup> he had successfully managed a long legal procedure and finally won a legal case on farm lands belonged to temples across the nation at the Supreme Court under the President I Seungman regime (1948-1960). Bak Gijong had served for Buddhism as an administrator and a manager for a long time. He was confident to solve the order's huge debts. He thought that by simplifying the order's central administration and strengthening its provincial administration, he could reduce its expenditure and clear off the debts. The reporter concluded that even though Yun Goam and Bak Gijong did not get modern education, they could successfully manage and solve the then problem. He also anticipated that both leaders could cooperate with each other because they had lived in the same temple for almost ten years.

On September 20, 1967, the highest patriarch Yun Goam announced that the order would establish a praxis complex at Haein-sa Temple at which it should educate monks and elevate their quality.<sup>414</sup> In the tedious and long disputes between married and celibate monastic groups, many unqualified monks were admitted to the monkhood and furthermore, the order did not well educate them. The public generally considered monks as unqualified and unable ones. According to his proposal, the monks should attend two regular intensive retreats per year, summer and winter intensive retreats. Each retreat continues for 3 months. Except the two regular retreats, they could attend irregular retreats in various Seon centers. However, because the order did not systematically manage the practitioners, it did not know where, when and how long they practice Seon under whose master. Yun Goam suggested the order to reform the order's monastic education system. He argued that the order should strictly execute compulsory education for newly ordained monks at least for three years after the establishment of the praxis complex. He asserted that Haein-sa Temple should be the order's center even though its Secretariat Office should of course process the basic administrative affairs. He strongly hoped that after constructing a building, the order should initiate the praxis complex.

The order's central assembly hosted the 13<sup>th</sup> regular session for three days, December 15-17, 1967, which more than 50 representatives attended.<sup>415</sup> It reexamined the order's three major projects, (1) the translation of Buddhist texts in Korean, (2) the propagation of Buddhism to the masses and (3) the education of monks and determined that it should operate the mission tour group across the

---

<sup>413</sup> Ibid.

<sup>414</sup> See the October 4, 1967 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.419.

<sup>415</sup> Ibid.

nation and assign funds for educating around 40 selected monks each year. It appointed expert advisors to change the color of monastic robes from the traditional grey color to the yellow color. It assigned them to examine whether the order should change the color to the yellow one of the robes that the Buddha presumably wore.

On January 24, 1969, Hong Jongcheol (1924-1974), the government's secretary of education, invited the Buddhist leaders of the celibate monastic Jogye Order.<sup>416</sup> Those invited leaders were I Cheongdam, chair of the Council of Senior Monks; Bak Gijong, Secretary-General; Gim Seoun, inspector general; Bak Byeogan, speaker of the central assembly; and Gim Palbong, president of the order's lay Buddhist association. They discussed the following three agendas: (1) the promotion of Buddhist purification, (2) the protection of cultural properties in temples, and (3) the purification of privatized temples and pseudo-Buddhist organizations.

On March 12 – 13, the order convened the meeting for the abbots of 25 parish head temples at the auditorium of its Secretariat Head Office.<sup>417</sup> It hosted the meeting one and half a year after September 1967. 24 parish abbots attended it in which they discussed several issues under the conference topic, "Modernization of Korean Buddhism." The resolutions were subject to submit to the central assembly meeting in May 1969. The March 19, 1969 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun* detailed the resolutions as follows:

- (1) The order shall establish a Buddhist Hall. It shall construct a modern seventeen-storied gigantic building having the total floor space of 8,500 *pyeong* at Jogye-sa Temple, the order's head temple with the budget of six hundred million Korean dollars. It shall start the construction in August 1969 and complete it by March 1971. 15,000 monastics and 6 million lay Buddhists should attend the project and it could secure three hundred million Korean dollars, half of the anticipated budget, from selling the temple properties and another three hundred million Korean dollars, another half portion of the budget from donations of lay Buddhists. During the construction period, the order's Secretariat Head Office should extensively conduct a campaign for the fundraising drive. If the hall is established, the order can arrange the shrines, the order's official newspaper offices, its publishing offices, its research offices, a conference room, an auditorium, a museum, a gallery, a library, a translation center, a Seon center, and others.
- (2) It shall revise the order's Law of Education. It shall also revise the detailed rules of its Law of the Establishment of Education Institutions, reform its educational system and establish its Central Institute for Education.
- (3) It shall reform the monastic robes. It shall standardize hats, ritual robes, shoes, and others.
- (4) It shall train its missionaries, develop its official magazines, publish its history and its basic textbook, and translate Buddhist texts in Korean. And

<sup>416</sup> See the January 24, 1969 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.431.

<sup>417</sup> See the March 15, 1969 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.431-432.

it shall propagate Buddhism among the masses and revitalize Buddhism. It shall allot 56 million won for editing and publishing the order's basic textbook. It shall publish its 5,000 copies by the end of November 1969.

- (5) It shall revise the Law of Monkhood and the Law of Monastic Ordination and improve the quality of monastics. It shall increase the age limit from 16 years old to 25 years old and the education requirement from the junior high school graduation to the high school one for the novice monk candidates. It also shall increase the age limit from 20 years old to 30 years old and the education requirement from the high school graduation to the university graduation.
- (6) It shall revise the Law of Lay Buddhist Organizations. It shall let them help the order's key projects, prohibit untrustworthy organizations from being established and support stable organizations.
- (7) It shall propel unregistered temples to register them to the order. In the disputes between married and celibate monks, many temples did not register them to the order. The order shall get registration application from the unregistered temples by May 1969 and take registration completed by June 1969.
- (8) Except registered temples, there were over the privately-established-and-owned 1,000 temples across the nation. The order shall allow the temples having a floor space of over 30 *pyeong* in all and a plot of land of over 90 *pyeong* to be registered. It shall strictly regulate the temples unqualified for registration during two months, July and August.
- (9) In March, the order shall investigate all privately-owned temples exercising pseudo-Buddhist activities such as the reading of human faces, the distribution of amulets, the deciphering of land secrets and others prevailed in each parish and in April, it shall guide them to follow proper Buddhist teachings and rituals. If they do not follow its directions, 13 Buddhist sects should cooperate with each other, organize the Advisory Committee for Removing Superstitions, and let the committee check the temples and make them not to conduct improper Buddhist activities for two months, July and August.
- (10) It shall organize a society for supporting social service and let various lay Buddhist organizations of various sects work for the public good all the year round.
- (11) It shall exchange culture at the international level. In order to propagate Korean Buddhism to foreign nations, the order shall publish and distribute the 5,000 copies of the order's propagation pamphlet through its oversea offices in Japan by May. The order's established propagation center in Japan shall secure a land of 6,000 *pyeong* in the Prefecture of Shizuoka in which it should start to construct a main hall from this September by using 100,000,000 won of the government subsidy and 100,000,000 won of the donation from lay Buddhists. It shall dispatch an examination team to investigate and take over the relics of Koreans scattered in temples across the Japan from May and let it work for the mission for six months. It shall send Korean Buddhist representatives to the 9<sup>th</sup> WFB general conference held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, beginning from April 12.

- (12) It shall strengthen the Academy of Buddhist Culture and Arts and purify the life of the masses. It shall establish Buddhist Radio Station and positively propagate Buddhism.
- (13) It shall establish the preparatory committee for founding Buddhist Radio Station by July, hold the groundbreaking ceremony by September, and complete the construction.
- (14) It shall directly manage and repair Buddhist cultural properties in cooperation with the government's bureau of the management of cultural properties from next year even though it has been relying on the government administrative organizations.
- (15) Based on the government's nationwide investigation on the actual conditions of temples, it shall repair main halls, monastic residential quarters, and annexed buildings.
- (16) It shall investigate temple farmlands, compare them with the temple land register, and retrieve the lands improperly occupied by the government or other persons by February 1970. It shall assign the budget of 2,000,000 won and employ 3,000 persons.<sup>418</sup>

On December 2, 1969, the Jogye Order comprehensive plan detailed some measures for purifying Buddhism as follows:<sup>419</sup> (1) The order shall strongly enforce unregistered temples to register to the order and complete the registration by August 1970. (2) It shall examine more than 1,000 private-owned temples across the nation and allow the temples of having over a floor space of 30 *pyeong* and a ground space of 90 *pyeong* to be registered to it. (3) It shall investigate by March 1970 the private-owned temples that activated quasi-Buddhist ritual, organize an advisory committee with the thirteen sects, and sweep away superstitious religious activities.

In the session, they discussed the establishment of a Buddhist radio station and decided to prepare to open it concurrently along with the foundation of a Buddhist hall. Regarding the monastic robes, they decided to adopt the system of two seasonal robes for summer and winter. They also determined to standardize the ritual robes, hats, shoes and others. They resolved that of the total budget 600,000,000 won for establishing a Buddhist hall, they would fund-raise the half of them among lay Buddhists and secure half of them from selling the temple properties. The order shall start the construction of the hall in May 1970. It shall construct it on the ground of 600 *pyeong* and would be two floors in underground and 15 floors in ground. The order shall construct a building for a Buddhist museum from April 1970. It shall examine Buddhist cultures and arts across the nation from August 1970 and suggest how to develop new forms of them in the future.

---

<sup>418</sup> See the March 19, 1969 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.432-433.

<sup>419</sup> Ibid.

## 7. The movement's counter-effects

### 7.1. The celibate monastic side: Conflicts between celibate monks

After celibate monks obtained the order's hegemony from married monks, they began to fight against each other in order to take the hegemony of the order and temples among themselves in the same order. They negatively developed the conflicts between themselves in the Jogye Order in 1960's and after married monks separated themselves from the order and established a new order named Taego Order in 1970, celibate monks were completely engaged in internal fights and struggles in the same order among themselves since 1970's. Even though celibate monks initiated the Purification Buddhist Movement with the strong support of the government and successfully obtained the order's hegemony, they were not better than married monks who had the order's hegemony and managed the order before them.

In 1967, the highest patriarch I Cheongdam and the Secretary-General Son Gyeongsan fought against each other on the administration of the order and the management of Dongguk University, the order's mission university. On July 25, the order's both highest leaders submitted resignation letters to its central assembly's extraordinary session held in Haein-sa Temple, presumably the largest temple in Korea.<sup>420</sup> In the extraordinary session, when the Secretary-General Son Gyeongsan reported the management of Dongguk University as the chairman of its Board of Directors, some assemblymen, followers of I Cheongdam, claimed that he unreasonably fell into debt of 43 million Korean dollars.

I Cheongdam, a radical reformist, and Son Gyeongsan, a moderate reformist, had worked together to complete the movement. When both leaders initiated their tenures, they cooperated with each other to reconstruct degenerate Korean Buddhism and concretely proposed the following three grand-scale projects, (1) setting up a huge Buddhist center in downtown Seoul, (2) establishing a praxis complex, and (3) opening a monastic university. They also planned to establish (1) a bank, (2) a daily newspaper, (3) a radio station, (4) a foundry, (5) a perfume-manufacturing company, (6) a paper mill, (7) a department store, and others.<sup>421</sup>

To secure the finances for the grand-scale projects, first, I Cheongdam proposed the order to develop and chop down around 80,000 hectares of temple forests across the nation. He could not implement his proposal because of strong opposition from the government, which recommended the citizens to afforest mountains and to plant trees on them. Second, he suggested Buddhists to

<sup>420</sup> See the July 27, 1967 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.415.

<sup>421</sup> See the August 3, 1967 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.416-418.



construct cable cars between temples connecting mountains in Seoul and near Seoul. He got strong oppositions from Buddhist monks because they argued that his proposal was against monastic disciplines. Third, he proposed the order to organize and systematize 5 millions of Buddhists across the nation. He did not succeed in organizing the national lay Buddhist organization. Rather, some lay leaders cheated him and tried to utilize him for their personal interests and benefits.<sup>422</sup>

Like I Cheongdam, Son Gyeongsan also tried to the best to secure the finances to implement the projects. Son Gyeongsan also served as the chair of the Board of Directors of Dongguk University, a mission university. He invested the order's money and lost more than 40 million Korean dollars. I Cheongdam and his followers attacked Son Gyeongsan and his staff for the failure. Son Gyeongsan asked the assembly representatives in the order's central assembly to give him a time to compensate the order for the lost huge amount of money. However, they did not trust in Son Gyeongsan's sayings but impeached him for his lost money.<sup>423</sup>

On October 18 and 24, 1968, the order dispatched Gim Neunggak, the manager of the inspection department, and his subordinates to Bulguk-sa Temple in the City of Gyeongju, North Gyeongsang Province to examine the temple's audit statements.<sup>424</sup> The order got information on the temple's unjust disbursement for a painting work. On October 25, Chae Byeogam, abbot of the temple, declined the inspection and filed to the police a formal complaint that they used violence. On October 31, while the order called Chae Byeogam to Seoul, Gim Neunggak and 28 members of his department occupied the temple and took over the temple's business.<sup>425</sup> On November 7, Gim Neunggak in cooperation with around 40 monks of neighboring temples near Bulguk-sa Temple forced Chae Byeogam, the temple's abbot and I Hyujeong, the temple's secretary of general affairs, to be disrobed and to wear lay clothes and completely controlled the temple.<sup>426</sup>

Gim Neunggak could investigate and report their suspicion to the order's head office, but he was not empowered to occupy the temple.<sup>427</sup> Young monks of the temples under the parish jurisdiction of Bulguk-sa Temple humiliated Chae Byeogam. Bulguk-sa Temple was one of 25 parish head temples and supervised more than 40 temples in six counties along the coastal side of North Gyeongsang Province.<sup>428</sup> Because Bulguk-sa Temple was the famous tourist temple, many tourists visited the temple at which they paid for an entrance fee and donated some amount of money. The temple was reputed to a rich temple.

---

<sup>422</sup> Ibid.

<sup>423</sup> Ibid.

<sup>424</sup> See the October 27, 1968 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.421.

<sup>425</sup> See the November 1, 1968 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.421.

<sup>426</sup> See the November 8, 1968 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.421-422.

<sup>427</sup> See the November 8, 1968 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.422.

<sup>428</sup> See the November 8, 1968 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.422-424.

Even if Chae Byeogam had had a good reputation in managing the temple's finance since he was appointed as its abbot in May 1965, his disciple Ha Gisang, the temple's secretary of finance, was suspected to have a wife and children in downtown Pohang and to run a money lending business.<sup>429</sup>

During October 28 – 30, 1968, the City of Gyeongju inspected the temple's audit statements and found out that the temple unjustly paid 619,000 Korean dollars for painting work as part of a total payment of 5,064,630 Korean dollars. The city was searching for Ha Gisang, the temple's secretary of finance for the case.<sup>430</sup> On November 14, 19 monks led by I Hyujeong, the temple's former secretary of general affairs, returned to the temple and occupied and controlled it with violence. However, when I Daeui, the newly appointed abbot, arrived in Gyeongju on November 15 along with his newly appointed staff Im Domun (b. 1935), secretary of general affairs and Im Jongseon, secretary of finance, he could not get into the temple.<sup>431</sup>

On November 18, the Gyeongju Police Station dispatched the police to Seoul to serve a warrant on five monks, including Gim Neunggak, Hong Daeyong and Yun Gihong, on a charge of violence.<sup>432</sup> They used violence to take Bulguk-sa Temple and to kick out the temple's abbot Chae Byeogam and his monastic followers.

On November 18, angered by the Bulguk-sa Temple's case, the Association of Lay Buddhist Organizations hosted a conference for protecting Korean Buddhism at Jogye-sa Temple, the order's head temple and asked the monks to remove their deep-rooted unethical behaviors and to recover the proper monastic ethics and principles. The conference attendants defined Korean Buddhism as a historic Buddhism of Korea that we Korean Buddhists should inherit and deplored the then Buddhist order as losing its trust among the masses.<sup>433</sup> They claimed that both sides, current Bulguk-sa Temple resident monks and other monks who want to take the temple, fought against each other to get the hegemony of the rich temple.<sup>434</sup> When the disputes between married and celibate monks were almost finished, other disputes between celibate monks over the management of temples began to emerge at the different level.

On November 19, the order's central assembly convened a meeting in which it made Chae Byeogam to resign the abbotship, forwarded 5 inspectors who used violence to the order's Disciplinary Committee and let them immediately resign their posts.<sup>435</sup> So Gusan resigned the position of Inspector General and Im Domun the directorship of the Bureau of Inspection. Even Bak

---

<sup>429</sup> Ibid.

<sup>430</sup> See the November 9, 1968 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.424.

<sup>431</sup> See the November 17, 1968 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.424.

<sup>432</sup> See the November 19, 1968 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.427.

<sup>433</sup> See the November 18, 1968 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.425 and the November 19, 1968 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.425-427.

<sup>434</sup> See the November 19, 1968 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.425-427.

<sup>435</sup> See the November 20, 1968 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.428-429.

Gijong, the order's highest administer, resigned the post of Secretary-General. On November 20, the central assembly declined to accept the resignation of Bak Gijong, Secretary-General. It newly elected Gim Seoun, former chair of the Board of Directors of Dongguk University, as Inspector General.<sup>436</sup>

The major national newspaper *Joseon ilbo* criticized the celibate monastic Jogye Order's irresponsible measures on the Bulguk-sa Temple case in its article.<sup>437</sup> Even though the case triggered problems and criticisms in the society in general and in Buddhism in particular, nobody was responsible for it. For example, even though Secretary-General Bak Gijong submitted a resignation letter to the order's central assembly, the order did not hold him responsible at all. Even though the Association of Lay Buddhist Organizations hosted the conference and publicly criticized the case, it complimented how great Chae Byeogam, abbot of Bulguk-sa Temple, was. The order, furthermore, appointed Chae Byeogam to the director of the Center for Seon Studies higher and more important than the abbot position of Bulguk-sa Temple. The center was the political and spiritual center for the movement and the spiritual home for celibate monks since its establishment in 1920 under the Japanese occupation period, 1910-1945 just after the March 1 Movement of 1919 for independence. More than 10 temples affiliated themselves with the center across the nation. The ex-director I Beomhaeng (b. 1921) became the abbot of Bulguk-sa Temple.

On August 12, 1969, I Cheongdam, current chair of the Council of Elder Monks, announced a manifesto in which he asserted that he could not endure the slow and tedious process of the movement and he should break away from the celibate monastic Jogye Order and resign from all posts that he had in the order.<sup>438</sup> He argued that the then order was nerveless and incompetent. Even though he was an architect of the movement, he clearly proved himself through his manifesto that the movement was not successful. He promised that he would not affiliate with the order and dedicate himself to recover the Korean Buddhist tradition outside the order by communicating with intellectuals and scholars.

He was disappointed that the assembly representatives did not consider seriously his proposal for reconstructing the Jogye Order<sup>439</sup> in the 20<sup>th</sup> session of the order's central assembly meeting held on July 5 - 7.<sup>440</sup> He stressed in the session the order's three major projects, (1) the modernization of monastic education, (2) the modernization of translation, and (3) the modernization of propagation, and submitted the detailed proposals for the projects to the central

<sup>436</sup> See the November 21, 1968 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.430.

<sup>437</sup> See the December 15, 1968 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.430-431.

<sup>438</sup> See the August 12, 1969 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.435.

<sup>439</sup> Gim Gwangsik detailed I Cheongdam's proposal in his article "I Cheongdam gwa yusin jaegeon-an yeongu" (I Cheongdam and his Proposal for Reconstructing Jogye Order) in his *Saebulgyo undong ui jeon-gae* (The Development of New Movements in Korean Buddhism in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century) (Anseong: Dopiansa Temple Press, 2002), 429-459.

<sup>440</sup> See the August 13, 1969 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.436.

assembly. He suggested the order (1) to ordain monks at least graduated from universities, (2) to translate easily classical Chinese Buddhist texts in Korean and let Buddhists access to them, and (3) to change the passive propagation policy and actively engage in propagation.

He diagnosed that the current order's founder, fundamental tenets and lineage became confused and suggested in the session for three days begun on July 5 that the order should organize the supreme council including monastic and married monks and let the highest patriarch lead its administration. He argued that even though the order initiated the order's united administration in 1962, married monks walked out from the umbrella of the order's united administration and tried to establish their own order. He suggested the order to engage married monks under the same umbrella and to extend the order's united administration. He strongly contended that monks should not rely on moneys but on mind cultivation.<sup>441</sup>

In the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> session, held on July 5-7, Bak Gijong, Secretary-General, submitted his resignation to the assembly when some representatives criticized him that he did not manage the order very well. The majority of representatives considered that even though I Cheongdam and his followers submitted a proposal for reconstructing the Jogye Order, they wanted to take the current order's power. The assembly ignored I Cheongdam's proposal and did not accept Bak Gijong's resignation.<sup>442</sup>

The order regarded the proposal as being unrealistic. It recognized that I Cheongdam hid his intention in the proposal and actually intended to take back the order's power.<sup>443</sup> Bak Gijong's administration lowly evaluated I Cheongdam's ability to manage the order, saying that even though I Cheongdam had served as the order's Secretary-General and its assembly speaker twice respectively and as its chair of the Council of Elder Monks once, he did not manage the order very well. I Cheongdam's followers defended that even though I Cheongdam had a moral responsibility on the order's management, he did not engage in unjust corruptions.

Korean monks reacted upon I Cheongdam's membership withdrawal from the order in the four different directions as follows:<sup>444</sup> (1) Some acclaimed I Cheongdam's determination that withdrew from his affiliation to the incompetent order. (2) Some considered his action as an expression of alienated feelings. (3) Some was indifferent to his action, considering it as an individual freedom. (4) Some expected a new order for his followers.

On August 23, sympathizers of I Cheongdam, mostly affiliated with the Center for Seon Studies, decided to convene the national conference for celibate monks on September 1.<sup>445</sup> 44 leading monks such as Chae Byeogam, director of

<sup>441</sup> See the August 13, 1969 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.438-439.

<sup>442</sup> See the August 13, 1969 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.436-438.

<sup>443</sup> Ibid.

<sup>444</sup> See the August 24, 1969 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.440-442.

<sup>445</sup> See the August 23, 1969 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.439-440.

the Center for Seon Studies; I Unheo, director of the Institute of Translation affiliate with Dongguk University; Seo Gyeongbo, dean of the College of Buddhist Studies at Dongguk University; Gim Iryeop (1896-1971), famous nun essayist; and others proposed to host the conference with the following three agendas.<sup>446</sup> (1) They shall hear the details why I Cheongdam withdrew from the order. (2) They shall discuss how to solve the problem. (3) They shall reexamine the movement.

The order's authorities defined that they did not convene the national conference based on its constitution and laws and announced the conference should be illegal and invalid.<sup>447</sup> They sent an official notice to all temples across the nation and requested monks not to attend the conference. Later, they convened the conference for the order's monastic leaders on August 26 and the meeting for 25 abbots of the parish temples on August 30. They defended themselves from attacks of I Cheongdam and his followers.

In 1954, celibate monks initiated the movement to take the order's hegemony from married monks. They made a self-defined (holy) slogan, i.e., the recovery of traditional Korean Buddhist celibate monasticism from Japanized married monasticism, heavily relying on nationalistic sentiment. However, the movement was converted to another phase for now. Celibate monks began to make their own factions and competed with each other to get the order's hegemony among them.

The different groups of celibate monks united to take the order's hegemony from married monks in the movement's beginning. After taking back the order's hegemony from married monks, they began to align themselves based on their own Dharma lineages and political interests. Celibate monks belonged to two major Dharma lineages cooperated with each other to accomplish their common objective, i.e., to recover Korean Buddhism's celibate monasticism and to take the order's hegemony from married monks. The two major Dharma lineages were the lineage originated from Baek Yongseong, also known as the Beomeo-sa Temple faction and the lineage from Song Mangong, also known as the Sudeok-sa Temple faction. Baek Yongseong originally affiliated himself to Beomeo-sa Temple. During the movement, his disciples were appointed as the abbots of many parish temples, so his disciples and grand disciples resided in the temples. The monks of Baek Yongseong's Dharma lineage naturally controlled those parish temples and their respective branch temples. Song Mangong was active at Sudeok-sa Temple. His disciples were also appointed as the abbots of many parish temples, so his disciples and grand disciples resided in the temples. The monks of Song Mangong's Dharma lineage could automatically influence those parish temples and their respective branch temples. The majority of celibate Korean Buddhist monks belonged to either of two lineage groups. And

---

<sup>446</sup> See the August 24, 1969 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.440-442.

<sup>447</sup> Ibid, 440.

there were some minor Dharma lineage groups in the celibate monastic Jogye Order.

The most members of the order's ruling camp belonged to Baek Yongseong's Dharma lineage. However, even though the monks of Song Mangong's Dharma lineage initiated the movement based on the Center for Korean Studies in 1954 and took the order's hegemony from married monks, after the power struggle with Secretary-General Song Gyeongsan in 1967, I Cheongdam and monks of Song Mangong's Dharma lineage lost their leadership in the order. Yun Goam, the order's highest patriarch and Bak Gijong, its Secretary-General, assumed their positions in 1967 after I Cheongdam, the order's former patriarch and Son Gyeongsan, the order's former Secretary-General, stepped down from their posts. Yun Goam and Bak Gijong and the cabinet members were not the monks belonged to Song Manam's Dharma lineage. Both sides crashed against each other to take the order's leadership. The ruling group represented Baek Yongseong's lineage and the opposition group Song Mangong's lineage. Other minor monastic factions sided with either of two.

The order's ruling group also counter-argued against I Cheongdam's arguments and asserted that the order's three major projects were successfully implemented.<sup>448</sup> For example, on the order's translation project, the Institute of Translation affiliated with Dongguk University was translating Buddhist texts in Korean and publishing a series of the translated texts under the Hangeul Tripiṭaka. On its education project, the order already established a praxis complex at Haein-sa Temple and Songgwang-sa Temple respectively, educated monks at Dongguk University and sent some monks to Japan to get education. On its propagation project, the order organized clubs at 69 universities for Buddhist students, dispatched Buddhist military chaplains and was constructing a Buddhist hall. O Beoban (1932-2007), the order's secretary of education, asserted that the order did not effectively implement the three projects because it needed to fight legally against the married monastic order very seriously and to repair dilapidated temples.

Someone critiqued I Cheongdam's withdrawal as being irresponsible.<sup>449</sup> They argued that as an actual architect of the movement who served the major posts in the order, he should have been responsible for the side effects of the movement by himself and he should try to settle down the problems in the order. Some defended I Cheongdam and contended that the order made him to act in an extreme way. They very seriously diagnosed the then order's situation.

On July 3, 1969, dictator and president Bak Jeonghui, strong supporter to the movement, announced in the form of an informal talk that he would ask all citizens to vote for the revision of the constitution and allow him to run for his

---

<sup>448</sup> Ibid, 441.

<sup>449</sup> Ibid.

3<sup>rd</sup> four-year term of president.<sup>450</sup> The opposition leaders and progressive students demonstrated against him on street everyday. However, on July 31, I Cheongdam publicly issued a positive statement on Bak Jeonghui's proposal for the revision of the constitution.<sup>451</sup> He utilized a strong and personal relationship with the dictator for his personal and celibate monastic order's interests. According to the August 26, 1969 issue of a national daily newspaper *Dong-a ilbo*, the celibate monastic Jogye Order also announced a supportive statement for the revision of the constitution around one week earlier than the newspaper's issue date.<sup>452</sup>

On August 26, Bak Gijong, Secretary-General, expressed his intention to resign his post in a meeting for the order's 24 monastic leaders in which they discussed how to solve out the current problems.<sup>453</sup> Upon the criticisms of some pro-I Cheongdam monks in the meeting, he responded that he would take a responsibility for I Cheongdam's withdrawal from the order and resign to help the order to settle down the power struggle. On August 27, the order's leaders passed a resolution in their meeting that they would not accept his resignation and request the meeting of 25 abbots of parish head temples scheduled on August 30 to approve their resolution.<sup>454</sup>

On August 30, the order's central assembly and the association of 25 abbots of parish head temples hosted the joint meeting in which 51 monks participated. There were three factions in the order's central assembly, the order's ruling faction, the order's opposition faction, and the faction of married monks deviated from the married monastic side's Jogye Order to the celibate monastic Jogye Order. On August 31, the order's central assembly convened a meeting and passed a resolution that I Cheongdam should be returned to the order and should be re-recommended to the Chair of the Council of Elder Monks.

On September 1, the order accepted the resignations of its Secretary-General Bak Gijong's administration's cabinet members and appointed Choe Wolsan to its Secretary-General, Gim Gyeong-u to its secretary of general affairs, Go Gwangdeok (1927-1999) to its secretary of education, Yun Giwon to its secretary of finance, and Choe Wonjong to its secretary of social affairs.<sup>455</sup> Choe Wolsan was abbot of Bulguk-sa Temple, Gim Gyeong-u abbot of Daegak-sa Temple in Busan, Go Gwangdeok resident monk of Daegak-sa Temple in

---

<sup>450</sup> In January 1969, the ruling party publicly declared that the party officially examined the revision of the constitution to allow President Bak Jeonghui to run for his 3<sup>rd</sup> term in 1971. On October 17, 1969, dictator Bak Jeonghui enforced the national vote for the constitution revision and passed it.

<sup>451</sup> Buddhology Institute, ed., *Hanguk geun hyeondae bulgyo-sa yeonpyo* (A Chronological Table for Modern and Present Korean Buddhism) (Seoul: Education Board of Korean Buddhist Jogye Order, 2000), 94.

<sup>452</sup> See the August 26, 1969 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.442.

<sup>453</sup> See the August 27, 1969 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.443-444.

<sup>454</sup> See the August 27, 1969 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.444.

<sup>455</sup> See the September 1, 1969 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.446.

Seoul, Yun Giwon abbot of Ssanggye-sa Temple, and Choe Wonjong abbot of Seonam-sa Temple in Chuncheon City, Gangwon Province.

The opposition faction of 12 members in the order's 50 central assembly members tied up with the deviated married monastic faction of 18 ones and excluded the ruling faction of 20 ones in organizing the order's cabinet.<sup>456</sup> For example, the opposition faction affiliated with the Center for Seon Studies, follower of I Cheongdam, recommended Choe Wolsan, Gim Gyeong-u, and Go Gwangdeok and the deviated married monastic faction's Yun Giwon and Choe Wonjong. The order also enthroned I Cheongdam as the Chair of the Council of Elder Monks. Even though Go Gwangdeok politically sided with the opposition faction, he was a disciple of Ha Dongsan and religiously belonged to the Dharma lineage of Baek Yongseong because Ha Dongsan was the disciple of Baek Yongseong.

The order's ruling faction mostly belonged to Baek Yongseong's Dharma lineage; its opposition faction was affiliated with the Center for Seon Studies and mostly belonged to Song Mangong's Dharma lineage; and the faction of deviated married monks sided with the celibate monastic Jogye Order through the introduction of former Secretary-General Son Gyeongsan.

Son Gyeongsan was a moderate in the movement and considered married monks in the movement as possible as he could do. I Cheongdam was a radical in the movement and excluded married monks in it as possible as he could do. Bak Gijong's administration consisted of the ruling faction and the deviated married monastic faction and got the order's hegemony against the opposition faction. Even so, I Cheongdam's followers allied themselves with the deviated married monastic faction to get the order's political hegemony.<sup>457</sup> I Cheongdam strengthened his position in the order through the order's power struggle.

On September 13, Choe Wolsan had the inauguration ceremony along with his cabinet members at the order's central assembly session at its Secretariat Head Office.<sup>458</sup> He announced that he would dedicate himself to modernize Korean Buddhism and strongly implement the project of constructing a Buddhist hall. On September 14, the newly appointed Secretary-General Choe Wolsan took over the order's matters from former Secretary-General Bak Gijong.<sup>459</sup> On September 15, he visited Haein-sa Temple and reported his inauguration to the order's highest patriarch Yun Goam.<sup>460</sup> The order's administration became normal on the surface. Because he felt keenly the necessity to harmonize the order's factions, he emphasized unity and harmony among its monastic members. He also promised to modernize Korean Buddhism, to dissolve distrust in it, and to complete the movement.

---

<sup>456</sup> See the September 2, 1969 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.446-448.

<sup>457</sup> See the September 3, 1969 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.449-450.

<sup>458</sup> See the September 10, 1969 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.450.

<sup>459</sup> See the September 17, 1969 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.450-451.

<sup>460</sup> See the September 17, 1969 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.450.



The order's new administration planned to reform Korean Buddhism by reflecting I Cheongdam's proposal for reconstructing Jogye Order submitted to the 20<sup>th</sup> session of the order's central assembly meeting held on July 5 - 7.<sup>461</sup> The October 2, 1969 issue of *Dong-a ilbo* summarized the major plans that the new administration elaborated as follows:<sup>462</sup> (1) The order shall make its central assembly as the system of the upper and lower houses. Its upper house consists of only celibate monastic representatives and its lower house lay representatives. It shall appoint only celibate monks to the office workers in its secretariat head office, replacing lay office workers by celibate monks. (2) It shall emphasize various monastic complexes and seminaries to educate monks and establish the central education institute to train missionaries to propagate Buddhism to the masses. (3) It shall strengthen the College of Buddhist Studies at Dongguk University and educate the highest leaders of Korean Buddhism.

It also examined various temple management methods on how to use idle temple properties effectively.<sup>463</sup> It suggested that the order should not rely on only tourism but diversify its income sources. For example, it could use the idle lands for cultivating medical herbs and raising livestock and get some incomes. It planned to implement the construction project of a Buddhist hall not operated for a while. It thought that if it would rent some spaces of the hall to needed persons, it could get some incomes from the renting business. Because the order used to manage its Secretariat Head Office with the allotted amount of each parish head temples, it did not have the budget enough to implement the big projects. The newspaper suspected that it could exercise the plans in the near future without having wholehearted support and encouragement from all Buddhists.<sup>464</sup>

On December 2, 1969, the Jogye Order held the 22<sup>nd</sup> regular session of its central assembly in which Speaker Bak Byeogan, Secretary-General Choe Wolsan and 49 assembly representatives participated and decided to actively engage in social activities.<sup>465</sup> It drafted the comprehensive plan on the reform of the order's administration such as the renovation of monastic discipline, the improvement of monastic robes, the effective management of temple properties, the foundation of a Buddhist hall, the bringing up of Buddhist culture and arts, and so on. It passed the 1970 budget of 20 million won. It also discussed the dispatching of monk students to overseas nations to learn advanced Buddhist studies, the establishment of a scholarship foundation, the setup of clerical hierarchical system, the compilation of the order's principal textbook, the translation of Buddhist texts in Korean, the strengthening of the propagation to military soldiers, and so on.

---

<sup>461</sup> See the August 13, 1969 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.436.

<sup>462</sup> See the October 2, 1969 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.451.

<sup>463</sup> Ibid.

<sup>464</sup> Ibid.

<sup>465</sup> See the December 6, 1969 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.454-455.

## 7.2. The married monastic side: Attempts to divide the Jogye Order

After married monks lost the hegemony in the Jogye Order and its temples, they attempted to divide the order in two in the 1960's, making the two orders respectively represent both sides, the married and unmarried monastics. However, celibate monks, with the strong support of the government, did not allow married monks to divide the order in two. The government actively intervened in the movement in favor of celibate monks and did not allow the partition of the order in two for married monks. So, married monks did not succeed in dividing the order but separated themselves from the order and established a new order for themselves named Taego Order in 1970, making the Jogye Order as a sectarian order for celibate monks.

On May 24, 1962, the Supreme Council for Reconstructing a Nation passed in the 40<sup>th</sup> general meeting the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties (Bulgyo jaesan gwalli-beop) consisted of a preamble, 4 chapters, 19 articles and an appendix and substituted the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples proclaimed by the Japanese Governor-General Office on June 3, 1911. It stipulated how the government should supervise the properties and facilities belonged to Buddhist organizations. The government paved a way to intervene in and control Buddhist organizations without any restrictions. It violated the constitution regulating separation between politics and religion. The May 24, 1962 issue of the major national newspaper *Joseon ilbo* summarized the law as follows.<sup>466</sup>

- (1) The government's secretary of education shall manage Buddhist organizations and temple abbots. Buddhists should register their organizations and temples to the department.
- (2) The law categorizes Buddhist organizations in five, ((i) the nation-level central administrative body, (ii) the parish head temples, (iii) the branch temples affiliated with each parish head temple, (iv) incorporated foundations and incorporated associations, and (v) other organizations other than the abovementioned four categories).<sup>467</sup> If any organization is incorporated, the representative of each organization shall register the organization immediately to the secretary of education based on the prescribed laws and regulations.
- (3) If the Buddhist organizations, including temples, dispose of their properties, they should get approvals from the government. The law prohibits the persons affiliated with the organizations from purchasing them.

---

<sup>466</sup> See the May 24, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.356-357.

<sup>467</sup> This author refers the five categories to the May 25, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.357.

- (4) The law defines real estates and movable properties. It asks each Buddhist organization to report its list of properties and the statement of its budget and its execution. Even though abbots and representative executives register their titles and names to the government based on previous laws and regulations, they should register their names and titles to the government in four months after this law's implementation. If not, the government shall consider that they would be discharged from the positions.
- (5) If the education secretary considers that the representative of a Buddhist organization, including a temple abbot, cannot manage the organization and temple, he or she can appoint an administrator of its property. And if the organization becomes normalized, the government discharges the administrator and let the organization's representative manage it.
- (6) If a representative of Buddhist organization violates this law, he or she will be sentenced to imprisonment for less than 2 years and will be punished with a penalty of less than 2 million Korean dollars.<sup>468</sup>

On May 31, 1962, the government promulgated the law and on August 22, its enforcement ordinance with a preamble, 102 articles and an appendix.<sup>469</sup> On September 22, Gim Sanghyeop, secretary of education, issued a government notice and asked the representatives of Buddhist organizations to register the organizations and their representatives to the government by October 15. He detailed how and where to register the organizations and their representatives in the government in the note.<sup>470</sup>

On May 31, the Emergency Assembly for Reconstructing Buddhism (Bulgyo jaegeon bisang jonghoe) examined two laws, i.e., the Law of Monks and Nuns and the Law of the Management of Provincial Temples in an office of the government's Department of Education.<sup>471</sup> The latter law bureaucratized and centralized Buddhist organizations. It did not democratize Korean Buddhism more seriously than beforehand. It was even worse than the temple rules made based on the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temples and its enforcement ordinances under Japanese occupation period.

The Law of Monks and Nuns stipulated that even though monastics should be celibate in principle, married monks should be recognized as monastics if they reside in temples without their family members as Clause 3 Article 9 of the new constitution defines. The Law of the Management of Provincial Temples removed the election system previously adopted for temple abbots, based on which temple resident monks elected their temple abbot. The abbot of a temple over ten resident monks was elected. However, the newly examined law regulated the order's Secretary-General to appoint the abbots of its parish head

---

<sup>468</sup> This author added the sixth item by referring to the May 25, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.357.

<sup>469</sup> See the October 2, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.361-362.

<sup>470</sup> Ibid.

<sup>471</sup> See the June 1, 1962 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.357-358.

temples and the abbot of a parish head temple to appoint the abbots of its branch temples. It is not a democratic law.

On July 4, the order's united administration appointed 8 bureau directors in the order's Secretariat Head Office and let them administer the order's administration. It appointed two bureau directors in each department of four departments totaling eight. Two directors of the Department of General Affairs were I Daeuk and Go Gwangdeok; two of the Department of Finance Gang Beopjong and I Jongmyeong; two directors of the Department of Education Bak Seungnyong and Gim Hyejeong (b. 1933); and two directors of the Department of Social Affairs Jeong Jawon and Jang Sangyeol.<sup>472</sup>

On August 20, the emergency assembly hosted a meeting in an office of the government's Department of Education.<sup>473</sup> The government suggested that the number of the members of the 1<sup>st</sup> central assembly in the order's united administration should be 50, assigning 32 representatives for the unmarried monastic group and 18 for the married monastic group. The five representatives of the married monastic group walked out of the meeting in protest of the government's favor to the unmarried monastics. It was supposed to host the assembly's inauguration ceremony on August 25 in the order's head office.

On August 23, the five representatives of the married monastic group announced a public statement and criticized the government's favor.<sup>474</sup> They requested the representative ratio between two groups to the even number between them. If the celibate monastic group and the government did not accept their assertion, the married monastic group would not participate in the assembly's inauguration ceremony. Both sides argued the number of representatives in the order's assembly.

Married monks argued that the election of 32 celibate monastic representatives and 18 married monastic representatives without married monastic representatives attended in the emergency assembly on August 20 was invalid. They asserted that the government's measure is not to mediate both sides but to increase disputes between both sides. They questioned the government, "How can the government ignore our opinions and guide both sides of married and celibate monks to harmonize with each other?"<sup>475</sup>

Unmarried monks asserted that they followed the government's arbitration between both sides based on the measures of the department of education. They argued that even though the married monastic side was not satisfied, the government appointed proper monks as representatives in the order's central assembly based on election regulations. They defended the government's measures for their own political interests.<sup>476</sup>

---

<sup>472</sup> See the July 5, 1962 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.358.

<sup>473</sup> See the August 21, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.358.

<sup>474</sup> See the August 24, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.358-359.

<sup>475</sup> Ibid, S.1.1.359.

<sup>476</sup> Ibid.

On August 25, the order's assembly hosted the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting and the inauguration ceremony in the Main Hall of Jogye-sa Temple to which 18 representatives of the married monastic group did not participate.<sup>477</sup> Even so, many lay Buddhists observed it. They elected Bak Byeogan as its chairman and Son Gyeongsan and Bak Seogak as the vice chairmen in the assembly meeting. On August 26, the order promulgated the Law of Monastic Ordination and on August 30, the Law of the Order's Central Assembly.

On September 20, due to the ratio of the representatives between the married and the unmarried monastic groups, the order's united administration was broken off. All of the major figures of the married monastic group in the order's united administration, including the Secretary-General Im Seokjin, resigned and resolved to fight against the unmarried monastic one. They criticized the government and the celibate monastic side.

On October 4, 13 married monastic representatives of the Emergency Assembly for Reconstructing Buddhism represented by I Unsong sued 16 celibate monastic representatives represented by I Cheongdam for nullifying the constitution to the Seoul District Court.<sup>478</sup> They asked the court to rule that the constitution passed at the February 28, 1962 assembly meeting and the highest patriarch I Hyobong enshrined on April 1 based on the constitution were invalid. They argued in their written complaint that the celibate monastic representatives devised and passed the constitution without following the proper legal steps. The celibate monastic representatives counter-argued against them that they wrote and passed the constitution based on proper procedures.

On October 19, the married monastic group established their own headquarters in 2-2 Chungjeongno 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Seoul.<sup>479</sup> They asserted that the revised constitution of the order's united administration should be nullified and the inauguration of Patriarch I Hyobong should not be authorized. The government's secretary of education Bak Ilgyeong (1920-1994) warned the married monastic sides that he would contact the department of internal affairs and take follow-up measures.

On October 31, the government closed the registration applications of Buddhist organizations.<sup>480</sup> The department of education announced that if Buddhist organizations did not register their organizations and representatives to the department, it would consider that the organizations were dissolved and the representatives of the organizations were resigned and it would appoint the representatives based on the law.

On October 17, the government's secretary of education issued a directive for the government units to register the temples based on the law. He guided the

---

<sup>477</sup> See the August 26, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.360.

<sup>478</sup> See the October 5, 1962 issue of *Joseon ilbo* and the October 5, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.362-363.

<sup>479</sup> See the October 20, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.364.

<sup>480</sup> See the October 31, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.366.

government units to accept the registration of temples based on the documents issued by Patriarch I Hyobong of the unmarried monastic group.

In those times, 42 Buddhist leaders including Gwon Sangno, Gim Yeongsu (1884-1967), Heo Sanghyeon, Gim Beomnin and Jo Jonghyeon (1904-1989) promoted an organization titled Hanguk ilseung bulgyo (Korean One Vehicle Buddhism) and attempted to register the organization to the government's department of education.<sup>481</sup> They told in the prospectus that they would make doctrine, rituals, doctrinal classifications and administrative systems completely different from the traditional and established Buddhist order. They would simplify rituals and follow doctrinal tradition, not Seon tradition. They would democratize their organization and allow lay Buddhists to have voting rights. Because they adopted Mahāyāna Buddhism, they named their order with Ilseung (One Vehicle) meaning the doctrine of Mahāyāna Buddhism. They enthroned Gwon Sangno of 85 years old to their supreme patriarch, Gim Yeongsu of 79 years old to their vice supreme patriarch and Heo Sanghyeon of 72 years old to their secretary-general. The Hanguk ilseung bulgyo presented three general principles as follows: "(1) We shall accomplish a democratic nation with firm faith in Buddhism; (2) we shall strengthen the unity of our nation with strong faith in Buddhism; and (3) we shall harmonize the world with the Buddha's love."<sup>482</sup>

On December 14, the government accepted the registration from the Jogye Order of the unmarried monastic group based on the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties. On December 20, the City of Seoul government issued a warning notice for the married monastic group to remove the signboard of and disband the Jogye Order at their head temple.<sup>483</sup> On December 24, Bak Daeryun, Secretary-General of the order of married monastic side, issued a public statement and declared that he and his order decline the order from the City of Seoul.<sup>484</sup> He argued in it that the department of education unfairly intervened in Buddhist disputes and the government's mediation violated the freedom of religion. He suggested the government not to order the married monastic Jogye Order disorganized until it received the ruling from the court on the invalidity of the constitution. He complained of the measure of the department of education which changed the board members of Dongguk University Foundation, argued that they were not qualified, and memorialized the government to fire them. On December 30, the celibate monastic Jogye Order appointed Gim Beomnyong as its Secretary-General.

On January 11, 1963, celibate monk I Baewon and married monk Gim Byeongho fought against each other at Gaeun-sa Temple in 157 Anam-dong, Seongbuk-gu, Seoul. It was reported that because both sides resided in the

---

<sup>481</sup> See the November 7, 1962 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.366-367.

<sup>482</sup> Ibid, 367.

<sup>483</sup> See the December 24, 1962 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.367.

<sup>484</sup> Ibid.

temple together, they used to fight easily and often.<sup>485</sup> The Seongbuk District Police booked them on charge of violence.<sup>486</sup> On February 18, more than 20 celibate monks and more than 60 laypersons attacked Heungcheon-sa Temple in Jeongneung, Seoul and asked married monks residing at the temple to hand over the temple to them. Both sides fought against each other in the temple.<sup>487</sup> On February 18, more than 10 celibate monks attacked the Daewon-am Hermitage affiliated with Gaeun-sa Temple in Anam-dong, Seoul and asked married monks of the hermitage to hand over the hermitage to them. Because both sides fought against each other, the police dispatched troops, arrested and took 4 celibate monks and 2 married monks to the police and was investigating them.<sup>488</sup>

On February 27, 1963, the married monastic group separated from the order's united administration.<sup>489</sup> It held its own independent central assembly meeting at its order's headquarters, to which more than 70 assembly representatives participated, elected Guk Mukdam as its own highest patriarch, revised the order's constitution and passed a resolution that it would submit their own independent proposal to the government for establishing an order. It also suggested the government should not unfairly intervene in the conflicts. It also appointed the order's other major posts, for example, Inspector General, Secretary-General and others. On the contrary, on February 28, the celibate monastic side also counter-hosted an extraordinary session in the order's central assembly at Jogye-sa Temple and discussed how to reorganize the order and expand its power.<sup>490</sup> More than 30 provincial Buddhist leaders also attended the session.

On May 22, when the government's secretary of education I Jong-u had an interview with a newspaper reporter, he told him that he might reconcile disputes between two groups by admitting the vested rights of married monks.<sup>491</sup> On May 29, reacting against the secretary's interview, the celibate monastic group held the national conference for monastic representatives in the conference room of the order's head office at Jogye-sa Temple in which 65 national representatives including Secretary-General Gim Beomnyong participated.<sup>492</sup> They resolved in the conference as follows: They would ask the department of education on the government's policy on Buddhism; they would question the department on why the government recognized and how it would consider the order's united administration; they would inquire the government whether it could divide the order's united administration to two orders, i.e., the order for married monks and the order for celibate monks; they would refuse

---

<sup>485</sup> See the January 12, 1963 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.368.

<sup>486</sup> See the January 13, 1963 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.368.

<sup>487</sup> See the February 19, 1963 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.368.

<sup>488</sup> Ibid.

<sup>489</sup> See the February 27, 1963 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.369.

<sup>490</sup> See the February 28, 1963 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.369.

<sup>491</sup> See the May 23, 1963 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.371.

<sup>492</sup> See the May 29, 1963 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.371-372.

any government measures against the principles of the order's united administration; and they would convene the national conference for (celibate) monastics if needed.

On July 16, the married monastic group planned to hold a large service for a massive number of participants. However, the government blocked this, considering it an illegal meeting. The 22 monastic and lay representatives began a hunger strike at their Secretariat Head Office.<sup>493</sup> On July 17, the group declared a public statement and criticized the government's measure as an illegal persecution of married monks.<sup>494</sup> On July 20, it held a massive street demonstration and the police detained 27 monks and 9 lay Buddhists to the police station.<sup>495</sup> The police released all 36 detainees next day. On July 20, 33 representative elder monks including Bak Daeryun, Gwon Sangno, Yun Jonggeun and I Gonhwang had a special ceremony that burned moxa on their left arms in the auditorium of its headquarters and resolved that they would send an open letter in five items to military ruler Bak Jeonghui.<sup>496</sup> On July 22, four representative elder married monks such as Gwon Sangno, former President of Dongguk University, 85 years old, entered a hunger strike, criticizing the government's indifference.<sup>497</sup>

The *Joseon ilbo* comprehensively critically and objectively analyzed the Buddhist disputes since the 1<sup>st</sup> presidential message on May 20, 1954 and strongly suggested that government should not intervene in the religious affairs but accept the registration of and authorize a married monastic order in its July 21, 1963 issue.<sup>498</sup> The newspaper basically disagreed with the government's intervention in the religious internal affairs and accepted the basic ideas from the married monastic side and suggested the government to allow multiple denominations in Korean Buddhism. The government's intervention in religious affairs is unconstitutional in modern democratic society. The government legalized and authorized Catholicism and Protestantism, two main denominations of Christianity and several different sub-denominations under Protestantism, mostly affiliated with Presbyterian and Methodist churches in Korea. However, the government unequally and inconsistently applied its policy between Buddhism and Christianity. While the government allowed Christian denominations freely to register themselves to it, it did not allow married monks to register their order to it.

Korean Buddhism has conventionally been ecumenical in the institutional context unlike Christianity and Japanese Buddhism. Even so, in these modern times in which the modern constitution clearly prescribes the separation of state and religion and the freedom of religion, how can the government discriminate

---

<sup>493</sup> See the July 18, 1963 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.372.

<sup>494</sup> See the July 18, 1963 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.372.

<sup>495</sup> See the July 21, 1963 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.373.

<sup>496</sup> Ibid.

<sup>497</sup> See the July 23, 1963 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.375.

<sup>498</sup> S.1.1.373-375.



against only the married monastic side and not allow only the side to register its organization to the government? Generally speaking, civilian dictator I Seungman and military dictator Bak Jeonghui strongly supported unmarried monks and seriously discriminated against married monks. Both dictators tactically used nationalism and labeled married monks and monasticism as Japanized and/or pro-Japanese Korean monks and monasticism. They provided a strong favor to and sided with unmarried monks. They followed the arguments of unmarried monks and attempted to keep celibate monasticism in one order's united administration or at least under the hegemony of celibate monks.

On July 26, the order's central assembly declared a state of the order's emergency and entered the hunger strike for 48 hours. The assembly vehemently criticized the education department's no accepting the registration of a married monastic order.<sup>499</sup> They defined in the assembly that the military government loyally inherited the civilian government's policy on Buddhist disputes. Married monks strongly denounced the government's 3 preconditions for married monks to register their order, i.e., (1) the order just allows married monks for their life, (2) married monks should withdraw all legal cases, and (3) the government shall allow only unregistered temples registered for married monks. The assembly passed a resolution that it would not accept the government's 3 preconditions and all assembly members would enter a hunger strike for 48 years.

On August 23, Guk Mukdam, representative of the married monastic group, took the case that the government's secretary of education did not accept the applications for the married monastic group's registering of the Buddhist organizations and their representatives but returned the applications to married monks. He also argued in his complaint that the constitution that the order's united administration adopted was improperly passed in the assembly procedures.<sup>500</sup> He argued over the invalidity of the order's constitution.

On July 19, the government intervened to solve the conflicts between the two groups. The government recognized the existing rights for the married monastics with the condition that they should not accept new married monastics to the order. However, the married group did not accept the government's offer. The Department of Education tried to authorize the married monastics tentatively in the order.

On October 7, three representatives including Gim Gwangmun of the National Association of Monks of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, affiliated with the married monastic side, submitted a memorial to the government authorities that the government's department of education should not intervene in the religiously internal affairs of Korean Buddhism and not violate the constitution's principle of the separation of state and religion and the democratic society's freedom of religion.<sup>501</sup>

---

<sup>499</sup> See the July 27, 1963 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.375.

<sup>500</sup> See the August 23, 1963 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.383.

<sup>501</sup> See the October 8, 1963 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.388.

On October 11, Secretary Yun Jonggeun of General Affairs of the Secretariat Head Office of the married monastic Jogye Order attempted to take a can of two gallons of gasoline, to move in the Pagoda Park in Jongno 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, downtown Seoul and to burn him to death in it.<sup>502</sup> The police prohibited him from moving in the temple and burning himself to death. The police reported that the secretary, abbot of Yeonhwa-sa Temple in Jongam-dong, Seoul attempted to burn himself to death to protest against the government's measures which do not allow married monks to register their temples and properties to the government.

He also argued that the government showed favor to the unmarried monks and discriminated against married monks. He asked the government to misuse Buddhist disputes and strongly requested the government to abolish the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties based on which the government did not allow the registration of a married monastic order. The government had used the law to centralize and manipulate Korean Buddhism.

On October 12 at 5:00 pm, another monk Han Byeoksong of Daewon-am Hermitage also attempted to burn himself to death by pouring gasoline in the same place of Pagoda Park. Gim Jeong-ae, a resident of the same temple, followed after him and prohibited him from burning his body. He also protested against the government's measures.<sup>503</sup>

On November 18 – 19, the central assembly of the unmarried monastic group hosted a session and protested against the government's measure that tentatively authorized the married monastic order. It passed a resolution in the following three items:

- (1) The Jogye Order is the united order that has preserved the long tradition during 1,600 years since the beginning of the Korean Buddhist history.
- (2) We cannot accept any organization that refutes the order's united administration.
- (3) We strongly negate the division of the united order's property to other (married monastic) order, which is the violation of Buddhist (monastic) precepts (based on celibate monasticism) and helps (monastic) disharmony increased.<sup>504</sup>

Supreme Patriarch I Hyobong of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism of the unmarried monastic side also announced that all monks affiliated with the order should renew their registers between November 20, 1963 and January 20, 1964 for 60 days.<sup>505</sup>

However, the married monastic group criticized the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties as a bad law because the law recognizes only the celibate monastic order that has the management rights of the Buddhist

---

<sup>502</sup> See the October 12, 1963 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.388.

<sup>503</sup> See the October 13, 1963 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.388.

<sup>504</sup> See the November 19, 1963 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.389.

<sup>505</sup> See the December 9, 1963 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.390.

properties. It launched a signature collecting drive for abolishing the law. It argued that if the military government transferred power to civil government, it would succeed to nullify it in the civil government.<sup>506</sup>

On February 5, 1964, Bak Daeryun, secretary-general of the married monastic Jogye Order belonging, made a petition to the National Assembly to abolish the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties.

On August 21, 4 plaintiffs, representing the married monastic group, submitted a legal case to court against 12 celibate monks including I Hyobong, supreme patriarch of the unmarried monastic side and asserted that the constitution passed by the emergency assembly on March 27, 1962 and the election of I Hyobong as the order's highest patriarch on April 1, 1962 should be nullified.<sup>507</sup> The plaintiffs claimed in their complaint that because the emergency assembly illegally revised the assembly rules and changed the number of representatives from 30 to 15, all resolutions and elections based on the rules were invalid. However, on September 6, the government's Department of Education defined the Jogye Order of the married group as an illegal organization.

On November 28 – 29, the central assembly of the Jogye Order of the married monastic side hosted its 25<sup>th</sup> regular session at Heungcheon-sa Temple and revised the law of the order's central and provincial assembly and allowed monks and nuns, laymen and laywomen to represent the central and provincial assembly. The assembly elected 12 lay representatives and 5 nun representatives in the session.<sup>508</sup> Unlike the central assembly of the unmarried monastic side which consists of only the representatives of unmarried monks, the married monastic side legally democratized the order's central and provincial assembly and included lay and nun representatives.

On March 16, 1965, both sides, represented by Son Gyeongsan from the unmarried monastic group and by Sin Jongwon from the married monastic one, signed an agreement to establish a committee for harmonizing the two groups (Hwadong wiwon-hoe). They agreed to try not to take legal cases to the court, which had led to the loss of many Buddhist properties.

On June 11, the Seoul District Civil Court ruled on the case concerning the nullification of the revised constitution of the order's united administration and the patriarch inaugurated based on it, in favor of the married monastic group.<sup>509</sup> It ruled as follows:

The emergency assembly consisted of 30 representatives, half of which were married monks and other half of which were celibate monks. It arbitrarily dismissed them. It elected 15 representatives, i.e., 5 celibate monks, 5 married

---

<sup>506</sup> See the November 20, 1963 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.389-390.

<sup>507</sup> See the August 22, 1964 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.392-393.

<sup>508</sup> See the November 30, 1964 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.393.

<sup>509</sup> See the June 11, 1965 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, the June 11, 1965 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, and the June 12, 1965 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.393-394.

monks and 5 social celebrities, and revised the constitution. So, the constitution was invalid. It appointed major posts including the highest patriarch in the order based on the constitution. Moreover, the election of 5 social celebrities was illegal and even contradictory to the 5<sup>th</sup> article of the rules of the emergency assembly. So, the election of I Hyobong as the order's highest patriarch was invalid.<sup>510</sup>

On June 22, twelve monks of the unmarried monastic group including I Deogin appealed this decision to the higher court. On September 7, 1965, the higher civil court ruled the case in favor of the unmarried monastic group.<sup>511</sup> The married monastic side appealed the case to the Supreme Court.

On April 12, 1966, Song Gyeongsan became the order's Secretary-General of unmarried monks. On August 11 – 13, the celibate monastic Jogye Order held the 13<sup>th</sup> central assembly meeting and passed a resolution to open up its assembly to married monastics who broke away from the order. The order elected 37 representatives among 50 and left the 13 vacant seats for the married monastic side. In September, a preparation committee to establish harmony between the two groups was established.

On February 6, 1967, more than 40 monastic leaders from both sides signed an agreement.<sup>512</sup> They confirmed the constitution of the order's united administration and recognized it as the only authentic order in Korean Buddhism. They also assigned 29 seats in the central assembly to the unmarried monastic group, assigned 21 seats to the married monastic group and allocated 8 parish head temples of 23 to the married monastic one. Sin Jongwon, abbot of Baegyang-sa Temple, one of 25 parish head temples, represented the married monastic group and Son Gyeongsan, Secretary-General of the celibate monastic Jogye Order.

However, on February 8, the married monastic side's Secretariat Head Office announced that Sin Jongwon was not abbot of Baegyang-sa Temple and did not represent its order's Secretariat Head Office. It criticized him that he defected from the married monastic order because celibate monks promised him to appoint the abbot of the parish head temple and he pretended as the representative of the married monastic side. It strongly asserted that while celibate monks should keep the monastic precepts of Hīnayāna, married monks should establish their own order based on Mahāyāna Buddhism.<sup>513</sup> The married monks defended their married monasticism based on Mahāyāna Buddhism and strongly contended that they were eligible to establish a new order. They also considered themselves as Mahāyānists and celibate monks as Hīnayānists.

---

<sup>510</sup> See the June 13, 1965 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.394.

<sup>511</sup> See the September 8, 1966 issue of *Dong-a ilbo* and the September 8, 1966 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.399-400.

<sup>512</sup> See the February 7, 1967 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.402-403.

<sup>513</sup> See the February 9, 1967 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.406-407.

On February 27, the married monastic side held a national conference for representatives at the Seoul Civil Center to which more than 2,000 monks and lay Buddhists including more than 390 lay representatives participated and in which they denounced the aforementioned agreement and asserted that unauthorized persons signed it. They declared in a manifesto that the two sides should be separated to two independent orders and the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties that authorized the order's united administration of the unmarried group should be abolished. It declared the establishment of a married monastic order. It contended that because two groups were in principle different in interpreting Buddhism, Korean Buddhism should be divided into two orders. It argued in the meeting that persons who signed the agreement on February 6 were not authorized representatives for the married monastic order and the celibate monastic order manipulated them to sign it.<sup>514</sup> They also asserted that if both sides legally have their own orders respectively, the order of married monks would be a doctrinal order and the order of unmarried monks a Seon order.

On March 15, 43 members of the order's central assembly of the unmarried monastic side resolved in the Secretariat Head Office's conference room at Jogye-sa Temple that the order shall adopt the examination system for the monk hierarchy in which there are five levels.<sup>515</sup> The monks belonged to the lowest position should practice Buddhism for at least ten years for promoting themselves to the next higher position. The order attempted to adopt the examination system and to promote the quality of monks.

On March 17, the government's secretary of education told in an interview with reporters that he was considering for abolishing the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties, indicating that the law had intensified the disputes between two groups and it violated freedom of religion at the administrative level.<sup>516</sup> The authorities of the celibate monastic Jogye Order anticipated that even though the law was troublesome, it helped protect Buddhist properties and even though the government might abolish it, the government measure might not affect to settle down the disputes so seriously.<sup>517</sup>

On March 20, Secretary-General Bak Daeryun of the Secretariat Head Office of the married monastic Jogye Order submitted a memorial in three items to the military ruler Bak Jeonghui on behalf of married monks and crystallized the basic ideas of the married monastic side as follows:

The secretary-general of the secretariat head office of Jogye Order submitted a memorial dated January 30, 1967 to the ruler Bak Jeonghui based on the resolution of its central assembly. The chair of the 7<sup>th</sup> national

---

<sup>514</sup> See the February 27, 1967 issue of *Dong-a ilbo* and the February 28 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.408.

<sup>515</sup> See the March 16, 1967 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.408-409.

<sup>516</sup> See the March 17, 1967 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.409.

<sup>517</sup> Ibid.

conference of representatives presented a proposal dated February 27, 1967 to the ruler. I think that the ruler and his government might examine how to manage Buddhist disputes and to reconstruct Buddhism. We are carefully investigating the case with our colleague monks and lay Buddhists and want to supplement the memorials in several items. I hope the ruler to deal wisely with and settle down the disputes.

First, I think that if we are born in this nation, we are subject to enjoy the basic human rights equally such as the freedom of religion and the government should protect our rights from being violated. The department of education authorities recognizes and supports just celibate monks affiliated with the Center for Seon Studies, the minority of Jogye Order, in the handling of Buddhist disputes. However, it does not negate married monks, the majority of Jogye Order, consisting of more than 80 percents of all monks and does not allow this Jogye Order of the married monastic side to be registered to the government based on the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties. We, married monks, face inexplicable pains for now due to the government's suppression.

Second, the order affiliated with the Center for Seon Studies pretends to control Korean Buddhism completely and to exaggerate their influence in Korean Buddhism. However, if we review a table of statistics of the government's department of education, it estimates that the order just appointed around more than 90 temples for celibate monks among 2,063 temples belonged to the Jogye Order. Of 90 temples, celibate monks actually manage only less than 30 temples, consisting of around 30 percents and the monks affiliated with our married monastic side still control and manage around 70 percents of the temples. More than 1,000 temples which married monks control and manage are not registered (to the government). If we analyze the number of temples and followers between two sides, more than 1,700 temples, around 5,000 monastics, and around 1,500,000 lay Buddhists currently belong to the married monastic side and less than 300 temples, around 3,000 monastics, and about 250,000 lay followers are currently affiliated with the unmarried monastic side. The reasonable and realistic solutions might be the partition of a united Buddhist order into two orders. If the government accept the registration of all temples depending on their own affiliations and assign the temples into two orders, both sides might coexist and co-prosper.

Third, it would be hard or impossible for us to settle down the Buddhist disputes continued for more than ten years through harmonization and unification between married and the unmarried monastic sides. Because both sides are too much different from each other in their doctrinal hermeneutics, soteriology, and ethics, they cannot find a catalyst to harmonize and unite with each other. I am confident that if the government allows both sides to divide the order's united administration into two orders, to let them develop depending on their own doctrines and to compete with each other rather than uniting them and making them fight against each other, the disputes might be dissolved automatically. The division of a united order into two orders would be a shortcut to peace, freedom and cooperation, not a way to disunion and conflict. I am strongly confident that if so, we can reconstruct and modernize Korean Buddhism successfully.

Our order will make all efforts to take determined and concrete measures, to remove the causes of Buddhist disputes and not to make the disputes recur. For now, like the case of the other religion, the department of education should equally allow both sides of the Jogye Order to register their own temples to the government and run them by themselves based on the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties in so far as the law is applicable and lasted. (The government has accepted the registration of churches belonged to different Christian denominations and legalized the churches.) I believe that the equal and impartial treatment of Buddhism with other religion (of Christianity) is constitutional. I propose Your Excellency to make a special and wise decision and to solve the disputes completely.<sup>518</sup>

On March 31, more than 300 married monks hosted the national conference for abbots and missionaries affiliated with the married monastic Jogye Order and resolved that they should divide Korean Buddhism into two orders, married monastic order and celibate monastic order and they should endeavor to accomplish the goal.<sup>519</sup> They contended that because each side of married and celibate monks was advocating different doctrines, if the order's united administration continues, it might lengthen the disputes. They suggested in the meeting that the division of Korean Buddhism to two orders should be the best way for Korean Buddhists to solve out the long disputes. They argued that if the government continuously illegalizes the married monastic order based on the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties, the government measures might have violated the freedom of religion. They determined that if the government did not accept their request, they would employ radical steps.

The *Joseon ilbo* reported in its May 16, 1967 issue that two Buddhist monastic groups were still fighting against each other to take the management rights in their temples in South Jeolla Province.<sup>520</sup> Because forty temples affiliated with the married monastic side among 131 temples in total in South Jeolla Province did not register their temple abbots to the government, the government authorities could not supervise the temples. Both sides were still fighting against each other to take the hegemony at five temples such as Jeungsim-sa, Baegyang-sa, Seonam-sa, Seosan-sa, and Hyangnim-sa temples in the province.

On May 25, the married monastic group hosted the conference for temple abbots in the order's Seoul and Gyeonggi Provincial District that around 500 monks attended. Married monks demanded the government in four items in the conference as follows:

- (1) The government should help Korean Buddhism to divide in two orders, married and celibate monastic orders.

---

<sup>518</sup> S.1.1.409-410.

<sup>519</sup> See the March 31, 1967 issue of *Dong-a ilbo* and the April 1, 1967 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.410-411.

<sup>520</sup> S.1.1.411.

- (2) It should allow each temple's abbot to decide which order of two the temple should be belonged.
- (3) It should search for and strictly punish the accounting corruption in the temples and Buddhist mission schools across the nation.
- (4) It should stop to favor the celibate monastic side unilaterally.<sup>521</sup>

The married monastic side concretized how to divide Korean Buddhism into two orders in the proposal. It suggested for the government to allow married monks to secure the temples in which they had resided and managed and to solve out the disputes completely. It was a natural idea for married monks to propose the division of one Korean Buddhism in two because they could not have any possibility to take back the order's hegemony. As the time passed by, the married monastics were subject to lose even the abbotships to the celibate monastics with the government's support.

Upon the movement's initiation, married monks criticized the government's intervention. However, when they lost the hegemony in the order and temples, they requested the government to intervene in the disputes and allow married monks to preserve their temples and abbotships and choose one of the divided two orders. Unlike married monks, unmarried monks asked the government to intervene in the disputes and when they obtain the hegemony in the order and temples, they requested the government not to allow married monks to divide the order in two. Both sides utilized or negated the government's interventions for their interests based on different situations.

In 1968, celibate monks still fought against married monks over the management of temples and tried to take over the management rights from married monks. Celibate monks and the defending married monks used violence and the police. At times they took cases to the court. For instance, the February 9, 1968 issue of *Joseon ilbo*<sup>522</sup> reported the disputed case of Yeombul-am Hermitage on Mt. Gwan-ak near Seoul; the June 11, 1968 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*<sup>523</sup> and the June 13 and 15, 1968 issues of *Joseon ilbo*<sup>524</sup> discussed that of Naejang-sa Temple in the County of Jeong-eup, North Jeolla Province; and the October 26, 1968 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*<sup>525</sup> introduced that of Beomnyun-sa Temple in Seoul.

On November 18, 1968, when the Bulguk-sa Temple's case that celibate monks fought against each other among themselves to get the rich temple's hegemony became publicized, the married monastic order utilized the case and held the central assembly's 30<sup>th</sup> session meeting that 62 representatives from all provinces attended and it declared the nullification of the order's united

---

<sup>521</sup> See the May 25, 1967 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.411-412.

<sup>522</sup> S.1.1.420.

<sup>523</sup> S.1.1.420.

<sup>524</sup> S.1.1.420

<sup>525</sup> S.1.1.421.



administration.<sup>526</sup> It suggested that the government should recognize equally two orders, the married monastic order and the unmarried monastic order, totally different in terms of doctrines and creeds, to make them compete with each other and to end the long disputes between two groups. It sent a memorial to President Bak Jeonghui. It can be summarized under the following three items: (1) The government should abolish the unconstitutional Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties; (2) it should protect Buddhist properties by the current Law of the Protection of Cultural Properties; and (3) it can help Buddhists organize the Association of Buddhist Organizations if cooperation among them is needed. It determined at the meeting that it should establish mission offices in Osaka, Tokyo, and Kobe for 250,000 Korean Buddhists in Japan under the direct control of the order's Secretariat Head Office.

On the same day, Bak Daeryun, the married monastic order's Secretary-General, disclosed that celibate monks sold out the Buddhist properties across the nation for a sum of 299,158,000 Korean dollars.<sup>527</sup> According to his listing, they sold out the land to the extent of 489,000 *pyeong*,<sup>528</sup> forest of 57,200,000 *pyeong*, lumber in the amount of 200,280,000, and Dongguk University property for 334,000,000 Korean dollars. He claimed that even though celibate monks sold out the big properties, Buddhists did not know how and where they used the moneys and rather the temples became gradually devastated. Even though we could not believe in Bak Daeryun's assertions at their face value, many celibate monks might sell out Buddhist properties for judicial costs and other various budgets necessary in taking temples from married monks. He also contended that there were over 100 legal cases in the disputes between two groups.<sup>529</sup>

On March 26, 1969, the Association of Korean Buddhists held at a civic center the national conference for Buddhists to which more than 3,000 lay Buddhists participated.<sup>530</sup> They declared the nullification of the order's united administration and demanded the government to recognize the division of the married monastic group and the unmarried monastic one into two independent orders. They requested the government to abolish the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties and not to intervene in the disputes unfairly between two groups. They determined in it that they should exclude the government authority that restricted the freedom of religion and should protect Buddhism from the external forces. They requested the government to let each monk decide his order. They declined to register the temples and Buddhist organizations to the government. However, on March 26, I Seongcheol, director of the bureau of

---

<sup>526</sup> See the November 18, 1968 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.424 and the November 19, 1968 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.425.

<sup>527</sup> See the November 18, 1968 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun* and the November 19, 1968 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.425.

<sup>528</sup> *Pyeong* is a unit of area of 3.954 square yards.

<sup>529</sup> See the November 19, 1968 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.425.

<sup>530</sup> See the March 25, 1969 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, the March 26, 1969 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, and the March 27, 1969 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.434-435.

culture, argued that because the association is not a registered organization to the government, he could not recognize it as a religious organization. He would guide the organization to the order's united administration.<sup>531</sup>

On March 27, the married monastic order submitted to the government an application for establishing a new order. The married monastic group argued that the directives that the secretary of education issued regarding the registration of temples to the government on April 14 clearly violated the private ownership prescribed in the constitution and determined to fight against the government's measure legally.<sup>532</sup> The secretary of education ordered Korean Buddhism to convene the meeting of the Association of 13 Korean Buddhist Sects and to determine all of unregistered temples across the nation registered to the government by June 30. However, on May 28, 6 representatives of the married monastic group, including Bak Daeryun, visited Sim Beomsik, the government's secretary of education and told him that if he did not process the registration application for a new order submitted on March 27, they would take the case to the court and drive the nationwide anti-government movement for protecting their married monastic order.<sup>533</sup> Married monks also argued that the government's enforcement for Buddhist temples to register them was unconstitutional. According to Article 16 of the South Korean Constitution, all religious organizations are not required to register themselves to the government. The government required only Buddhist organizations to register themselves to it. Married monks claimed that the government discriminated Buddhism. The department of education reported more than 1,500 unregistered temples.

On August 24, noting the celibate monastic Jogye Order's internal power struggle and its unconditioned backing up the dictatorship, the married monastic Jogye Order convened the meeting for its provincial leaders and secretly discussed how to react against the counterpart. Married monks contended that the government encouraged the disputes and the internal struggles originated from the government's improper and unreasonable policy on Buddhism. They planned to announce that the government should abolish the Law of the Management of Temple Properties and allow for married monks to register a new order.<sup>534</sup>

On October 23, 1969, the Supreme Court ruled the five-year-sustained case of the constitution and the inauguration of the first patriarch in the order's united administration in favor of the unmarried monastic group.<sup>535</sup> It ruled that the constitution passed in the 7<sup>th</sup> session of the order's emergency assembly on March 27, 1962 and the election of I Hyobong as the order's highest patriarch on April 1, 1962 were valid. On August 21, 1964, the married monastic group took the case to the civil court in the Seoul district. On June 11, 1965, the court

---

<sup>531</sup> See the March 26, 1969 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.434.

<sup>532</sup> See the May 31, 1969 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.435.

<sup>533</sup> Ibid.

<sup>534</sup> Ibid, S.1.1.443.

<sup>535</sup> See the October 24, 1969 issue of *Joseon ilbo*, S.1.1.451-452.

ruled it for the married monastic group in the district court. On September 7, 1966, the higher court ruled it for the unmarried monastic group.

On October 23, 1969, the Supreme Court concluded the case for the celibate monastic order. It validated the celibate monastic Jogye Order's current constitution and legitimized the celibate monastic order.<sup>536</sup> This completed the long history of the legal processes of the movement between the married monastic group and the unmarried monastic group. The final ruling completely authorized the movement's legitimacy over married monastic Buddhism.

However, on October 24, Yun Jonggeun, one of plaintiffs, declared that he would prepare another legal case to negate the legitimacy of the celibate monastic side's Jogye Order.<sup>537</sup> The married monastic group was currently waiting for the answer from the government because it submitted a registration application for a new order named "Bulgyo Jogye-jong" (Jogye Order of Buddhism) on October 13.<sup>538</sup>

The celibate monastic group actively approached the married monastic group after having the favored ruling in the Supreme Court.<sup>539</sup> The leaders of both groups unofficially met with each other several times and discussed how to settle down the disputes between two groups. On November 15, both sides had an official meeting. On the process, the government returned the registration application for a new order to the married monastic group and encouraged them to solve the disputes. Even so, some married monks of the married monastic group did not agree with its merger into the order's united administration but insisted to establish an independent order for married monks.

## 8. The movement's completion: The establishment of Taego Order

On April 16, 1970, the married monastic group held the 9<sup>th</sup> national conference for representatives in which they officially gave up their effort to divide the Jogye Order in two orders, respectively representing each side, and declared that they would establish the new order entitled the Taego Order of Korean Buddhism. The government and the celibate monastic group strongly opposed the official partition of the order in two, so the married monastic group could not partition the order in two but was forced to give up their partition plan. The group needed to separate themselves from the established order and establish a new order for them.<sup>540</sup>

<sup>536</sup> See the October 24, 1969 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.452.

<sup>537</sup> See the October 24, 1969 issue of *Dong-a ilbo*, S.1.1.452-453.

<sup>538</sup> Ibid.

<sup>539</sup> See the November 19, 1969 issue of *Gyeonghyang sinmun*, S.1.1.453.

<sup>540</sup> Taego Order of Korean Buddhism, ed., *Taego jongsae: Hanguk bulgyo jeongtong jongdan ui yeoksa* (The History of the Taego Order of Korean Buddhism: The History of

On May 8, they officially could establish the Taego Order of Korean Buddhism because the government accepted the registration of the new order based on the Law of the Management of Buddhist Properties. They elected Bak Daeryun as the highest patriarch, Bak Gapdeuk as the secretary-general, Song Byeongsu as the secretary of the general affairs, Yun Jonggeun as the secretary of education and Gim Gyuseon as the secretary of finance, and appointed other officers.

After the complete separation of the married monastic group from the existent Jogye Order and the official establishment of the new order entitled the Taego Order, the Jogye Order actually and institutionally completed the Purification Buddhist Movement in 1970. After taking the order's hegemony, celibate monks had fought against celibate monks, not married monks, to take the hegemony of the order and temples in 1960's. Celibate monks cooperated with each other to take the order's hegemony and fought against married monks in the Jogye Order and upon successfully taking the order's hegemony, they began to fight against each other to take the hegemony of the order and temples among themselves.

Because unmarried monks completed the movement based heavily on strong institutional support, not wholly on their own independent ability, the celibate monastic Jogye Order needed to educate low-quality celibate monks, systematize the order's administration, enforce the strict application of monastic discipline, propagate Buddhism to the masses, manage temples systematically, and so on. The order's missions are still ongoing and waiting to be accomplished.

So, I think that we can adopt the two key terms of ecumenism and sectarianism and philosophically analyze the movement. First, as we can use the terms and examine doctrinal classification systems taken place in early Sino-Korean Buddhism, we are ecumenically and sectarianistically able to categorize them. Second, with the advent of Chan Buddhism, East Asian Buddhists needed to vertically and horizontally classify the two traditions of earlier doctrinal and later Chan Buddhism. Third, celibate and married monks developed sectarianism and/or ecumenism in the united and ecumenical Jogye Order during the movement, 1954-1970.

Upon the movement's success, unmarried monks completely removed married monks, transferred the ecumenical Jogye Order to a sectarian order for themselves and removed married monks. Married monks separated themselves from the Jogye Order and established a new sectarian order named Taego Order for themselves in 1970, making the established Jogye Order represent only celibate monks. Upon the official establishment and registration of Taego Order to the government in 1970, the movement was officially and institutionally completed.

## CONCLUSIONS

I adopted two key concepts of ecumenism and sectarianism and defined the Purification Buddhist Movement, 1954-1970, as an institutionally sectarian movement of celibate monks. Celibate monks completely and from their sectarian perspective removed married monks from the united and ecumenical order named Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism officially established in 1941 under the colonial rule which ecumenically accepted married and unmarried monks in its monasticism. Unlike celibate monks, married monks ecumenically defined monasticism as a mixture of married and unmarried monks and attempted to preserve their established privileges in the management rights of the order and their temples.

Celibate monks initiated the movement from 1954 based on the first presidential message which President I Seungman (1875-1965) issued and successfully completed it in 1970 when married monks were removed from the united order and established a new order named Taego Order of Korean Buddhism for themselves. Even though celibate monks have continuously used the same order's name of Jogye Order since 1941, the connotation of the order's title is different before and after the completion of the movement. The Jogye Order before the movement and continued from its establishment in 1941 was institutionally ecumenical and the order after the movement and continued until to now is institutionally sectarian.

Both sides theoretically and differently defined monasticism. Unmarried monks conservatively and literally interpreted and applied their interpretation, successfully removed married monks from and completed the movement in the order. Unlike them, married monks progressively and freely interpreted and applied their interpretation, attempted to keep their established powers in, were removed from the order and founded a new order for themselves. Therefore, I

defined the movement as the institutional interconnection between ecumenism and sectarianism unlike the two paradigms of ecumenism and sectarianism which I devised in my previous researches. Both groups ecumenically or sectarianistically interpreted monasticism based on orthopraxy (precepts), not orthodoxy.

I firstly devised the paradigm of ecumenism and sectarianism, applied the two key concepts and classified Buddhist doctrines and texts from the beginnings of translation of texts from Indo-Central Asian languages to Chinese to the endings of translation of texts. I categorized doctrinal classifiers into two groups, ecumenical and sectarian doctrinal classifications, and defined the first paradigm as the doctrinal interconnection between ecumenism and sectarianism. Two groups ecumenically or sectarianistically interpreted texts and doctrines based on orthodoxy, not orthopraxy (vinaya).

After the beginnings of Chan (Seon) Buddhism, Chan Buddhists needed to classify preexistent doctrinal Buddhism and later Chan Buddhism. So, I secondly made another paradigm of ecumenism and sectarianism, applied the concepts and classified doctrinal and Chan Buddhism. I analyzed the relations between the two different traditions and defined the second paradigm as the soteriological interconnection between ecumenism and sectarianism. While ecumenists generally advocated moderate soteriology of sudden enlightenment and gradual praxis, Chan sectarians supported radical soteriology of sudden enlightenment and sudden praxis. Two groups ecumenically or sectarianistically interpreted the relations between the two traditions based on orthodoxy and orthopraxy.

So, the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, the leading and biggest order in Korean Buddhism, and the Taego Order of Korean Buddhism, the second biggest order, completely differently see the movement continued between 1954 and 1970. While the Jogye Order explains it with the positive term "Purification Buddhist Movement," the Taego Order describes it with the negative words "dispute," "persecution," and "conflict." Korean Buddhists have conventionally used the term "Purification Buddhist Movement" because they could not ignore the influence from the Jogye Order, so we need to re-examine the term's validity and authenticity from a neutral view for now. Because we cannot negate the fact that married monastic system of Korean Buddhism was made under the influence of Japanese Buddhism during Japan's occupation period, 1910-1945, the arguments of the Taego Order should also be investigated closely.

If the movement is reviewed from the perspectives of the Jogye Order, it is to recover Korean Buddhist celibate monastic tradition from married Japanized monasticism and to revitalize Korean Seon praxis tradition from deteriorated married priesthood. The founders of current Jogye Order proudly consider themselves as the purifiers of wrong and perverted marriage priesthood in Korean Buddhist monastic tradition. They argue that they succeeded to cleanse Japanized colonial Buddhism and ended up with purifying the Jogye Order based on traditional monasticism of Korean Buddhism. In order to back up their

arguments, they should give us more evidence. One could not deny how seriously the movement activists were involved in taking temple properties and ownerships by using violent measures and being dependent on the external powers such as the government and the court throughout the movement. Even though the Jogye Order states that the movement activists tried to recover traditional Korean Buddhist monasticism, we also should not justify non-Buddhist methods in the movement such as the use of violent actions and the dependence on the external forces.

Conversely, if the movement is seen from the view of the Taego Order, the movement is a dispute, a fight, a struggle, a conflict, and a confrontation between Korean Buddhists, mostly monks, not laypersons. The Taego Order argues that the movement does not have a solid ideology to be actualized from the beginning but a strong desire to get the hegemony in the order's political power and as the result, to monopolize the ownership of the temple properties and the management of them. Even though one cannot decline the movement's negative aspects, one also cannot negate a fact that it purified the monastic order in Korean Buddhism. Even though one accepts the Taego Order's arguments, one should not justify the current status quo of the Korean Buddhist order prior to the movement in which the majority of Korean Buddhist monks were married. One cannot ignore the fact that the marriage monastic system, along with the Ordinance of Korean Buddhist Temple and the bureaucratic parish system, which were originated from Japan's occupation, facilitated Korean Buddhists to be pro-Japanese.

Later researchers and scholars need to discuss the marriage aspect of the monastic system comprehensively. It is fairly difficult for one to generalize that married monks supported pro-Japanese government and unmarried ones kept traditional Korean Buddhist monasticism very well. The movement's participants used to dichotomize between married and celibate monastics and to polarize the two groups as good and evil. They assigned married priests to the symbol of pro-Japanese colonialism and celibate monastics to the model of keeping true Korean monasticism. However, the majority of the unmarried monastic Seon practitioners were not engaged in the independence movement but dedicated themselves to practice Seon Buddhism for themselves, not for the nation during the Japanese occupation period. One, furthermore, can easily find out many married monks who supported the independence movement. I think that the dichotomization between pro-Japanese and anti-Japanese monks, invented by the movement's activists and theorists, should be discarded.

Ironically, Han Yongun (1879-1944), progressive activist and theorist, who actively participated in the movement for independence from Japan's occupation, strongly suggested that Korean Buddhism should allow the monastics to marry for the modernization and secularization of Korean Buddhism in his *Bulgyo yusin-non* (Essays on Korean Buddhism's Restoration)

even in 1910.<sup>1</sup> He argued that married monks could propagate Buddhism more easily than unmarried monks. He might be the most famous Buddhist leader for independence and the practitioner who seriously advocated the Seon practice. Even if his arguments on marriage monasticism in Korean Buddhism should be discussed based on the vinaya rules of traditional Buddhism, which did not allow marriage monasticism, one could not ignore that Japanese Buddhism helped Korean Buddhism modernize.

Korean Buddhism learned a lot from Japanese Buddhism in terms of advanced scholarship in Buddhist Studies, well-organized management of Buddhist temples and participation in social activities. Korean Buddhist organizations dispatched their monks and lay students to Japan in which they learned advanced Buddhist Studies at Buddhist mission universities and/or public ones. They incorporated Japanese Buddhism's scholarship in Buddhist Studies and its experience to propagate Buddhism to the public and modernized Korean Buddhism based on the model of Japanese Buddhism. Japanese Buddhists elevated the lowest position to the higher and respectable position of Korean Buddhist monastics in the society. Regardless of Japanese Buddhism's contributions to the development of Korean Buddhism during Japan's occupation period and even during post-colonial period, the movement's participants very much utilized nationalistic sentiment and simplified married monks to be pro-Japanese and unmarried monks to be anti-Japanese in order to accomplish their own political missions.

The simplification might be just a political slogan because we have a lot of counter-evidences for married monks to participate in and for unmarried monks not to join but indifferent from independence movement during the Japanese occupation period. The majority of married and unmarried monks, regardless of Buddhist leaders and common monks, did not participate in independence movement in various reasons. So, the simplification of married monks to be pro-Japanese and unmarried monks to be anti-Japanese cannot be supported from concrete evidences. When we carefully review independence movement activists among Buddhist monks, we are really hard to find out celibate monks.

Im Hyeobong is a leading scholar in pro-Japanese and anti-Japanese Korean Buddhism under Japanese occupation and published three research books on the topic. When I concretely review a comprehensive research book on anti-Japanese independence movement during Japanese occupation period by Im Hyeobong, I can identify just one celibate monk Baek Yongseong (1864-1940) as a major anti-Japanese activist and numerous married monks as anti-Japanese activists in it.<sup>2</sup> When I review another comprehensive research book on pro-Japanese Buddhism in two volumes by Im Hyeobong, I can recognize in it that

---

<sup>1</sup> See Han Yongun, *Bulgyo yusin-non* (Essays on the Restoration of Korean Buddhism), in Han Jongman, ed., *Hyeondae Hanguk ui bulgyo sasang* (Current Korean Buddhist Thoughts) (Seoul: Hangil-sa, 1980), 81-91.

<sup>2</sup> Im Hyeobong, *Ilje ha bulgyo-gye ui hang-il undong* (Korean Buddhism's Anti-Japanese Independence Movement under Japanese Occupation) (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 2001).



the majority of pro-Japanese Buddhist leaders are married monks because married monks actually led Korean Buddhism and were not free from pro-Japanese activities under the Japanese rule.<sup>3</sup> Im Hye bong attached to it a long list of both married and unmarried monks who accepted a Japanese policy and changed their Korean family names to Japanese family names.<sup>4</sup> Im Hye bong also extensively introduced monks active in various fields under Japanese occupation who should be pro-Japanese in some degree in his another book entitled *Chinil seungnyeo baekpal-in: Kkeut naji anneun yeoksa ui mureum* (108 Pro-Japanese Korean Buddhist Monks: Unanswered Historical Questions) (Seoul: Cheongnyeon-sa, 2005).

Not based on facts and evidences, unmarried monks generalized married monks to be pro-Japanese and celibate monks not to be traditional (anti-Japanese). Even though married monasticism is not traditional in Korean Buddhism, unmarried monks should not simply classify married monks to be pro-Japanese. However, unmarried monks utilized their own fabricated generalization for their political purposes and accomplished their own political agenda of the Purification Buddhist Movement. Because of strong nationalistic sentiments in Korea, married monks could not make another paradigm of reactionism (traditionalism) and modernization into an issue. Korean Buddhism's married monks did not actively, positively, and theoretically, but passively, defensively and emotionally react against the allegation of unmarried monks.

When married monks lost the hegemony in the order and its temples, they attempted to divide the order in two, making each of them represent each side. However, celibate monks did not allow the division with the government's strong support. In 1970, married monks separated themselves from the order and established a new order for themselves called the Taego Order. So, the movement ended up with the establishment of the Taego Order which allowed married monks, making the established Jogye Order a sectarian order only for celibate monks. The movement contributed to the formation of modern sects of Korean Buddhism. Prior to it, Korean Buddhism used the concept of sect (Kor., *jong*; Chn., *zong*; Jpn., *shū*) for specialization, tradition, or lineage. While doctrinal Korean Buddhism basically used the term as the meaning of specialization and tradition, practical Seon Buddhism used the concept for the Dharma lineages.

Korean Buddhism did not have institutional sects before the movement. Even though it had a variety of doctrinal traditions and Seon Dharma lineages, it had institutionally been ecumenical in Korean Buddhist tradition. However, after the movement, it began to have institutional sects, making them have

---

<sup>3</sup> Im Hye bong, *Chinil bulgyo-ron* (Research on Pro-Japanese Colonial Buddhism), 2 vols (Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1993).

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, 2: 622-636.

exclusive, autonomous and independent ordination and administrative systems. So, the movement can be characterized as a sectarian movement which resulted in two major religious institutions, the Jogye Order which advocates celibate monasticism and the Taego Order which allows married monasticism.

When the Buddhist texts were massively introduced to China in early Chinese Buddhist history, Chinese Buddhists needed to classify them. While some scholars ecumenically and horizontally classified the texts and doctrines, others sectarianistically and hierarchically classified them. They used the concept of sect in terms of the doctrinal paradigm of sectarianism and ecumenism. Later with the advent of Chan Buddhism in Sino-Korean Buddhism, Chan Buddhists emphasized the soteriological and practical aspect more than pre-existent doctrinal Buddhism. While Some Chan Buddhists ecumenically and horizontally classified earlier doctrinal Buddhism and later Chan Buddhism, others sectarianistically and vertically classified Chan Buddhism over doctrinal Buddhism. They used the term of sect in regards to the soteriological paradigm of sectarianism and ecumenism.

In contemporary Korean Buddhism, married monks ecumenically used the term of sect, suggested unmarried monks to live together with them and defined the monastic order as the combination between married and unmarried monks. Celibate monks sectarianistically used the term of sect, suggested married monks to move from the temples and defined that the monastic order should be consisted of unmarried monks. The combined order of married and unmarried monks became divided after the movement and each group made their own institutions, the Jogye Order and the Taego Order. Even though unmarried monks still use the same title of Jogye Order used before the movement, the connotation of the same title after the movement became totally different in the title's meaning. The Jogye Order ecumenically constituted married and unmarried monks before the movement. The Jogye Order exclusively consists of unmarried monks after the movement. During and after the movement, Korean Buddhists began to use the term of sect in the context of the institutional paradigm of sectarianism and ecumenism.

As above, even though East Asian Buddhists have used the same term of sect, they have used them in aforementioned three different contexts. For example, in early Sino-Korean Buddhism, they used the term of sect in the first doctrinal context; with the beginning of Chan Buddhism, they used it in the second soteriological context; and the movement's activists used it in the third institutional context. We needed to keep the three different paradigms in mind to understand contemporary Korean Buddhism. Korean Buddhists use the first meaning of sect when they discuss and classify texts and doctrines in the doctrinal and textual context. When they discuss and classify doctrinal and Seon Buddhism, they use the concept of sect in the practical and soteriological context. And, during and after the movement, Korean Buddhists began to use the term of sect in the institutional context.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Collections of the Buddhist Canon

*Hanguk bulgyo jeonseo* (The Collected Works of Korean Buddhists). 12 vols. Edited by Dongguk daehak-gyo (Dongguk University). Seoul: Dongguk daehak-gyo chulpan-bu, 1979-1996.

*Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* (The Taishō Canon). 100 vols. Edited by Takakusu Junjirō, Watanabe Kaigyoku, et al. Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankō-kai, 1924-1932.

*Xuzang jing* (The Japanese Sequential Canon). 150 vols. Edited by Yingyin Xu zang jing weiyuan-hui. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Buddhist Association, 1967.

### Dictionaries

Buswell, Robert E., Jr., ed. *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. New York: Macmillan Reference, 2004.

Ciyi, ed. *Foguang dacidian* (Foguang Dictionary of Buddhism). The 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Kaohsiung, Taiwan: Foguang chupan-she, 1989.

Edgerton, Franklin. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. 2 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

(The) English Buddhist Dictionary Committee, ed. *The Soka Gakkai Dictionary of Buddhism*. Tokyo: Soka Gakkai, 2002.

Fischer-Schreiber, Ingrid, et al. Michael H Kohn, trans. *The Shambhala Dictionary of Buddhism and Zen*. Boston: Shambhala, 1991.

Hucker, Charles O. *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985.

I Dongsul, ed. *Hanguk sachal bogam* (Dictionary of Korean Buddhist Temples). Seoul: Uri chulpan-sa, 1997.

I Jeong, ed. *Hanguk bulgyo inmyeong sajeon* (Dictionary of Korean Buddhist Names). Seoul: Bulgyo sidae-sa, 1991.

Keown, Damien. *Dictionary of Buddhism*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

- Komazawa daigaku Zengaku daijiten hensansho (Center for Publishing *Dictionary of Zen Studies*), ed. *Zengaku daijiten* (Dictionary of Zen Studies). 3 vols. Tokyo: Taishūkan shoten, 1978.
- Malalasekera, G. P., ed. *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. Colombo: Government of Ceylon, 1961.
- Mochizuki Shinkō. *Bukkyō daijiten* (Dictionary of Buddhism). 10 vols. Tokyo: Sekai seiten kankō kyōkai, 1958-1963.
- Monier-Williams, Monier. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899.
- Morohashi Tetsuji. *Dai kanwa jiten* (Classical Chinese-Japanese Dictionary). 13 vols. Tokyo: Taishūkan shoten, 1957-60.
- Nakamura Hajime. *Bukkyōgo daijiten* (Dictionary of Buddhist Terms). 3 vols. Tokyo: Tōkyō shoseki, 1975.
- Nienhauser, William H., Jr., ed. *The Indiana Companion to Traditional Chinese Literature*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.
- Ogihara Unrai, ed. *Bonwa daijiten* (Sanskrit-Japanese Dictionary). 1915. Reprint, Tokyo: Suzuki gakujutsu zaidan, 1986.
- Ono Gemmyō, ed. *Busho kaisetsu dai-jiten* (Dictionary of Buddhist Texts). 15 vols. Tokyo: Daitō shuppan-sha, 1933-1936, 1974, 1988.
- Powers, John. *A Concise Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. Oxford and Boston: Oneworld, 2000.
- Rhys Davids, T. W., and William Stede. *Pāli-English Dictionary*. London: Pali Text Society, 1959.

## Reference Works

- (The) Board of Education of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, ed. *Geundae seonwon banghamnok* (Records of Intensive Retreat Participants at Modern Korean Buddhist Seon Centers). Seoul: Jogye Order Publishing, 2006.
- Buddhology Institute of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, ed. *Hanguk geun-hyeondae bulgyo-sa yeonpyo* (A Chronological Table for Modern and Present Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Board of Education of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., *Gangwon chongnam* (A Conspectus of Korean Buddhism's Traditional Monastic Seminaries). Seoul: Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, 1997.

- Dongsan mundo-hoe (Association of Master Ha Dongsan's Dharma Descendants), ed. *Dongsan daejongsa munjip* (The Collection of Grand Master Ha Dongsan's Works). Busan: Beomeo-sa Temple, 1998.
- Ha Dongsan, comp. Gim Taeheup, ed. *Yongseong seonsa eorok* (Seon Master Baek Yongseong's Analects). Seoul: Samjang yeokhoe, 1941.
- Hanguk bulgyo chongnam pyeonjip wiwon-hoe (The Editing Committee of the Comprehensive Collection of Source Materials of Contemporary Korean Buddhism), ed. *Hanguk bulgyo chongnam* (The Comprehensive Collection of Source Materials of Contemporary Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Daehan bulgyo jinheung-won, 1993.
- Hanguk bulgyo seungdan jeonghwa-sa pyeonchan wiwon-hoe (The Committee for Editing the History of Purification Buddhist Movement in Korean Buddhist Monastic Order). *Hanguk bulgyo seungdan jeonghwa-sa* (The History of Purification Buddhist Movement in Korean Buddhist Monastic Order). Gyeongju: Hanguk bulgyo seungdan jeonghwa-sa pyeonchan wiwon-hoe, 1996.
- Han Yongun. *Han Yongun jeonjip* (The Collected Writings of Han Yongun). 6 vols. Seoul: Sin-gu munhwa-sa, 1973.
- I Cheolgyo and Gim Gwangsik, comps. *Hanguk geun-hyeondae Bulgyo jaryo jeonjip* (Source Materials of Modern and Contemporary Buddhism). 70 vols. Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1996.
- I Manyeol, ed. *Hanguk-sa nyeonpyo* (A Chronological Table of Korean History). Seoul: Yeongmin-sa, 1985.
- Im Domun, ed. *Yongseong daejongsa jeonjip* (The Complete Collection of Great Master Baek Yongseong's Works). 18 vols. Seoul: Sinyeong-sa, 1991.
- Jeong Gwangho, ed. *Hanguk bulgyo choegeun baengnyeong-sa pyeonnyeong* (Chronological Explanations of Korean Buddhism during Recent 100 Years, 1865-1965). Incheon: Inha University Press, 1999.
- Jeong Yeongsik. *Hanguk gwanhwa-seon ui wollyu* (Origin of Korean Kōan Seon). Seoul: Hanguk haksul jeongbo, 2007.
- Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, ed. *Bulgyo pallye-jip* (Legal Precedent Cases on Buddhist Organizations). Seoul: Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ilje sidae bulgyo jeongchaek gwa hyeonhwang: Joseon chongdok-bu gwanbo bulgyo gwannyeon jaryo-jip* (Japanese Government-General's Policy of Buddhism and the Status Quo: The Collection of Buddhist Source Materials in Japanese Government-General's Official Gazette). 2 vols. Seoul: Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, 2001.

- Lancaster, Lewis and Sung-bae Park. *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979.
- Sambo Hakhoe, ed. *Hanguk geunse bulgyo baengnyeong-sa* (The History of Modern Korean Buddhism for the Recent 100 Years). 4 vols. Reprint. Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1994.
- Seo Jeongdae, ed. *Jongdan beomnyeong-jip* (The Collection of the Regulations and Rules of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism). Revised Edition. Seoul: Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, 2001.
- Seonu Doryang, ed. *Sinmun euro bon Hanguk bulgyo geun-hyeondae-sa* (The History of Modern Korean Buddhism Seen through Newspaper Articles). 4 vols. Seoul: Seonu Doryang Press, 1995 & 1999.
- Tongdo-sa Temple, ed. *Guha daejongsa minjok bulgyo undong saryo-jip* (The Collection of Source Materials for Anti-Japanese Activities of Great Master Gim Guha). 5 vols. Yangsan: Tongdo-sa Temple, 2007.
- Yamazaki Hiroshi and Kosahara Kazuo, eds. *Bukkyō-shi nenpyō* (A Chronological Table for Buddhist History). Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1979.

## Modern Works

- An Byeongjik, ed. *Han Yongun*. Seoul: Han-gil-sa, 1979.
- Araki Kengo, trans. *Daie-sho* (Letters of Chan Master Dahui Zonggao). Zen no goroku (Zen Analects), no. 17. Tokyo: Shikuma shobō, 1969.
- Bak Hanyeong. Gim Hyotan, comm. and trans. *Gyehak yakjeon juhae* (Comments and Explanations of the *Introduction to Buddhist Vinaya* by Bak Hanyeong). Seoul: Dongguk yeokgyeong-won, 2000.
- Batchelor, Stephen, trans. So Gusan. *The Way of Korean Zen*. New York: Weatherhill, 1985.
- Barry, Brian, trans. I Seongcheol. *Echoes from Mt. Gaya: Selections on Korean Buddhism*. Seoul: Lotus Lantern International Buddhist Center, 1988.
- Beomeo-sa Temple, ed. *Haksul semina jaryo-jip: Dongsan daejongsa wa bulgyo jeonghwa undong* (Conference Source Materials: Grand Master Ha Dongsan and Purification Buddhist Movement). Busan: Beomeo-sa Temple, 2007.
- Broughton, Jeffrey L. "Kuei-feng Tsung-mi: The Convergence of Ch'an and the Teaching." Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1975.

- Buddhology Institute, ed. *Jogye jongsas: Geun-hyeondae pyeon* (The History of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism: Modern and Present Periods). Seoul: Jogye-jong chulpan-sa, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Bongam-sa gyeolsa wa hyeondae hanguk bulgyo* (The Intensive Retreat Community of Bongam-sa Temple and Contemporary Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Jogye-jong chulpan-sa, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Bulgyo jeonghwa undong ui jaejomyeong* (Reexamination of Purification Buddhist Movement). Seoul: Jogye-jong chulpan-sa, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Bulgyo geundae-hwa ui jeon-gae wa seonggyeok* (Development of Buddhist Modernization and its Characteristics). Seoul: Jogye-jong chulpan-sa, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Jogye-jong chongnim ui yeoksa wa munhwa* (The History and Culture of Jogye Order's Praxis Complexes). Seoul: Jogye-jong chulpan-sa, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Biguni seungga daehak ui yeoksa wa munhwa* (The History and Culture of Female Monastic Seminaries in Jogye Order). Seoul: Jogye-jong chulpan-sa, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Gyeongheo · Mangong ui seonpung gwa beommaek* (The Seon and Dharma Lineage of Gyeongheo and his Disciple Mangong). Seoul: Jogye-jong chulpan-sa, 2009.
- Bulgyo munhwa yeongu-won (Korean Buddhist Culture Research Institute), ed. *Sŏn Thought in Korean Buddhism*. Seoul: Dongguk University Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Ch'ŏn-t'ae Thought in Korean Buddhism*. Seoul: Dongguk University Press, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Buddhist Thought in Korea*. Seoul: Dongguk University Press, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The History and Culture of Buddhism in Korea*. Seoul: Dongguk University Press, 1993.
- Bulgyo sahak-hoe, ed. *Geundae hanguk bulgyo saron* (Essays in the History of Modern Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1988.
- Bulgyo sinmun-sa (The Official Newspaper Company of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism), ed. *Hanguk bulgyo inmul sasang-sa* (The History of Eminent Thinkers in Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1990.
- Buswell, Robert E., Jr., trans. *Tracing Back the Radiance: Chinul's Korean Way of Zen*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Korean Approach to Zen: The Collected Works of Chinul*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Zen Monastic Experience*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. *Currents and Countercurrents: Korean Influences on the East Asian Buddhist Traditions*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. *Religions of Korea in Practice*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Buzo, Adrian and Tony Prince, trans. *Kyunyŏ-jŏn: The Life, Times and Songs of a Tenth-Century Korean Monk*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1994.
- Chan, Wing-tsit, trans. and comp. *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- Chang, Chung-yüan, trans. *The Original Teachings of Ch'an Buddhism: Selected from the Transmission of the Lamp*. New York: Random House, 1969.
- Chang, Garma C. C. *The Buddhist Teaching of Totality: The Philosophy of Hwa Yen Buddhism*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971.
- Chappell, David, ed. *T'ien-t'ai Buddhism: An Outline of the Fourfold Teachings*. Tokyo: Daiichi shobō, 1983.
- Ch'en, Kenneth. *Buddhism in China: A Historical Survey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Chinese Transformation of Buddhism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.
- Ch'oe, Chun-sik. *Buddhism: Religion in Korea*. Seoul: Ewha Womans University Press, 2007.
- Chŏng, Pyŏng-jo. *History of Korean Buddhism*. Seoul: Jimoondang, 2007.
- Chun, Shin-yong, ed. *Buddhist Culture in Korea*. Seoul: Si-sa-yong-sa Publishers, 1982.
- Cleary, J. C., trans. *A Buddha from Korea: The Zen Teaching of T'aego*. Boston: Shambhala, 1988.
- Cleary, Thomas, trans. *The Flower Ornament Scripture*. 3 vols. Boulder: Shambhala, 1984-1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Entry into the Inconceivable: An Introduction to Hua-yen Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and J. C. Cleary, trans. *The Blue Cliff*. Boulder: Shambhala, 1978.



- Conze, Edward. *Buddhism: Its Essence and Development*. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.
- Cook, Francis H. *Hua-yen Buddhism: The Jewel Net of Indra*. University Park & London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1977.
- de Bary, William Theodore, ed. *The Buddhist Tradition in India, China and Japan*. New York: A Vintage Book, 1972.
- Dongguk daehakgyo seongnim dongmun-hoe (Dongguk University's Monastic Alumni Association), ed. *Hanguk bulgyo hyeondae-sa* (The History of Modern Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Sigong-sa, 1997.
- Dongsan mundo-hoe and Gim Gwangsik. *Dongsan daejongsa wa bulgyo jeonghwa undong* (Great Master Ha Dongsan and Purification Buddhist Movement). Busan: Beomeo-sa Temple, 2007.
- Dumoulin, Heinrich. *A History of Zen Buddhism*. 2 vols. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.
- Faure, Bernard. *The Rhetoric of Immediacy: A Cultural Critique of Chan/Zen Buddhism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Chan Insights and Oversights: An Epistemological Critique of the Chan Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Power of Denial: Buddhism, Purity, and Gender*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Chan Buddhism in Ritual Contexts*. London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Red Thread: Buddhist Approaches to Sexuality*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Fung, Yu-lan. Derk Bodde, trans. *A History of Chinese Philosophy*. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952.
- Galtung, Johan. *Buddhism: A Quest for Unity and Peace*. Honolulu: Dae Won Sa Buddhist Temple of Hawaii, 1988.
- Gang Geon-gi. *Moguja Jinul yeongu* (Research in Bojo Jinul). Seoul: Bucheonim sesang, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jeonghye gyeolsa-mun gang-ui* (Lectures on the *Jeonghye gyeolsa-mun*). Seoul: Bulil chulpan-sa, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Bojo guksa Jinul ui saeng-ae wa sasang* (Life and Thought of National Master Bojo Jinul). Seoul: Bulil chulpan-sa, 2010.
- Gang Seokju and Bak Gyeonghun. *Bulgyo geunse baengyeon* (Modern Korean Buddhism during 100 Years). Revised Edition. Seoul: Minjok-sa, 2002.

- Garfield, Jay L., trans. *The Fundamental Wisdom of the Middle Way: Nāgārjuna's Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Geum-o seon suhaeng yeongu-won (The Research Institute for Seon Master Jeong Geum-o's Seon Praxis), ed. *Geum-o seunim gwa bulgyo jeonghwa undong* (Master Jeong Geum-o and Purification Buddhist Movement). 2 vols. Seoul: Geum-o seon suhaeng yeongu-won, 2008.
- Gim Gwangsik. *Manhae Han Yongun pyeongjeon* (A Critical Biography of Manhae Han Yongun). Extended Version. 2004. Seoul: Jangseung, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Hanguk hyeondae bulgyo-sa yeongu* (Research on the History of Contemporary Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Bulgyo sidae-sa, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Uriga salaon hanguk bulgyo 100 nyeon* (Korean Buddhism during Recent 100 Years). Seoul: Minjok-sa, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Hanguk geundae bulgyo ui hyeonsil uisik* (Understanding of Society in Modern Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Hanguk geundae bulgyo-sa yeongu* (Research in the History of Modern Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Hanguk bulgyo 100 nyeon: 1900-1999* (Modern Korean Buddhism: 1900-1999). Seoul: Minjok-sa, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sae bulgyo undong ui jeon-gae: Seongchallo bon 20 segi uri bulgyo* (The Development of New Movements in Korean Buddhism in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century). Anseong: Dopian-sa Temple Press, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Yongseong*. Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Geun-hyeondae hanguk bulgyo ui jaejomyeong* (Reexamination of Modern and Contemporary Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Minjok-sa, 2000.
- Gim Gyeongjip. *Hanguk geundae bulgyo-sa* (The History of Modern Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Gyeongseo-won, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Hanguk bulgyo gaehyeong-non* (Theories of Korean Buddhist Reform). Seoul: Jingak-jong haein-haeng, 2001.
- Gim Ilta, et al. *Hyeondae goseung inmul pyeongjeon* (Biographies of Modern Korean Buddhist Eminent Monks). Seoul: Bulgyo yeongsang, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Beommang-gyeong bosal-gye* (Bodhisattva Precepts in the *Brahma Net Sutra*). 5 vols. Seoul: Hyorim, 1992.
- Gim Sunseok. *Ilje sidae joseon chongdok-bu ui bulgyo jeongchaek gwa bulgyo ui daeeung* (Japanese Government-General's Policies on Korean Buddhism and Korean Buddhism's Reactions). Seoul: Gyeong-in munhwa-sa, 2004.

- Gim Yeongtae. *Hanguk bulgyo-sa* (History of Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Gyeongseo-won, 1997.
- Gim Yongtae. *Joseon hugi bulgyo-sa yeongu: Imje beoptong gwa gyohak jeontong* (Research on the History of Late Jogye Dynasty: Imje Seon Dharma Lineage and Doctrinal Tradition). Seoul: Singu munhwa-sa, 2010.
- Gimello, Robert M. "Chih-yen (602-668) and the Foundations of Hua-yen Buddhism." Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1976.
- Grayson, James Huntley. *Korea: A Religious History*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Myths and Legends from Korea: An Annotated Compendium of Ancient and Modern Materials*. Richmond: Curzon, 2001.
- Gregory, Peter N., ed. *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*. Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 4. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Inquiry into the Origin of Humanity: An Annotated Translation of Tsung-mi's Yuan jen lün with a Modern Commentary*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1995.
- Ha Dongsan, ed. (Seok) Dongbong, trans. *Yongseong keun seunim eorok: Pyeongsangsim i do ra ireuji malla* (Grand Master Baek Yongseong's Analects). Seoul: Bulgwang chulpan-bu, 1993.
- Han Bogwang. *Yongseong seonsa yeongu* (Research in Seon Master Yongseong). Seoul: Gamno-dang, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_, trans. Fujiyoshi Jikai. *Seonjeong ssangsu ui jeon-gae* (The Development of the Chan / Pure Land Syncretism). Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1991.
- Hershock, Peter D. *Reinventing the Wheel: A Buddhist Response to the Information Age*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1999.
- Hogarth, Hyun-key Kim. *Syncretism of Buddhism and Shamanism in Korea*. Korean Studies Series, no. 21. Seoul: Jimoondang, 2002.
- Hong, Sungshim, ed. *The Great Seon Masters of Korea*. Seoul: Eastward, 2007.
- Hu Shi. *Shenhui heshang yiji* (Master Shenhui's Posthumous Manuscripts). Shanghai: Yadong tushuguan, 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Hu Shi wencun* (Hu Shi's Manuscripts). 4 volumes. Taipei: Yuandong tushu gongsi, 1953.
- Hubbard, Jamie and Paul L. Swanson, eds. *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm over Critical Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997.

- Hyon Gak, trans. Cheongheo Hyujeong. *The Mirror of Zen: The Classic Guide to Buddhist Practice by So Sahn*. Boston: Shambhala, 2006.
- I Byeongdo, trans. I Neunghwa. *Joseon bulgyo tongsa: Geundae pyeon* (The History of Korean Buddhism: The Part of Modern Period). Seoul: Hyeon, 2003.
- I Jigwan. *Hanguk bulgyo soi gyeongjeon yeongu* (Research on Authoritative Scriptures in Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Dongguk daehakgyo seongnim-hoe, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Hanguk bulgyo gyeul jeontong: Hanguk bulgyo gyebeop ui jajujeok jeonseung* (Korean Buddhism's Vinaya Tradition: Korean Buddhism's Independent Transmission of the Vinaya Teaching). Seoul: Gasan bulgyo munhwa yeongu-won, 2005.
- I Jong-ik and Sim Jaeryeol, comm. and trans. *Seon-ga gwigam* (The Guiding Source of Seon Community). Seoul: Boseong munhwa-sa, 1999.
- I Neunghwa. *Joseon bulgyo tongsa* (The History of Korean Buddhism). 3 vols. Seoul: Sinmun-sa, 1918.
- I Seongcheol. *Hanguk bulgyo ui beommaek* (The Orthodox Dharma Lineage of Korean Buddhism). Hapcheon, South Korea: Janggyeong-gak, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Seonmun jeongno* (The Correct Path of Seon Buddhism). Hapcheon, South Korea: Haein chongnim, 1981.
- I Yeongja, trans. Che-gwan. *Cheontae sagyo-ui* (Introduction to Tiantai Buddhism's Four Teachings). Seoul: Gyeongseo-won, 1988.
- Im Hye bong. *Chinil bulgyo-ron* (Research on Pro-Japanese Colonial Korean Buddhism). 2 vols. Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jongjeong yeoljeon 1: Geu nuga keun kkum eul kkaeyeot na?* (Who Awakened the Dreams?). *Jongjeong yeoljeon 1* (The 1<sup>st</sup> Series of the Biographies of Modern Korean Buddhism's Supreme Patriarchs). Seoul: Garam gihoe, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ilje ha bulgyo-gye ui hang-il undong* (Korean Buddhism's Anti-Japanese Independence Movement under Japanese Occupation). Seoul: Minjok-sa, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Chinil seungnyeo baekpal-in: Kkeut naji anneun yeoksa ui mureum* (108 Pro-Japanese Korean Monks: Unanswered Historical Questions). Seoul: Cheongnyeon-sa, 2005.
- Inada, Kenneth K. *Nāgārjuna: A Translation of His Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā with an Introductory Essay*. Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1970.

- Iwashita Denshirō, ed. *Tairiku jinja taikan* (Outline of Japanese Shintō Shrines in East Asia). Reprint. Tōkyō: Yumani Shobō, 2005.
- Jaffe, Richard. *Neither Monk nor Layman: Clerical Marriage in Modern Japanese Buddhism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Jo Myeonggi. *Silla bulgyo ui inyeom gwa yeoksa* (The Ideologies and History of Korean Buddhism in Silla). Seoul: Sintaeyang-sa, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Goryeo Daegak guksa wa cheontae sasang* (National Master Daegak Uicheon and his Cheontae Thought). 1962. Seoul: Gyeongseo-won, 1982.
- Jeong Gwangho. *Geundae Han-il bulgyo gwangye-sa yeongu: Ilbon ui singminji jeongchaek gwa gwannyeon hayeo* (Research in the History of Modern Relations between Korean Buddhism and Japanese Buddhism: Centering on Japan's Colonial Policies). Incheon: Inha University Press, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ilbon chimnyak sigi ui Han-il bulgyo gwan-gye-sa* (The History of Modern Relations between Korean Buddhism and Japanese Buddhism during Japan's Occupation Period). Seoul: Areumdaun sesang, 2001.
- Jiam Mundo-hoe (Association of I Jong-uk's Dharma Descendants). *Jiam hwasang pyeongjeon* (A Critical Biography of I Jong-uk). Seoul: Samjang-won, 1991.
- Jongdan-sa ganhaeng wiwon-hoe (Publication Committee for the History of the Taego Order of Korean Buddhism), ed. *Taego jongsu: Hanguk bulgyo jeongtong jongdan ui yeoksa* (The History of the Taego Order of Korean Buddhism: The History of an Orthodox Order in Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Hanguk bulgyo chulpan-bu, 2006.
- Jorgensen, John, and Eun-su Cho, trans. Baegun (1299-1375). *The Essential Passages Directly Pointing at Essence of the Mind*. Seoul: Jogye Order Publishing, 2005.
- Kalupahana, David. *A History of Buddhist Philosophy: Continuities and Discontinuities*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Buddhist Philosophy: A Historical Analysis*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Causality: A Central Philosophy of Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ethics in Early Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Nāgārjuna: The Philosophy of the Middle Way: Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1986.
- Kang, Wi Jo. *Religion and Politics in Korea under the Japanese Rule*. Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1997.

- Kamata Shigeo, trans. *Zengen shosenshū tojo* (The Preface to the *Collected Writings on the Source of Chan*). Zen no goroku, vol. 9. Tokyo: Chukuma shobō, 1971.
- Kamstra, J. H. *Encounter or Syncretism: The Initial Growth of Japanese Buddhism*. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1967.
- Kasulis, T. P. *Zen Action / Zen Person*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1981.
- Kawamura, Leslie S., trans. Gadjin M. Nagao. *Mādhyamika and Yogācāra*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1991.
- Keel, Hee-sung. *Chinul: The Founder of the Korean Sōn Tradition*. Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series, no. 6. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Kim, Chong-sō, ed. *Reader in Korean Religion*. Seongnam, South Korea: Academy of Korean Studies, 1993.
- Kim, Dal-yong, trans. Iryeon. *Overlooked Historical Records of the Three Korean Kingdoms*. Seoul: Jimoondang, 2006.
- Kim, Jong-in. *Philosophical Context for Wonhyo's Interpretation of Buddhism*. Seoul: Jimoondang, 2004.
- Kim, Sang-hyōn, et al. *Korean Buddhism in East Asian Perspectives*. Korean Studies Series, no. 35. Seoul: Jimoondang, 2007.
- King, Sallie. "The Active Self: A Philosophical Study of the *Buddha Nature Treatise* and Other Chinese Buddhist Texts." Ph.D. Dissertation, Temple University, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Buddha Nature*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1991.
- Kiyota, Minoru, ed. *Mahayana Buddhist Meditation: Theory and Practice*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1978.
- Korean Buddhist Jogye Order, ed. *What is Korean Buddhism?* Seoul: Korean Buddhist Jogye Order, 2002.
- (The) Korean Buddhist Research Institute, ed. *The History and Culture of Buddhism in Korea*. Seoul: Dongguk University Press, 1993.
- Kusan. *Nine Mountains*. Seungju, South Korea: International Meditation Center, Song Gwang Sa Monastery, 1976.
- Lai, Whalen. "The Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna (*Ta-sheng ch'i-hsin lun*): A Study of the Unfolding of Sinitic Mahāyāna Motifs." Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1975.

- Lancaster, Lewis, Kikun Suh, and Chai-shin Yu, eds. *Buddhism in Koryō: A Royal Religion*. Fremont, California: Asian Humanities Press, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Chai-shin Yu, eds. *Buddhism in the Early Chosŏn: Suppression and Transformation*. Fremont, California: Asian Humanities Press, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_, eds. *Assimilation of Buddhism in Korea: Religious Maturity and Innovation in the Silla Dynasty*. Fremont, California: Asian Humanities Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_, eds. *Introduction of Buddhism to Korea: New Cultural Patterns*. Fremont, California: Asian Humanities Press, 1989.
- Liu, Ming-wood. "The Teaching of Fa-tsang: An Examination of Buddhist Metaphysics." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California – Los Angeles, 1979.
- Lopez, Donald S., Jr., ed. *Buddhist Hermeneutics*. Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 6. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986.
- Lusthaus, Dan. *Buddhist Phenomenology: A Philosophical Investigation of Yogācāra Buddhism and the Ch'eng Wei-shih Lun*. London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.
- McRae, John R. *The Northern School of the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*. Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 3. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Seeing through Zen: Encounter, Transformation, and Genealogy in Chinese Chan Buddhism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- Muller, Charles. "Korean Buddhism: A Short Overview."  
<http://www.hm.tyg.jp/~acmuller/kor-bud/korbud-overview.html> (accessed January 3, 2008).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment: Korean Buddhism's Guide to Meditation, with the Commentary by Kihwa*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1999.
- Mun Chanju. "Minjung bulgyo gyopan-reul seugi wihan siron" (Some Attempts to Establish the Doctrinal Classification of Minjung (Liberation) Buddhism). *Dongguk sasang* (Annual Journal of the Buddhist College of Dongguk University) 24 (1991): 109-138.
- Mun, Chanju. "Historical Introduction to Minjing Buddhism (Korean Liberation Buddhism) in 1980's." *Kankoku Bukkyōgaku Semina-* (Journal of Korean Buddhist Seminar) 9 (2003): 239-270.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Yun Goam (1899-1988) and Peacemaking: Theory and Practice." *Daegak sasang* (Maha Bodhi Thought) 12 (2009): 243-293.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Buddhism and Peace: An Overview." In *Buddhist Roles in Peacemaking: How Buddhism Can Contribute to Sustainable Peace*. Edited by Chanju Mun and Ronald S. Green. Honolulu: Blue Pine, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Preface: Yun Goam (1899-1988), the First Spiritual Leader of Dae Won Sa Buddhist Temple: A Biography of His Peacemaking Activities." In *Buddhist Roles in Peacemaking: How Buddhism Can Contribute to Sustainable Peace*. Edited by Chanju Mun and Ronald S. Green. Honolulu: Blue Pine, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Imperialism and Temple Properties: A Case Study of Korean Buddhism during Japan's Occupation Period (1910-45)." *Hsi Lai Journal of Humanistic Buddhism* 7 (2006): 278-294.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Purification Buddhist Movement, 1954-62: The Recovery of Traditional Monasticism from Japanized Buddhism in South Korea." *Hsi Lai Journal of Humanistic Buddhism* 8 (2007): 278-294.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Peacemakers vs. Anti-peacemakers: Four Forms of Modern Korean Buddhism." In *Fojiao yu dangdai renwen guanhuai: Foxue yanjiu lunwenji* (Buddhism and Contemporary Humanities: The Collection of the Papers in Buddhist Studies). Edited by Foguang wenjiao jijin-hui (Fo Guang Shan Foundation for Culture and Education). Kaohsiung, Taiwan: Foguang wenjiao jijin-hui, 2008. 47-70 (in Chinese), 553-590 (in English).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wonhyo (617-686): A Critic of Sectarian Doctrinal Classifications." *Hsi Lai Journal of Humanistic Buddhism* 6 (2005): 290-306.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The History of Doctrinal Classification in Chinese Buddhism: A Study of the Panjiao Systems*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Ronald S. Green, eds. *Buddhist Exploration of Peace and Justice*. Honolulu: Blue Pine, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Buddhism and Peace: Theory and Practice*. Honolulu: Blue Pine, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The World is One Flower: Buddhist Leadership for Peace*. Honolulu: Blue Pine, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Mediators and Meditators: Buddhism and Peacemaking*. Honolulu: Blue Pine, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Ronald S. Green, eds. *Buddhist Roles in Peacemaking: How Buddhism Can Contribute to Sustainable Peace*. Honolulu: Blue Pine, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ha Dongsan and Colonial Korean Buddhism: Balancing Sectarianism and Ecumenism*. Honolulu: Blue Pine, 2009.
- Murti, T. R. V. *The Central Philosophy of Buddhism*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1960.



- Mu Soeng. *Thousand Peaks: Korean Zen – Tradition and Teachers*. Cumberland, Rhode Island: Primary Point Press, 1991.
- Nukariya, Kaiten. *Chōsen zenkyō-shi* (The History of Seon and Doctrine Tradition in Korean Buddhism). Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1930.
- Odin, Steve. *Process Metaphysics and Hua-yen Buddhism: A Critical Study of Cumulative Penetration vs. Interpenetration*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Social Self in Zen and American Pragmatism*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Artistic Detachment in Japan and the West: Psychic Distance in Comparative Aesthetics*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001.
- O Beoban. *Wonhyo ui hwajaeng sasang yeongu* (Wonhyo's Theory of Harmonization). Seoul: Hongbeop-won, 1989.
- Oh, Kang Nam. "A Study of Chinese Hua-yen Buddhism with Special Reference to the *Dharmadhātu* (*fa-chieh*) Doctrine." Ph.D. Dissertation, McMaster University, 1976.
- Oh, Young-bong. *Wonhyo's Theory of Harmonization*. Seoul: Hongbeop-won, 1989.
- Osuka, Shigeru. *The Very Mahayana Buddhist Ethics: Introduction and Translation of the Fan-wan-ching*. Tokyo: Chuo University Press, 2005.
- Park, Jin Y., ed. *Makers of Modern Korean Buddhism*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2010.
- Park, Pori. "The Modern Remaking of Korean Buddhism: The Korean Reform Movement during Japanese Colonial Rule and Han Yongun's (1879-1944) Buddhism." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California – Los Angeles, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Trial and Error in Modernist Reforms: Korean Buddhism under Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, 2009.
- Park, Sung-bae. *Buddhist Faith and Sudden Enlightenment*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wonhyo's Commentaries on the *Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna*." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California – Berkeley, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *One Korea's Approach to Buddhism: The Mom / Momjit Paradigm*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2009.
- Park, Young E., trans. *The Collected Writings of Gyeongheo*. 2 vols. Seoul: Jogye Order Publishing, 2007.

- Seo, Kyung-bo. "A Study of Korean Zen Buddhism Approached through the *Chodangjip*." Ph.D. Dissertation, Temple University, 1960.
- (Seok) Beopseong, Hwang Pilho, et al. *Minjung bulgyo ui tamgu* (Research in Minjung Buddhism). Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1989.
- Seok Myeongjeong, trans. and comm. *Hwajung yeonhwa sosik* (Letters from a Lotus in Fire). Yangsan, South Korea: Geungnak-am Hermitage Seon Center, Tongdo-sa Temple, 1984.
- Seok Yeon-gwan, trans. Yunqi Zhuhong. *Jukchang supil* (Jottings under a Bamboo Window). Seoul: Bulgwang chulpan-bu, 1991.
- Seonu Doryang, ed. *22 in ui jeung-eon eul tonghae bon geun-hyeondae bulgyo-sa* (The History of Modern and Contemporary Korean Buddhism Seen through 22 Witnesses). Seoul: Minjok-sa, 2002.
- Seon Wonbin. *Hanguk geundae bulgyo ui sanmaek sipchil in: Keun seunim* (Modern Korean Buddhism's 17 Great Monks. Seoul: Beopbo sinmun-sa, 1992.
- Sharf, Robert H. *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002.
- Shih, Heng-ching. *The Syncretism of Ch'an and Pure Land Buddhism*. Asian Thought and Culture Series, no. 9. New York: Peter Lang, 1992.
- Shim, Jae-ryong. *Korean Buddhism: Tradition and Transformation*. Korea Studies Series, no. 8. Seoul: Jimoondang, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Philosophical Foundation of Korean Zen Buddhism: The Integration of Sŏn and Kyo by Chinul (1158-1210)." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Hawaii – Manoa, 1979.
- Shim Jae-ryong. *Dongyang ui jihye wa seon* (Eastern Wisdom and Seon Buddhism). Seoul: Segye-sa, 1990.
- Sim Jaeyeol, trans. *Bojo beobeo* (The Collected Works of Bojo Jinul). Seoul: Boseong munhwa-sa, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Bosal gyebon Beommang-gyeong* (Bodhisattva Precepts of the *Brahma Net Sutra*). Seoul: Boseong munhwa-sa, 1979.
- Sin Beobin. *Seosan daesa ui Seon-ga gwigam yeongu* (Research in Cheongheo Hyujeong's *The Guiding Source of Seon Community*). Seoul: Singiwon-sa, 1983.
- Sin Beopta. *Bukhan bulgyo yeongu: Isip segi choe-geunse ui bukhan bulgyo byeonhwa e daehan yeongu* (Research in North Korean Buddhism: A Study of North Korean Buddhism in Most Current Times of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century). Seoul: Minjok-sa, 2000.

- Song Wolju, et al. *Gyodan Jeonghwa undong gwa Jogye-jong ui oneul* (Purification Buddhist Movement and the Current Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Seonu Doryang Press, 2001.
- Suh, Jung-hyung. "Taoist Impact on Hua-yen Buddhism: A Study of the Formation of Hua-yen Worldview." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin – Madison, 1997.
- Suh, Sharon A. *Being Buddhist in a Christian World: Gender and Community in a Korean American Temple*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007.
- Suzuki, D.T. and Kōda Rentarō, eds., *Tonkō shutsudo Rokuso dankyō* (The Dunhuang Edition of the *Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch*). Tokyo: Morie shoten, 1934.
- \_\_\_\_\_, eds. *Kōshō-ji bon Rokuso dankyō* (The Kōshō-ji Edition of the *Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch*). Tokyo: Morie shoten, 1934.
- Swanson, Paul L. *Foundation of T'ien-t'ai Philosophy: The Flowering of the Two Truths Theory in Chinese Buddhism*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1995.
- Taego Order of Korean Buddhism, ed. *Taego jongsā: Hanguk bulgyo jeongtong jongdan ui yeoksa* (The History of the Taego Order of Korean Buddhism: The History of an Orthodox Order in Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Hanguk bulgyo chulpan-bu, 2006.
- Takakusu, Junjirō. *The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1947.
- Tikhonov, Vladimir and Owen Miller, trans. *Selected Writings of Han Yongun: From Social Darwinism to Socialism with a Buddhist Face*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2008.
- Ui Hakuju. *Zenshū-shi kenkyū* (Research in the History of Chan Buddhism). Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1941.
- Victoria, Brian D. *Zen at War*. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Zen War Stories*. London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.
- Vorenkamp, Dirck. "Hua-yen Buddhism: Faith and Time in Fa-tsang's Thought." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin – Madison, 1997.
- Weinstein, Stanley. *Buddhism under the T'ang*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Welch, Holmes. *The Buddhist Revival in China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism 1900-1950*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Welter, Albert. *The Meaning of Myriad Good Deeds: A Study of Yung-ming Yen-shou and the Wan-shan t'ung-kuei chi*. Asian Thought and Culture Series, no. 13. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.
- Williams, Paul. *Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Anthony Tribe. *Buddhist Thought: A Complete Introduction to the Indian Tradition*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Won, Yi Beom, and Byeongho Lim. *A History of Korean Buddhist Culture and Some Essays: The Buddhist Pure Land and the Christian Kingdom of Heaven*. Seoul: Jimoondang, 1992.
- Wright, Arthur F. *Buddhism in Chinese History*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.
- Wright, Dale S. "Emptiness and Paradox in the Thought of Fa-tsang." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Iowa, 1980.
- Yabuki Keiki, comp. *Meisha yoin* (Rare and Unknown Chinese Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Discovered in Dunhuang, Collected by Sir Aurel Stein and Preserved in British Museum). Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1930.
- Yampolsky, Philip B. *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.
- Yeo Ikgu. *Minjung bulgyo cheolhak* (Philosophy of Minjung Buddhism). Seoul: Minjok-sa, 1988.
- Yeocheon Mubi, trans. and comm. Yongming Yanshou. *Bosal gye leul banneun gil* (Ways to Receive Bodhisattva Precepts). Busan: Yeomhwa-sil, 2008.
- Yoshizu Yoshihide. *Kegon-zen no shisōshi-teki kenkyū* (Research in Chinese Huayan Chan Buddhism). Tokyo: Daitō shuppan-sha, 1985.
- Yü, Chün-fang. *The Renewal of Buddhism in China: Chu-hung and the Late Ming Synthesis*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Kuan-yin: The Chinese Transformation of Avalokiteśvara*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Yu Seogam. *Beommang-gyeong: Yu Seogam yulsa seolbeop* (The Brahma Net Sutra and Vinaya Master Yu Seogam's Sermons). Seoul: Daehak chulpan-sa, 1988.

- Yun Seonhyo, ed. *Goam daejongsa beobeo-jip: Jabi bosal ui gil* (Great Master Goam's Analects: The Ways of a Compassionate Bodhisattva). Seoul: Bulgyo yeongsang hoebo-sa, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Goam keunseunim pyeongjeon: Nege han mulgeon i itteuni* (A Critical Biography of Great Master Yun Goam). Seoul: Bulgyo yeongsang, 1994.
- Yun, Woncheol. "On the Theory of Sudden Enlightenment and Sudden Practice in Korean Buddhism: Texts and Contexts of the Subitist / Gradualist Debates Regarding *Sŏnmun chŏngno*." Ph.D. Dissertation, SUNY – Stony Brook, 1994.
- Zeuschner, Robert. "An Analysis of the Philosophical Criticisms of Northern Ch'an Buddhism." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Hawaii – Manoa, 1977.
- Zürcher, Erik. *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*. 2 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.



## INDEX

An Deogam (1913-2003), 222, 282,  
284, 319, 321, 322, 329  
An Hyeun (1911-2009), 259  
An Jinho (1880-1965), 39  
An Junggeun (1879-1910), 149  
An Seogyeon, 204, 205

Bae Hongsik, 262  
Bae Myochan, 259  
Bae Myojeon (d. 2003), 259  
Baek Chowol, 159  
Baek Gyeongbal, 286  
Baek Gyeongha, 221  
Baek Hangmyeong (1867-1929),  
210, 211  
Baek Seong-uk (1897-1981), 160,  
162, 262  
Baek Yongseong (1864-1940), 36,  
37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 48, 49, 57, 58,  
83, 86, 88, 89, 90, 93, 139, 142,  
146, 157, 158, 159, 160, 175,  
182, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193,  
194, 198, 203, 204, 208, 210,  
211, 212, 233, 345, 346, 348,  
372, 377, 383  
Baizhang Huaihai (720-814), 25  
Bak Beomnyong (1914-2005), 251,  
276, 286, 287, 297, 321  
Bak Bogak, 205  
Bak Bon-gong, 251  
Bak Byeogan (1901-1988), 251,  
294, 297, 332, 337, 349, 353  
Bak Byeongsu, 284

Bak Changdu, 162, 163  
Bak Chudam (1898-1978), 251,  
286, 318, 321, 327  
Bak Chunhae, 262  
Bak Daegyū, 204, 205  
Bak Daeryun (1884-1979), 38, 264,  
286, 288, 289, 290, 296, 312,  
315, 354, 356, 359, 361, 365,  
366, 368  
Bak Dong-am (1904-1969), 251,  
280, 286  
Bak Gapdeuk, 368  
Bak Geumbong, 246, 259, 286  
Bak Geunseop, 163, 222  
Bak Gijong (1907-1987), 293, 296,  
329, 335, 336, 337, 343, 344,  
346, 347, 348  
Bak Gowon, 262  
Bak Gyeonghun (b. 1934), 167,  
169, 242, 243, 381  
Bak Haedang, 50, 52, 53  
Bak Hanyeong (1890-1948), 36, 40,  
43, 55, 65, 138, 141, 148, 162,  
173, 174, 194, 195, 196, 207,  
208, 214, 223, 227, 378  
Bak Huido (1889-1952), 158  
Bak Huiseung, 168  
Bak Hyeok, 286, 297  
Bak Ilgyeong (1920-1994), 353  
Bak Ingok (1895-1961), 246, 250,  
252, 274, 276, 278, 279, 286,  
296  
Bak Jangneung, 303  
Bak Jeong-am, 251  
Bak Jeonghui (1917-1979), 60, 62,  
82, 127, 136, 224, 238, 316, 317,

- 318, 327, 346, 347, 356, 357,  
361, 365  
Bak Jonghong (1903-1976), 327  
Bak Min-o, 160  
Bak Munseong (1897-1997), 297,  
321, 329  
Bak Seobong, 321  
Bak Seogak, 262, 353  
Bak Seongwon, 262, 286  
Bak Seongha (b. 1907), 245, 252,  
257, 260, 261  
Bak Seongsu, 297  
Bak Seungnyong (1918-1996), 262,  
319, 327, 352  
Bak Wonchan, 218  
Bak Yeonghui (1892-1990), 163,  
222, 223  
Bak Yeonghyo (1861-1939), 158,  
191  
Bak Yonghwa, 286  
Bak Yunjin (1905-1950), 163, 221,  
223  
Bang Hanam (1876-1951), 36, 37,  
40, 42, 43, 63, 64, 65, 90, 163,  
210, 213, 215, 217, 276, 335  
Beomhae Gagan (1820-1896), 84,  
86  
Beomil (810-889), 24, 27, 48, 65,  
66, 70, 72, 73, 77, 78, 142, 253  
Bodhidharma (c. 470-543), 51, 143  
Bodhiruci (d. 527), viii, 4  
Bojo Chejing (804-880), 25  
Buddhabhadra (359-429), 93  
Buhyu Seonsu (1543-1612), 39, 69,  
71, 73  
Buswell, Robert E., Jr, 33, 147, 375,  
379  
Buyong Yeonggwon (1485-1571),  
39, 53, 54, 71  
Byeokdam Haengin, 39  
Byeokgye Jeongsim, 53, 69  
Byeoksong Jieom (1464-1534), 53,  
54  
Byeon Bong-am, 321  
Byeon Wolju, 222, 262  
Caoshan Benji (840-901), 28  
Center for Seon Studies (Seonhak-  
won), 60, 208, 210, 211, 212,  
241, 243, 244, 246, 247, 248,  
256, 259, 260  
Cha Ikgyo, 248  
Cha Sangmyeong (1895-1945), 163,  
170, 217  
Cha Seonghwan, 89  
Chae Byeogam (1924-2005), 244,  
245, 251, 297, 321, 341, 342,  
343, 344  
Chae Inhwan (b. 1931), 16  
Changtao Hanpo, 85, 88, 89  
Che-gwan (d. 970), 7, 31, 32, 384  
Chengguan (738-839), viii, 33, 34,  
41, 57  
Choe Beomsul (1904-1979), 65,  
162, 163, 223, 226  
Choe Bongsu, 162, 163  
Choe Dacheon, 321  
Choe Gaphwan (b. 1910), 262, 302  
Choe Gyu-nam (1898-1992), 303  
Choe Ildo, 232  
Choe Je-u (1824-1864), 134  
Choe Munhwan (1916-1975), 327  
Choe Namseon (1890-1957), 158,  
159, 163  
Choe Rin (1878-1958), 149, 158,  
159, 160  
Choe Wolsan (1912-1997), 251,  
297, 321, 347, 348, 349



- Choe Wongwang, 282  
 Choe Wonheo (1889-1966), 251, 256, 276, 278, 286, 289, 292, 318  
 Choe Wonjong, 347, 348  
 Choui Uisun (1786-1860), 84, 86  
 Cibian Congjian, 31, 32  
 Confucianism, 131, 132, 208
- Daeun (1780-1841), 49, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89, 90  
 Dahui Zonggao (1089-1163), 48, 378  
 Daowu Yuanzhi (*c.* 769-835), 27  
 Daoxuan (596-667), 25  
 Do Jinho, 159, 162, 163  
 Dōgen Kigen (1200-1253), 28  
 Doheon (824-882), 28, 314  
 Dongshan Liangjie (807-869), 28  
 Doseon (827-898), 26  
 Doui (d. 821), ix, 24, 25, 26, 37, 40, 65, 66, 70, 71, 72, 73, 77, 78, 253, 254, 322  
 Doyun (798-868), 26, 27, 28
- ecumenical, vii, viii, 24, 32, 33, 60, 141, 142  
 ecumenism, vii, viii, ix, x, 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 49, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 69, 70, 71, 78, 199, 227, 231, 238, 330, 331, 368, 369, 370, 374  
 ecumenist, 24, 61
- Fazang (643-720), vii, vii, 5, 34  
 Fujiyoshi Jikai, 383
- Gang Beopjong, 352  
 Gang Bong-u (1892-1970), 158  
 Gang Daeryeon (1875-1942), 170, 180, 185, 188, 217  
 Gang Dobong, 209, 210, 211, 221  
 Gang Geon-gi (b. 1940), 381  
 Gang Hongdu, 187  
 Gang Jaeho, 162, 163  
 Gang Jaho, 259  
 Gang Minsu, 181  
 Gang Seokju (1909-2004), 167, 169, 242, 243, 251, 286, 297, 381  
 Gang Sinchang, 185  
 Gang Taesu, 205  
 Gang Yumun, 163  
 Geumdam Bomyeong (1765-1848), 84, 86  
 Geumhae Gwanyeong (1856-1926), 84  
 Geungyang (878-956), 28  
 Gi Seokho, 211  
 Gi Yudam, 250  
 Gihwa (1376-1433), viii, 8, 35, 54  
 Gim Beobil, 297  
 Gim Beomnin (1899-1964), 65, 160, 161, 162, 163, 221, 223, 240, 261, 262, 285, 354  
 Gim Beomnyong (1891-1969), 218, 232, 354, 355  
 Gim Beopjeon (b. 1925), 232  
 Gim Bogyeong, 246  
 Gim Byeogong, 206  
 Gim Cheol (1886-1934), 158, 262  
 Gim Cheong-an, 232  
 Gim Daeu, 251  
 Gim Daewol, 251, 276, 280, 282, 293, 294, 297

- Gim Daljin (1907-1989), 222  
 Gim Deongmyeong (b. 1926), 87  
 Gim Donghwa (1902-1980), 262  
 Gim Dongsam (1878-1937), 157  
 Gim Dongseon (1856-1936), 162  
 Gim Dongsin, 160  
 Gim Dotae (1891-1956), 158  
 Gim Giseok, 327  
 Gim Gosong (1906-2003), 286, 297  
 Gim Guha (1872-1965), 169, 170,  
     180, 181, 182, 217, 221, 241,  
     254, 286, 297, 335, 378  
 Gim Gwangsik, 11, 14, 16, 17, 21,  
     65, 67, 72, 74, 76, 148, 159, 162,  
     175, 176, 182, 184, 189, 190,  
     191, 192, 193, 211, 213, 221,  
     222, 227, 228, 229, 233, 235,  
     236, 241, 263, 343, 377, 381,  
     382  
 Gim Gyeongbong (1892-1982), 40,  
     241  
 Gim Gyeonghong, 163  
 Gim Gyeongju (b. 1896), 173, 174,  
     206  
 Gim Gyeongsan, 181, 215, 217,  
     221  
 Gim Gyeong-u (b. 1928), 251, 254,  
     280, 294, 297, 347, 348  
 Gim Gyeong-un (1862-1936), 138,  
     163, 213  
 Gim Gyeryun, 287  
 Gim Gyuhyeon, 160  
 Gim Gyuseon, 368  
 Gim Gyusik (1881-1950), 157, 158,  
     182  
 Gim Haeyun, 163  
 Gim Haksan, 138  
 Gim Hancheon, 244, 257, 291  
 Gim Heungsu, 187  
 Gim Honggyeong, 232, 246, 251,  
     286, 297  
 Gim Honhae, 172  
 Gim Hwanbong, 286, 287  
 Gim Hwan-eung (1847-1929), 162  
 Gim Hyangbong, 250, 251  
 Gim Hyanggok (1912-1978), 232,  
     246, 250, 286, 296  
 Gim Hyeam (1920-2001), 232  
 Gim Hyejeong (b. 1933), 352  
 Gim Hyejin (1908-1984), 279, 280,  
     286, 297  
 Gim Ildo, 286  
 Gim Ilhyeon, 287  
 Gim Ilta (1929-1999), 21, 92, 321,  
     382  
 Gim Iryeop (1896-1971), 345  
 Gim Jaun (1911-1992), 82, 83, 87,  
     88, 89, 90, 92, 232, 233, 234,  
     235, 246, 250, 252, 259, 297  
 Gim Jeogeum (1900-1961), 212,  
     213, 221, 245, 246, 250, 252,  
     256, 286, 297  
 Gim Jeonggi, 284  
 Gim Jeongseop, 173  
 Gim Jesan (1862-1930), 84, 90,  
     210  
 Gim Jihyo (1909-1989), 250, 284,  
     286, 294, 296, 321  
 Gim Jijun, 185  
 Gim Jiwol (1911-1973), 251, 286  
 Gim Jiyeong, 244, 245, 250, 251,  
     259, 287  
 Gim Jomyeong, 244  
 Gim Jonghak, 284  
 Gim Jongnae, 138, 139, 141  
 Gim Junyeol, 262  
 Gim Jwajin (1889-1930), 157  
 Gim Naksun, 232

- Gim Namhyeon, 284  
 Gim Namjeon (1868-1936), 209, 210, 212, 213  
 Gim Neunggak, 341, 342  
 Gim Palbong, 337  
 Gim Samdo, 222, 223  
 Gim Sangheon (1893-1945), 160  
 Gim Sangho, 161, 163, 185, 262, 266, 271, 272, 273, 274, 277, 279, 286, 288, 289, 293, 296  
 Gim Sangpil, 304  
 Gim Sangsuk, 180  
 Gim Sangwol, 221, 232  
 Gim Seokdu, 209, 210  
 Gim Seoksan, 251  
 Gim Seongsuk (1898-1969), 166, 174, 242  
 Gim Seoun (1903-1995), 251, 259, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 286, 293, 296, 297, 321, 337, 343  
 Gim Songwol, 204, 205  
 Gim Sunho, 303  
 Gim Suseong, 262  
 Gim Taeheup (1899-1989), 174, 190, 212, 377  
 Gim Tanheo (1913-1983), 90, 251, 276, 286, 294, 297  
 Gim Wanseok, 286, 287, 297  
 Gim Wolhyeon, 280, 287  
 Gim Wongwang, 251, 280  
 Gim Wonhyeon, 287  
 Gim Yangtaek, 284  
 Gim Yeonggu, 284  
 Gim Yeonghae, 172  
 Gim Yeonghwan, 310  
 Gim Yeon-gok, 148  
 Gim Yeongsu (1884-1967), 68, 70, 76, 354  
 Gim Yeongtae (b. 1933), v, 15, 17, 19, 22, 38, 383  
 Gim Yeonheo, 204, 205  
 Gim Yeon-il, 181  
 Gim Yongbong, 251  
 Gim Yonggok, 180  
 Gim Yonghak, 262  
 Gim Yongjun, 284  
 Gim Yoyeon, 158  
 Gim Yunsik (1835-1922), 149, 152, 158  
 Go Gwangdeok (1927-1999), 87, 88, 90, 347, 348, 352  
 Go Gyeongdeok, 278, 279, 281, 282, 286, 297  
 Go Yeongpyo, 187  
 gradual, ix  
 Green, Ronald S., xi, xii, 388  
 Gu Hansong, 297  
 Gu Jeoksong, 286  
 Gu Manhwa, 204, 205  
 Gugok Gagun, 53  
 Guk Mukdam (1896-1981), 63, 66, 84, 85, 262, 264, 286, 288, 289, 295, 297, 319, 355, 357  
 Guxin (1535-1615), 49, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91  
 Gwak Beopgyeong (b. 1877), 170, 180, 186  
 Gwak Gijong, 262  
 Gwak Jongseok (1846-1919), 158, 159  
 Gwon Dongjin (1861-1947), 157  
 Gwon Junghyeon (1854-1934), 191  
 Gwon Sangno (1879-1965), 37, 70, 77, 90, 170, 172, 174, 180, 254, 261, 262, 274, 279, 354, 356  
 Gyeongbo (868-948), 26  
 Gyeonghan (1298-1374), 34

- Gyunyeo (923-973), 8
- Ha Dongsan (1890-1965), viii, 2,  
10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 23, 29,  
37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 48, 49, 55, 56,  
57, 58, 63, 66, 76, 82, 83, 86, 87,  
89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 109, 142, 145,  
190, 191, 192, 213, 214, 215,  
239, 240, 241, 245, 246, 249,  
251, 252, 254, 255, 256, 260,  
261, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267,  
270, 273, 275, 276, 278, 280,  
281, 282, 283, 284, 286, 288,  
289, 293, 294, 296, 297, 298,  
308, 319, 333, 348, 377, 378,  
381, 383, 388
- Ha Hyeja, 283
- Ha Jiseon, 244
- Ham Taeyeong (1873-1964), 287,  
289
- Han Bogwang (b. 1950), 383
- Han Changsu (1862-1921), 191
- Han Gyuseol (1848-1930), 158
- Han Jaehwa, 262
- Han Jongsu, 205
- Han Seolje, 210
- Han Seonghun, 163
- Han Yongun (1879-1944), 72, 138,  
139, 140, 141, 146, 147, 148,  
149, 150, 151, 153, 156, 157,  
158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163,  
164, 165, 174, 182, 184, 185,  
186, 187, 195, 210, 211, 214,  
221, 242, 273, 274, 371, 372,  
377, 378, 382, 389, 391
- Hasekawa Yoshimichi (1850-1924),  
170
- Heo Hyejeong, 232
- Heo Yeongho (1900-1952), 163,  
218
- Hirotsu Setsusan, 141
- Ho-eun Munseong (1850-1918), 84
- Hong Gyeongsik, 284
- Hong Jinhyeok, 204
- Hong Jongcheol (1924-1974), 337
- Hong Poryong, 186
- Hong Seongmo, 173
- Hong Taeuk (d. 1945), 225
- Hong Wolcho (1858-1934), 176
- Hongcheok, 26
- Huangbo Xiyun (d. 850), 145
- Huiguan (d. 453), 5
- Huiju, 52
- Huineng (638-713), 27, 29, 48, 71,  
72, 143, 145, 293
- Huiyuan (523-597), viii, 4, 7, 8
- Hwanam Honsu (1320-1392), 53
- Hwang Geumbong, 171
- Hwang Gyeong-un, 163
- Hwang Hyeon (1855-1910), 153
- Hwang Sandeok (1917-1989), 291
- Hwang Seonggi, 321, 327
- Hwang Seongnyong, 319
- Hwang Uidon (1890-1964), 282
- Hwang Yongeum, 211
- Hwanseong Jian (1664-1729), 86
- Hyecheol (791-861), 26
- Hyeon O, 244, 245, 247, 258, 291,  
294
- Hyeon Sang-yun (1893-1950), 158
- Hyeon-uk (787-868), 26
- Hyujeong (1520-1604), viii, 8, 9,  
11, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 49,  
53, 54, 57, 69, 71, 73, 91, 143,  
144, 145, 229, 335, 341, 342,  
384, 390

- I Beobung, 251  
 I Beomhaeng (b. 1921), 343  
 I Beophong (1915-2003), 251, 252, 259  
 I Bodam (b. 1859), 176  
 I Chadon (501-527), 29 3  
 I Cheolgyo (b. 1947), 11, 14, 21, 65, 67, 74, 76, 190, 191, 192, 377  
 I Cheongdam (1902-1971), 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 37, 56, 214, 215, 226, 232, 234, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 255, 256, 257, 259, 260, 261, 265, 266, 267, 268, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 301, 304, 308, 313, 314, 318, 319, 321, 322, 324, 325, 327, 332, 333, 335, 337, 340, 341, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 353  
 I Chunseong (1891-1977), 161, 286  
 I Daecheol, 250, 251  
 I Daejeon, 189  
 I Daeui (1901-1978), 65, 240, 244, 251, 259, 270, 286, 296, 342  
 I Daeuk, 352  
 I Dojin, 286  
 I Dongheon (1896-1983), 286, 287, 297  
 I Dongjo, 222, 223, 262  
 I Dongnyeong (1869-1940), 157  
 I Dou, 232  
 I Ganggil, 163  
 I Gibung (1896-1960), 302  
 I Gwang-un, 303  
 I Haengwon (1927-2004), 314, 318, 321, 327  
 I Hagam, 148  
 I Heunggyo (b. 1942), 87  
 I Hoegwang (1862-1933), 138, 140, 141, 142, 146, 166, 169, 170, 180  
 I Honseong (b. 1886), 163, 203, 204, 262  
 I Hwaeung, 274, 279, 282, 288, 289, 296, 303  
 I Hyobong (1888-1966), 10, 11, 12, 17, 37, 40, 43, 56, 63, 66, 214, 215, 226, 227, 241, 245, 246, 250, 252, 254, 259, 270, 274, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 286, 289, 291, 292, 296, 297, 298, 328, 329, 332, 333, 353, 354, 358, 359, 360, 366  
 I Inhong (1908-1997), 259, 286, 294, 297  
 I Jaebok (1918-1991), 321, 322  
 I Jaehak (1904-1973), 302  
 I Jaeseok, 262  
 I Jae-ung, 277  
 I Jaeyeol (1915-1981), 10, 11, 12, 37, 53, 70, 72, 74, 76, 248, 254  
 I Jeong (b. 1956), 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 39, 91, 92, 97, 138, 147, 159, 168, 209, 213, 241, 244, 246, 250, 251, 259, 276, 282, 293, 375  
 I Jeongcheon, 232  
 I Jigwan (b. 1932), 21, 84, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 384  
 I Jiyeong, 180  
 I Jonghwi, 251

- I Jong-ik (1912-1991), 10, 11, 12, 37, 70, 72, 74, 76, 222, 225, 248, 254, 257, 384
- I Jongmyeong, 352
- I Jong-u, 355
- I Jong-uk (1884-1969), 64, 168, 171, 174, 217, 220, 335, 385
- I Min-u, 150, 187
- I Namchae, 222, 262, 303, 319, 321, 322, 327, 329
- I Neungga, 321, 327
- I Neunghwa (1869-1943), 37, 139, 140, 141, 210, 384
- I Ryeonjin, 259
- I Sang-eun (1905-1976), 327
- I Seokho, 246, 251
- I Seokjin, 286
- I Seongcheol (1912-1993), 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 226, 232, 234, 246, 254, 266, 286, 297, 299, 365, 378, 384
- I Seon-geun (1905-1983), 261, 262, 273, 274, 277, 279, 281, 292, 294, 295, 301
- I Seongsu (b. 1923), 232
- I Seong-u, 259, 286, 297
- I Seoong (1912-2003), 222
- I Seunghun (1864-1930), 158
- I Seungman (1875-1965), 3, 10, 18, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 69, 82, 127, 157, 218, 220, 224, 236, 238, 239, 241, 242, 243, 247, 249, 252, 255, 256, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 270, 273, 277, 278, 279, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 287, 288, 289, 291, 292, 293, 294, 296, 297, 300, 303, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 318, 333, 334, 336, 357, 369
- I Susan (b. 1922), 294, 295
- I Tan-ong, 213
- I Ubong, 232
- I Unheo (1892-1980), 40, 92, 207, 208, 214, 241, 251, 345
- I Wanyong (1858-1926), 191
- I Waun, 321
- I Wolha, 321
- I Wonseon, 286
- I Yeong-u, 173
- I Yongbong, 278, 297
- I Yongheo (1869-1930), 162
- I Yongjo (b. 1900), 162, 163, 207
- I Yunyong (1854-1939), 191
- Ieom (866-932), 27
- Ilbong Gyeongnyeom, 87, 88
- Im Domun (b. 1935), 342, 377
- Im Haebong, 204, 205
- Im Hwan-gyeong (1887-1983), 172, 226
- Im Hyeobong, 63, 64, 65, 147, 166, 168, 169, 170, 173, 372, 373, 384
- Im Manseong, 138
- Im Seokjin (1892-1968), 171, 217, 218, 262, 266, 272, 273, 274, 276, 277, 279, 281, 282, 286, 297, 303, 328, 329, 353
- Im Wongwang, 251
- Imje Seon, viii, ix, 53, 60, 61, 136, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 146, 210, 253, 254, 260, 266, 383
- Itō Hirofumi (1841-1909), 135, 148, 149
- Jajang (590-658), v, 85, 86, 88, 89
- Jang Boan, 232

- Jang Bohae, 172  
 Jang Deoksu (1894-1947), 158  
 Jang Dohwan, 163  
 Jang Girim, 138  
 Jang Sangbong, 222, 223  
 Jang Sangyeol, 352  
 Jang Seoksang (1872-1947), 217, 221  
 Jang Wongyu, 53, 222  
 Jang Yongseo, 262  
 Jeon Bongjun (1855-1895), 134  
 Jeon Gwan-eung (1910-2004), 90  
 Jeon Ilwon, 205  
 Jeon Jinhan (1901-1972), 241, 258  
 Jeon Suwol (1855-1928), 210, 213  
 Jeong Bonghan, 286  
 Jeong Bongmo, 262, 266, 288, 296  
 Jeong Byeongheon, 160  
 Jeong Duseok (b. 1906), 221  
 Jeong Geumgwang, 259, 286  
 Jeong Geumo (1896-1968), 10, 11, 17, 56, 215, 244-261, 265-7, 282, 285-6, 289, 291, 293, 296, 298, 382  
 Jeong Guryong, 181  
 Jeong Jaehwa, 170  
 Jeong Jaemyeon (1884-1962), 158  
 Jeong Jawon, 352  
 Jeong Jeon-gang (1898-1975), 276  
 Jeong Jeonghaeng, 297  
 Jeong Maeng-il, 163, 185  
 Jeong Manhwa (d. 1918), 149  
 Jeong Nosik (1891-1965), 158  
 Jeong Sangjin, 163  
 Jeong Seongmun, 286  
 Jeong Se-ung, 327  
 Jeong Suok (1902-1966), 259, 286, 294, 297  
 Jeong Unbong (1889-1946), 87, 183  
 Jeong Yagyong (1762-1836), 39  
 Ji Hyeun, 262  
 Jigong (d. 1363), 86  
 Jin Hyemyeong, 232  
 Jin Jineung (1873-1941), 138, 159  
 Jingsak Hyesim (1178-1234), 72  
 Jinghyo Jeoljung (826-900), 27  
 Jinjeong Cheonchaek (b. 1206), 142  
 Jinpyo (b. 714), 86, 88  
 Jinul (1158-1210), viii, ix, 8, 10, 11, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 40, 41, 48, 49, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 61, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 227, 253, 254, 257, 260, 263, 264, 265, 266, 274, 322, 335, 381, 390  
 Jizang (549-623), viii, 4, 7, 8  
 Jo Bongseung, 170  
 Jo Bowol, 303  
 Jo Byeong-ok (1894-1960), 285  
 Jo Geumdam, 251, 286, 297  
 Jo Hagyu, 163  
 Jo Ilpa, 262  
 Jo Jonghyeon (1904-1989), 163, 354  
 Jo Man-gam, 277  
 Jo Myeonggi (1905-1988), 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 385  
 Jo Untaek, 162  
 Jo Wonhwan, 275, 276, 277, 285, 295  
 Jo Yongmyeong (d. 2003), 250, 271, 284, 319, 321, 322, 332  
 Jolam Yeonon, 53  
 Joseon, 131, 132, 166, 208  
 Junggwon Haeon (b. 1567), 54

- Kanno Hiroshi, 5  
 Katō Kankaku, 170  
 Kōan, 34, 35, 41, 46, 47, 78, 144, 377  
 Kuiji (632-682), 8, 25  
 Kumārajīva (344-412), vii, viii, 4, 5, 93  
  
 Li Tongxuan (646-740), 33, 34  
 Liang Qichao (1873-1929), 148, 153  
 Linji Chan, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 143, 231, 254, 322  
 Linji Yixuan (d. 866), 143, 144, 145, 146, 231  
 Luther, Martin (1483-1546), 188  
  
 Ma Byeokcho (1899-1986), 286  
 Magu Baoche, 27  
 Manha Seungnim, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90  
 Mazu Daoyi (709-788), 24, 25, 26, 27, 33, 37, 52, 142  
 Min Chanho, 157  
 Min Cheongho, 251, 286, 296  
 Min Dogwang, 14, 20, 211, 242, 244, 246, 247, 248, 250, 251, 254, 255, 258, 259, 260, 263, 266, 267, 268, 271, 272, 273, 274, 277, 279, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 296  
 Min Dongseon, 163  
 Min Ji, 31  
  
 Minami Jiro (1874-1955), 166, 167, 171  
 Minjung, 55, 62, 136, 387, 390, 392  
 Muhak (1327-1405), 35, 86  
 Mun Iljo, 246, 251, 286  
 Mun Jeong-yeong (1923-2007), 250, 276, 287, 288, 297, 321, 329, 332  
 Mun Jongdu (1916-1987), 285  
 Mun Seonggak (1932-1977), 313, 314  
 Mun, Chanju, v, 13, 15, 55, 57, 58, 62, 92, 141, 146, 147, 239, 387, 388, 411  
 Muyeom (800-888), 24, 27  
  
 Na Cheongho (1875-1934), 176, 180  
 Nāgārjuna, 382, 384, 385  
 Nakamura Kentaro, 191  
 Nakamura Sanshō, 198  
 Nam Mubul (1907-1994), 251  
 Nanggong Haengjeok (832-916), 27  
 Nangwon Gaecheong (854-930), 27  
 Nanquan Puyuan (748-835), 26  
 Naong (1320-1376), 34, 35, 53  
  
 O Beoban (1932-2007), 346, 389  
 O Giseon (1877-1946), 158  
 O Gwansu, 205  
 O Hoejin, 189  
 O Sechang (1864-1953), 158  
 O Seongwol (1866-1943), 85, 87, 141, 159, 181, 182, 210, 211, 213, 214  
 O Sigwon, 221



- O Taegeon (1897-1970), 160  
 orthodox, 9, 34, 46, 49, 50, 142, 144, 145, 231, 237, 238  
 orthodoxy, 3, 9, 13, 19, 81, 199, 370  
 orthopraxis, v, 82, 237, 238  
 orthopraxy, 3, 12, 13, 14, 19, 21, 55, 81, 82, 105, 106, 117, 136, 199, 216, 218, 233, 237, 370
- Prajñā (b. 734), 94  
 Pyeon-un, 26  
 Pyeongyang Eon-gi (1581-1644), 38, 54  
 Pyo Yangmun (1907-1962), 277
- Saam Chaeyeong, 38, 39, 54  
 Saitō Minoru (1858-1936), 188, 189, 190, 192, 203  
 sectarian, vii, viii, 15, 16, 24, 30, 31, 32, 33, 61, 62, 141  
 sectarianism, vii, viii, ix, x, 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 32, 33, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 48, 49, 50, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 68, 69, 70, 78, 119, 142, 199, 237, 238, 330, 331, 368, 369, 370, 374  
 Sekino Tadashi (1867-1935), 177  
 Sengrui (352-436), viii, 4, 5  
 Sin Hyewol (1861-1937), 210, 213  
 Sin Jeongho, 262  
 Sin Jijeong, 249, 250, 261  
 Sin Jongwon, 359, 360  
 Sin Palgyun (d. 1924), 157  
 Sin Sang-wan (1891-1951), 160  
 Sin Socheon (1897-1978), 251, 266, 276, 286, 291, 294, 296
- Sin-gwang Jonghwi, 48, 49, 72  
 So Gusan (1909-1983), 27, 226, 244, 245, 251, 286, 292, 293, 294, 297, 342, 378  
 Son Byeonghui (1861-1922), 157  
 Son Gyeongsan (1917-1979), 251, 272, 273, 274, 277, 279, 280, 282, 283, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 291, 292, 295, 297, 315, 318, 321, 322, 335, 340, 341, 346, 348, 353, 359, 360  
 Song Baegun (b. 1934), 385  
 Song Byeongsu, 368  
 Song Gyebaek (1896-1920), 158  
 Song Gyeongheo (1849-1912), 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 214, 389  
 Song Hakgeun, 294  
 Song Jeong-am, 272, 273, 274, 277, 279, 321  
 Song Jin-u (1890-1945), 158  
 Song Manam (1876-1957), 10, 11, 12, 37, 40, 43, 65, 66, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 84, 138, 163, 215, 217, 221, 227, 230, 231, 235, 240, 241, 250, 252, 254, 257, 259, 260, 264, 286, 296, 301, 346  
 Song Mangong (1871-1946), 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 159, 167, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 217, 221, 260, 345, 346, 348  
 Song Sanggeun, 244, 245  
 Song Seoam (1917-2003), 297  
 soteriological, 34  
 soteriology, ix, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, 37, 43, 44, 54, 57, 58, 78, 133, 362, 370  
 Sōtō Zen, 28, 138, 140, 141, 142, 146, 149, 167  
 subitist, ix  
 Sucheol (817-893), 26

- sudden, ix, 243  
 Sunji, 24
- Taego (1301-1382), ix, 10, 34, 61, 143, 253, 257, 260  
 Taego Order, v, x, 3, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 55, 59, 62, 66, 68, 74, 75, 78, 83, 84, 85, 117, 118, 127, 215, 218, 238, 264, 331, 340, 350, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 373, 374, 385, 391  
 Takeda Hanshi (1863-1911), 140  
 Terauchi Masatake (1852-1919), 136  
 Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1536-1598), 35, 170, 183
- Uicheon (1055-1101), viii, 7, 8, 24, 29, 31, 32, 54, 57, 160, 193, 194, 385  
 Uisang (625-702), 7, 8, 23
- vegetarianism, 3, 10, 14, 19, 20, 55, 60, 75, 81-82, 88, 92-93, 105-110, 114-116, 135-136, 188, 191-210, 212, 215-216, 218, 227, 237, 242, 275  
 vinaya, v, vi, viii, ix, 3, 12, 13, 14, 19, 42, 49, 57, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 98, 104, 105, 108, 110, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, 125, 128, 141, 153, 156, 191, 192, 193, 194, 199, 202, 208, 214, 216, 218, 227, 230, 233, 234, 235, 240, 248, 252, 253, 255, 256, 259, 265, 269, 275, 280, 335, 370, 372
- Watanabe Toru (1878-1967), 177  
 Wilson, Thomas Woodrow (1856-1924), 157  
 Woljeo Doan (1638-1715), 38  
 Won Bosan, 289, 295, 296, 297  
 Woncheuk (613-696), 7, 23  
 Wonhyo (617-686), viii, 4, 7, 8, 23, 24, 31, 32, 41, 54, 55, 57, 68, 69, 71, 97, 227, 273, 301, 335, 386, 388, 389
- Xitang Zhizang (734-814), 25, 26, 37, 71  
 Xu Jiyu (1795-1873), 148  
 Xuanzang (609-703), 7, 8
- Yampolsky, Philip B., 392  
 Yang Cheong-u, 294, 297  
 Yang Muhong, 185  
 Yangbu (d. 917), 28  
 Yangqi Fanghui (992-1049), 38  
 Yangshan Huiji (815-891), 24  
 Yanguan Zhaian, 27, 72, 142  
 Yanshou (904-975), viii, 41, 49, 57, 91, 92, 392  
 Yeo Jun (1862-1932), 157  
 Yeo Unhyeong (1886-1947), 157, 158  
 Yeomgeo (d. 844), 25, 26  
 Yeongmyeong Boje, 49, 86, 87, 90  
 Yoshizu Yoshihide, 5, 392  
 Yu Dongsan, 303, 321  
 Yu Hyecheon (d. 1998), 259  
 Yu Hyeon-geuk, 286  
 Yu Man-gyeom (1889-1944), 201  
 Yu Seogam (1911-1987), 21, 87, 88, 92, 251, 286, 297, 392

- Yu Subon, 286, 297  
 Yu Woltan (b. 1937), 313, 314  
 Yu Yeop, 65, 221, 223  
 Yueshan Weiyao (c. 745-828), 27  
 Yuk Suyeong, 271, 303  
 Yun Chiho (1864-1945), 158  
 Yun Geumsong, 321  
 Yun Gibong, 321  
 Yun Giwon, 305, 327, 347, 348  
 Yun Goam (1899-1988), 40, 42, 43, 55, 57, 82, 83, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 215, 259, 286, 297, 335, 336, 346, 348, 387, 388, 393  
 Yun Jonggeun, 327, 356, 358, 367, 368  
 Yun Seoho, 213  
 Yun Taerim (1908-1991), 327  
 Yun Wolha (1915-2003), 10, 11, 12, 17, 40, 43, 56, 82, 83, 89, 246, 249, 250, 251, 252, 254, 255, 256, 259, 261, 268, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 282, 283, 285, 286, 289, 290, 291, 292, 294, 296, 298, 321, 322, 327, 329  
 Yun Yonggu (d. 1868), 158  
 Yunju Daoying (d. 902), 28  
 Yunyan Tanshen (780-841), 27  
 Yushan Daoyuan, 28  
 Zhangjing Huaihui (756-815), 26  
 Zhiqian, 93  
 Zhiyan (602-668), 7, 8, 34  
 Zhiyi (538-597), 29, 30, 31, 32  
 Zhuhong (1535-1615), viii, 41, 49, 57, 91, 92, 390  
 Zongmi (780-841), viii, 8, 32, 33, 41, 48, 49, 57

## Author

Ven. **Chanju Mun** (Ordination Name: Seongwon) is the founder and chief editor of Blue Pine Books. He taught East Asian Buddhist Studies at the University of the West in Los Angeles between Summer 2004 and Spring 2007 and is currently teaching Buddhist philosophy at the University of Hawaii – Manoa beginning Fall 2007.

He received a Ph.D. in Buddhist Studies from the University of Wisconsin – Madison in 2002 and a Master's Degree in Philosophy from Seoul National University in 1991. He has been a researcher at exiled Tibetan Drepung Monastic University in South India and at the University of Tokyo.

He recently published numerous articles on modern Korean Buddhism and two research books including *The History of Doctrinal Classification in Chinese Buddhism: A Study of the Panjiao Systems* and edited five serial volumes on Buddhism and peace. He is currently planning to edit some more volumes in the series and to write several books on modern Korean Buddhism in the near future.