

ECOLOGICAL SOLIDARITY BETWEEN CATHOLICISM AND THE ASIAN RELIGIONS

Thomas Hong-Soon Han
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
thomashanhs@hotmail.com

Introduction

No one can deny that the ecological crisis the world faces today is a “profound moral crisis.”¹ This crisis cannot be addressed in terms of technology alone. Rather, it must be addressed above all in terms of ethics. Therefore, believers of religions should play a more active role in addressing the ecological crisis. They should work together in order to make the cosmos more habitable for humanity. Christians, in particular, should take the initiative of ecumenical and interreligious collaboration in the field of environmental protection, with the conviction that “their responsibility within creation and their duty towards nature and the Creator are an essential part of their faith.”²

For Catholics in Asia, a tiny minority³ and for Catholics in Northeast Asia, a very tiny minority⁴, interreligious collaboration and solidarity is imperative in order to possibly find a solution for the most pressing issues facing humanity such as ecological crisis. This paper intends to examine the possibility of promoting the collaboration and solidarity of Catholicism with religions of Asia in facing the ecological crisis of today, with particular reference to the collaboration and solidarity with Buddhism and Confucianism, which still remain significant components in the make-up of Northeast Asian cultures and ethico-religious worldviews despite the striking inroads of modernization and Westernization. Furthermore, as Asia pursues the Asianization, along with remarkable modernization, Confucian and Buddhist values are paid even greater attention today in Asia. On the other hand, the capitalist model of economic growth has brought forth the ecological destruction, alongside the exploitation of cheap labor by transnational corporations and the attendant injustices against the poor.

While the Buddhist and Confucian tradition has enormous historical, cultural, and national diversities, there are certain common ideas and values which are shared in this region. This paper discusses these ideas and values which can make a potential positive contribution to environmental thought and then the Catholic teachings on ecology, with

a view to enhancing the collaboration and solidarity among them. It examines what aspects of Confucianism and Buddhism are most conducive to the promotion of Catholicism's solidarity with them "to work together in the projects of common concern"⁵ such as ecological crisis, ecologically engaged way of life and eventually to the development of the Catholic teaching on ecology. It is based on the idea that dialogue and solidarity of a common commitment to works of environmental protection represent a constitutive dimension of evangelization⁶ and dialogue and solidarity with believers of other religions constitute a positive challenge for the Church,⁷ especially for the Church in Asia.⁸

A Catholic Perspective

In the Christian worldview, nature is the Creator's work. Each creature possesses its own particular goodness and perfection. Yet all is interdependent and forms a harmonious whole: "Creatures exist only in dependence on each other, to complete each other, in the service of each other."⁹ "There is a solidarity among all creatures arising from the fact that all have the same Creator and are all ordered to his glory."¹⁰ This solidarity is expressed in terms of fraternity with nature.

May you be praised, O Lord, in all your creatures, especially brother sun, by whom you give us light for the day; he is beautiful, radiating great splendor, and offering us a symbol of you, the Most High... May you be praised, my Lord, for sister water, who is very useful and humble, precious and chaste...May you be praised, my Lord, for sister earth, our mother, who bears and feeds us, and produces the variety of fruits and dappled flowers and grasses...Praise and bless my Lord, give thanks and serve him in all humility.¹¹

Human being, created in the image and likeness of God, occupies a unique place in creation. God created everything for human being, but human being in turn was created to serve and love God and to offer all creation back to him.¹² Being placed at the summit of the hierarchy of creatures, human being alone is given the responsibility for the rest of creation. Human being is called to "cultivate and take care of it"¹³ This responsibility does not, however, make the human being any less dependent on the rest of creation.

In the Christian view, creation is not complete. It is on the way towards its perfection.¹⁴ Humans are entrusted with the responsibility to complete “the work of creation, to perfect its harmony for their own good and that of their neighbors.”¹⁵ In this sense, they are to be “God’s fellow workers,”¹⁶ collaborators, and co-workers for his Kingdom.¹⁷

For Christians “the work of creation culminates in the greater work of redemption. The first creation finds its meaning and its summit in the new creation in Christ”,¹⁸ who “reconciled to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross”.¹⁹

Human stewardship entails accountability to God in the caring and management of the earth’s resources. Harmony is pursued not only between creation and humanity but also between the whole of the created universe and God.

Catholic teachings prescribe that there are limits to the human stewardship. Humans cannot dispose of the goods of the natural world, as if they had absolute power over them.

It is a requirement of our human dignity and therefore a serious responsibility, to exercise dominion over creation in such a way that it truly serves the human family. Exploitation of the riches of nature must take place according to criteria that take into account not only the immediate needs of people but also the needs of future generations. In this way, the stewardship over nature, entrusted by God to man, will not be guided by shortsightedness or selfish pursuit; rather, it will take into account the fact that all created goods are directed to the good of all humanity. The use of natural resources must aim at serving the integral development of present and future generations.²⁰

A true concept of development cannot ignore the use of the elements of nature, the renewability of resources and the consequences of haphazard industrialization - three considerations which alert our consciences to the moral dimension of development.²¹

The Catholic Church emphasizes the centrality of the human person in relation to nature. The human person is ontologically different from the rest of creation. In any discussion of ecology “respect for life, and above all for the dignity of the human person, is the ultimate guiding norm for any sound economic, industrial or scientific progress.”²²

The Catholic Church finds the origin of the ecological crisis in an anthropological error, which unfortunately is widespread in our day:

Man, who discovers his capacity to transform and in a certain sense create the world through his own work, forgets that this is always based on God's prior and original gift of the things that are. Man thinks that he can make arbitrary use of the earth, subjecting it without restraint to his will, as though it did not have its own requisites and a prior God-given purpose, which man can indeed develop but must not betray. Instead of carrying out his role as a co-operator with God in the work of creation, man sets himself up in place of God and thus ends up provoking a rebellion on the part of nature, which is more tyrannized than governed by him.²³

The Catholic Church diagnoses that such an error has been aggravated by sin and the “structures of sin”²⁴ characterized by the all-consuming desire for profit and the thirst for power. She thus insists that such structures are only overcome by changing “the spiritual attitudes which define each individual's relationship with self, with neighbor, with even the remotest human communities, and with nature itself; and all of this in view of higher values such as the common good or, the full development of the whole individual and of all people.”²⁵

Such a change of spiritual attitudes, which is called “conversion,” is linked to Christian holiness and to the practice of the human and supernatural virtues. It calls for a radical change of lifestyle indulged in consumerism that actually generates waste. The Catholic Church states severely:

It is manifestly unjust that a privileged few should continue to accumulate excess goods, squandering available resources, while masses of people are living in conditions of misery at the very lowest level of subsistence. Today, the dramatic threat of ecological breakdown is teaching us the extent to which greed and selfishness - both individual and collective - are contrary to the order of creation, an order which is characterized by mutual interdependence.²⁶

A Buddhist Perspective

Ecological ethics of Buddhism is based upon the principle of dependent origination (*pratitya-samutpada*). This principle represents the core of the Buddha's teachings: "When there is this, that is. With the arising of this, that arises. When this is not, neither is that. With the cessation of this, that ceases."²⁷ In this relationship one becomes the condition for the other to come into existence, or determines the arising of the other, as well as the condition that sustains the other. In the same vein, when one is absent, the other is also absent; when one ceases, the other also ceases which means that they both cease together. Everything is in flux and hence never exists in a permanent state.

This fundamental principle of Buddhism states that all phenomena are the result of mutually dependent existence: all things are inextricably interconnected and mutually interpenetrated. Our lives and those of all things are connected in such a giant web right across the planet and beyond. All human beings are connected to each other, and all forms of life are also interconnected. Human life is connected with nonhuman life. Reincarnation (*Samsara*) across the species boundaries suggests the solidarity among all forms of life. This in turn suggests that animals, like humans, have a moral consciousness and are capable of ethical action.

As Thich Naht Hahn succinctly puts it:

A human being is an animal, a part of nature. But we single ourselves out from the rest of nature. We classify other animals and living beings as nature, acting as if we ourselves are not part of it. Then we pose the question, "How should we deal with nature?" We should deal with nature the way we should deal with ourselves! We should not harm ourselves; we should not harm nature. Harming nature is harming ourselves, and vice versa. If we knew how to deal with our self and with our fellow human beings, we would know how to deal with nature. Human beings are inseparable. Therefore, by not caring properly for any one of these, we harm them all.²⁸

Furthermore, all creatures, sentient and insentient alike, possess Buddha-nature, the potential for Buddhahood, or enlightenment. "Of their own nature the myriad things are Buddha....In their inner nature the things of the world are unchangeable, undefiled, unmoved, and pure; this is what is meant by their being called 'Buddha'."²⁹ This aspect of the Buddhist teachings which was developed particularly in Northeast Asia³⁰ defines clearly the relationship between human being and nature.

The explanation of the Buddhahood of insentient trees and plants is as follows: the Dharmakaya consists of the Five Great Elements within which space and plants-and trees are included. Both this space and these plants-and-trees are the Dharmakaya. Even though with the physical eye one might see the coarse form of plants-and –trees, it is with the Buddha-eye that the subtle color can be seen. Therefore, without any alteration in what is in itself, trees-and-plants may, unobjectionably, be referred to as having Buddha-nature.³¹

Human being that possesses Buddha-nature as its essence shares a common element with every part of nature, which possesses the same Buddha-nature. Therefore it is impossible to have a notion of human being as being ultimately separate from anything else. A human being is a part of nature. Human being and nature are nothing but one. Realizing this, one will naturally feel compassion towards all other life and forms of life.

This Buddhist view weakens an absolute distinction that might be made between human being and other creatures. However, it confirms the inherent sacredness of nature and emphasizes the reverence for nature which is inherent the traditional cultures of Northeast Asia.

Intimately related to this view is the precept of *ahimsa*, or non-injury (nonviolence), which typifies the Buddhist piety. In its comprehensive meaning, *ahimsa* or non-injury means entire abstinence from causing any suffering whatsoever to any living creature, either by thought, word, or deed. For the Buddhists, *ahimsa* is not mere negative non-injury. It is positive, cosmic love. It implies peace and reverence toward all sentient beings. It is the development of a mental attitude in which hatred is replaced by love.

In the process of becoming enlightened, Buddhists are expected to cultivate empathy toward the suffering of others and practice *ahimsa* in all their actions so that they may not increase suffering. Enlightened or spiritually mature people identify with the sufferings and hopes of other creatures. And in so doing they are expected to become as biocentric as possible.

Another important aspect of Buddhism that bears upon ecology is the doctrine of *karma*, which is the law of causation related to our actions. It means that whatever one sows, one reaps, be it good or evil. The consequences of meritorious acts are always good,

while evil acts ensure painful retribution. One who believes in *karma*, therefore, will be careful not to cause harm to human beings and other objects of nature, including the earth itself, for harming them is simultaneously harming oneself.

In the Buddhist view, the ecological crisis the world is faced with is the consequence of the greed, hatred, and ignorance of egoistic individuals, profit-seeking enterprises, and power-seeking governments. (cf. Structures of sin). To overcome the ecological crisis so as to sustain present and future life, Buddhism urges self-mastery that pursues emptiness, egolessness, unselfishness, cultivating compassion. In this compassion, spiritually mature people feel one with all other creatures, which extends their identity throughout the cosmos. Buddhism urges them to equate their well-being with the well-being of all creatures and act with this always in mind. “Cut down the forest of your own greed, before cutting real trees.” We should learn self-control before presuming to control creation.

This calls for simplicity and moderation in lifestyle. In the Buddhist worldview a quest to satisfy unnecessary desires is destructive behavior and does not lead to peace and liberation. Restraint only is the way to peace and also the way to preserve the environment. Thus, the real solution to ecological crisis begins with the individual’s internal self-mastery.

A Confucian Perspective

In the Confucian worldview, the whole universe consists of the gaseous substance called *ch’i* [vital energy, or material force]. *Ch’i* of Oneness circulates; the Ultimate of Nonbeing [*wu-chi*] is the Great Ultimate [*t’ai-chi*]; the movement and stillness of the Great Ultimate give birth to yin and yang:

The Great Ultimate [*t’ai-chi*] through movement generates yang. When its activity reaches its limit, it becomes tranquil. Through tranquility the Great Ultimate generates yin. When tranquility reaches its limit, activity begins again. So movement and tranquility alternate and become the root of each other, giving rise to the distinction of yin and yang, and the two modes are thus established.³²

Yin and yang in turn, through their intercourse and transformations, give birth to the Five Agents—wood, fire, earth, metal and water—each one having its nature.³³ The reality of the Ultimate of Nonbeing and the essence of the two modes and five agents mysteriously combine and coalesce. The Way of *ch'ien* becomes the male; the Way of *k'un* becomes the female; the two *ch'i* stimulate each other, transforming and generating the myriad things. The myriad things generate and regenerate (*sheng sheng*), alternating and transforming without end. This is the continuing transformational process of nature.

Thus, in the Confucian view, nature is considered to be the parents: “*Ch'ien* is heaven, and hence is styled father. *K'un* is earth, and hence is styled mother.”³⁴ The interaction between heaven and earth gives birth to all beings, including humans.³⁵ Nature is viewed in terms of kinship among all creatures:

Heaven is my father and Earth is my mother, and even such a small creature as I finds an intimate place in their midst. Therefore that which fills the universe I regard as my body and that which directs the universe I consider as my nature. All people are my brothers and sisters, and all things are my companions.³⁶

In this kinship model of the relationship with the natural world, the nature of the world is perceived as a unified body; the proper attitude toward the nature is expressed in filial piety and responsibility; the practice of *jen* (humaneness, humanity) extends toward all living and non-living things as well as other human beings.

The great man regards Heaven and Earth and the myriad things as one body. He regards the world as one family and the country as one person....Therefore when he sees a child about to fall into a wall, he cannot help a feeling of alarm and commiseration. This shows that his humanity (*jen*) forms one body with the child. It may be objected that the child belongs to the same species. Again, when he observes the pitiful cries and frightened appearance of birds and animals about to be slaughtered, he cannot help feeling an “inability to bear” their sufferings. This shows that his humanity forms one body with birds and animals. It may be objected that birds and animals are sentient beings as he is. But when he sees plants broken and destroyed, he cannot help a feeling of pity. This shows that his humanity forms one body with plants. It may be said that plants are living things as he is. Yet, even when he sees tiles and stones

shattered and crushed, he cannot help a feeling of regret. This shows that his humanity forms one body with tiles and stones.³⁷

Moreover, for the Confucians, humans are the purest and best exemplar of the manifestation of the Great Ultimate and therefore they have a unique position in the hierarchy of creatures, which assigns them certain specific responsibilities.

Only humans receive the finest and most spiritually efficacious [*ch'i*]. Once formed, they are born; when spirit (*shen*) is manifested, they have intelligence; when their five-fold natures are stimulated into activity, good and evil are distinguished and the myriad affairs ensue.

The Sage settles these [affairs] with centrality, correctness, humaneness and rightness (the Way of the Sage is simply humaneness, rightness, centrality and correctness) and emphasizes stillness. (Without desire, [he is] therefore still.) In so doing he establishes the ultimate of humanity. Thus the Sage's "virtue equals that of Heaven and Earth; his clarity equals that of the sun and moon; his timeliness equals that of the four seasons; his good fortune and bad fortune equal those of ghosts and spirits."³⁸

Thus, human beings surpass all other beings and act for Heaven³⁹ as its eldest siblings. They are to take an active part in the efficient functioning of the cosmic process in such a way as to enhance its development, at least in terms of human culture. In so doing, they are to "form a trinity with Heaven and Earth."⁴⁰ For Confucians, the unity of Heaven and humanity (*t'ien-jen-ho-i*) is the ideal to attain. The key to attain this ideal is through the practice of sincerity.

Sincerity is the Way of Heaven. Making oneself sincere is the Way of Man. If you can be perfectly sincere without effort, without a mindfulness to its attainment, and walk embracing the Middle Way, you are a sage. If you are working at making yourself sincere, you must find your goodness and hold fast to it. You must study it broadly, investigate it in detail, deliberate on it carefully, discern it clearly and practice it universally.⁴¹

Confucians emphasize the need for arduous self-cultivation and education in order to make oneself sincere in ensuring that human society remain in harmony with the rest of the nature, caring and respecting not just for other persons, but for all beings. A central

part of this self-cultivation consists in overcoming the egocentric way of thinking and the selfish desires.

The learning of the great man consists entirely in getting rid of the obscuration of selfish desires in order by his own efforts to make manifest his clear character, so as to restore the condition of forming one body with Heaven, Earth, and the myriad things, a condition that is originally so, that is all.⁴²

To ensure the harmony in the cosmic order in which “all things are nurtured in concert, free of all mutual injury, and all things proceed in their parallel courses, free of any conflict among them,”⁴³ one should become egoless.

Conclusion

Catholicism fundamentally distinguishes itself from Buddhism and Confucianism in that these religions do not recognize the existence of Creator God. This fact is naturally reflected in the divergence of their respective views on human being, nature, and human being's relationship with nature. Whereas Catholicism tends to be classified as anthropocentric/theocentric, Confucianism tends to be classified as anthropocosmic and Buddhism as ecocentric.

However, this divergence, critical as it is, is not taken as a hindrance in promoting solidarity among them in the field of ecological concern. In fact, starting from such divergence, they converge on the need for respect for life and human being's harmony with nature. Catholicism emphasizes the fraternity with nature, while Buddhism claims that all things have the same Buddha-nature (*fo-hsing*), and Confucianism maintains that all things share the same original nature (*pen-hsing*) or principle (*li*). In Catholicism humans are perceived as co-workers of Creator God on earth, whereas in Confucianism humans are perceived as agents of Heaven.

They likewise converge on the diagnosis of the cause of the ecological crisis and hence on the prescription to solve it. In fact, Catholicism finds the cause of the problem in the structures of sin characterized by the all-consuming desire for profit and the thirst for power, while Buddhism and Confucianism find the cause in greed and craving. All these factors lead to consumerism that generates waste of natural resources, thereby degrading the environment.

Thus, the ecological crisis is the crisis of desire. In order to effectively solve this crisis, Catholicism insists on conversion, Buddhism on self-mastery, and Confucianism on self-restraint. All this equally calls for a change of lifestyle in such a way as to foster the harmony with nature and the ecological justice. Such a change of lifestyle must be oriented toward environmentally sound and sustainable development. Emphasis must be laid on the sustainable consumption as well as sustainable production.

These affinities, although predicated on different motivation, are congenial to the conservation of the integrity of creation and hence to the promotion of solidarity among Catholicism, Buddhism, and Confucianism in the matter of facing the ecological crisis. The ethic of reciprocity expressed in loving kindness and shared by all these religions⁴⁴ constitutes a solid ground on which to build this solidarity. This ethic leads to the solidarity among the believers of these religions themselves and to the solidarity between humans and nature. Hurting the nature constitutes hurting others, thereby hurting oneself as a boomerang and eventually hurting all inhabitants of the globe. Solidarity, “a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good,”⁴⁵ requires the dialogue and collaboration of all people of good will.

Solidarity among Catholicism, Buddhism, and Confucianism is mutually beneficial to one another. Through the experience and testimony of the others, believers of each religion will be able to gain a purification of their respective faiths, overcoming the cleavage between teachings and practices. It can safely be said that ecological teachings of those religions have not been faithfully implemented by their respective believers both in Asia and in the West.

Solidarity with these religions provides the Catholic Church with the opportunity to better understand the Buddhists, the Confucians, and their respective ecological perspectives, while experiencing the Asian deep sense of harmony with nature. It thus will contribute to a more effective application of the Church’s ecological teachings to the Asian, especially the Northeast Asian realities.

At the same time, it will stimulate the Church to renew her teachings on the ecology. In fact, the Church has rich *depositum fidei* containing ecology-oriented teachings and spiritual traditions that can and should be reviewed with a view to renewing the Church’s ecological teaching so as to make it ecologically more sensitive. In the process

of renewal, a serious discernment has to be made on the ecological perspectives of Buddhism and Confucianism. The idea of organic unity of human being and nature, extension of compassion to all beings including non-living ones, and the kinship model for an authentic relationship with nature, and so forth can be duly taken into consideration in this work of renewal. All this makes up a way of inculturation that must be carried out in Asia “in the spirit of complementarity and harmony” with “an innate spiritual insight and moral wisdom in the Asian soul.”⁴⁶

All in all, ecological solidarity of the Church with these religions enables all of them to serve more effectively the realization of the planetary common good, always giving priority to the preferential option for the poor⁴⁷ who most often are the victims of environmental degradation and are virtually forced to exploit the environment due to their poverty.⁴⁸ It will thus contribute to the establishment of “the true and planetary ethics which the world now needs.”⁴⁹

Ecological solidarity can be carried out on various levels that include being, acting, discussing, and reflecting with believers of these religions with a view to promoting a culture of ecological responsibility, globalization with spirituality, and globalization of ecological awareness. Such solidarity can and must be carried out by the believers of these religions who take part in the decision-making process of either national or international institutions. It can also be carried out in joint projects to be organized by the believers.

For any such solidarity to gain meaningful results it is essential that the laity get involved in it. And this requires the formation of them, especially children, young people and parents as well as the leaders, on the environmental responsibility and stewardship.

¹ Pope John Paul II, “Peace with God the Creator, Peace with All of Creation,” *Message for the World Day of Peace*, 1 January 1990, 5. Cf. also 7 and 15.

² *Ibid.*, 15.

³ less than 2.8%% of the population which accounts for two thirds of the world’s population.

⁴ 0.4% of the population in Northeast Asia which accounts for one fourths of the world’s population.

⁵ Secretariat for Non-Christians, *Dialogue and Mission*, 13.

⁶ Pope John Paul II, Encyclical Letter *Redemptoris Missio*, 55; Cf. Pontifical Council for Inter-religious Dialogue, *Dialogue and Proclamation*, 77.

⁷ Cf. Pope John Paul II, Encyclical Letter *Redemptoris Missio*, 56.

⁸ Cf. Pope John Paul II, Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation, *Ecclesia in Asia*, 31.

⁹ *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 340.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 344.

¹¹ St. Francis of Assisi, *Canticle of the Creatures*. St. Francis of Assisi was proclaimed by Pope John Paul II in 1979 as the heavenly Patron of those who promote ecology. Cf. Apostolic Letter *Inter Sanctos*: AAS 71[1979], 1509f. This saying has been attributed to him: “If you have men who will exclude any of God’s creatures from the shelter of compassion and pity, you will have men who will deal likewise with their fellow man.”

¹² Cf. *Gaudium et Spes*, 12, 24, 39.

¹³ *Gen* 2, 15.

¹⁴ Cf. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 302.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 307.

¹⁶ *ICor* 3, 9.

¹⁷ Cf. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 307.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 349.

¹⁹ *Col* 1, 20.

²⁰ Pope John Paul II, *Address to the UN Centre*, Nairobi, Kenya, 18 August 1985, 2.

²¹ Pope John Paul II, Encyclical Letter *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 34.

²² Pope John Paul II, “Peace with God the Creator, Peace with All of Creation,” *Message for the World Day of Peace*”, 1 January 1990, 7.

²³ Pope John Paul II, Encyclical Letter *Centesimus Annus*, 37.

²⁴ Cf. Pope John Paul II, Encyclical Letter *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 37.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 38.

²⁶ Pope John Paul II, “Peace with God the Creator, Peace with All of Creation,” *Message for the World Day for Peace*, 1 January 1990, 8.

²⁷ *Majjhima-Nikaya* II 32; *Samyutta-Nikaya* II, 28; etc.

²⁸ Thich Nhat Hanh, cited in Joan Halifax, “The Third Body: Buddhism, Shamanism, and Deep Ecology,” in Allan Badiner, ed., *Dharma Gaia: A Harvest of Essays in Buddhism and Ecology* (Berkeley: Parallax Press, 1990), 35-36.

²⁹ William LaFleur, “Saigyō and the Buddhist Value of Nature,” in J. Baird Callicott and Roger T. Ames, eds., *Nature in Asian Traditions of Thought: Essays in Environmental Philosophy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989), 192.

-
- ³⁰ This refers to Mahayana Buddhism which has been developed in China, Korea, and Japan.
- ³¹ William LaFleur, *op. cit.*, 207.
- ³² Cho Tun-i (1017-73), *An Explanation of the Diagram of the Great Ultimate*, trans. by Wing-tsit Chan, *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), 463.
- ³³ The Five Agents do not simply refer to these concrete substances. Rather, they represent a basic framework or mental model by which all phenomena can be classified into five types.
- ³⁴ *I Ching*(*Book of Changes*), Appendix V, trans. by James Legge.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.* “*Khien* is heaven, and hence is styled father. *Khwăn* is earth, and hence is styled mother. *Kǎn* [shows] the first application [of *khwăn* to *khien*], resulting in getting [the first of] its male, and hence we call it the oldest son. *Sun* [shows] a first application [of *khien* to *khwăn*], resulting in getting [the first of] its female, and hence we call it the oldest daughter. *Khân* [shows] a second application [of *khwăn* to *khien*], and *Lî* a second [of *khien* to *khwăn*], resulting in the second son and second daughter. In *Kǎn* and *Tui* we have a third application [of *khwăn* to *khien* and of *khien* to *khwăn*], resulting in the youngest son and youngest daughter.”
- ³⁶ Chang Tsai (1021-77), *The Western Inscription*, (inscribed on the western wall of his library), trans. by Wing-tsit Chan, *op. cit.*, 497.
- ³⁷ Wang Yang-ming, *Instructions for Practical Living*, trans. by Wing-tsit Chan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), 272.
- ³⁸ Cho Tun-i, *op. cit.*
- ³⁹ *The Shû King*(*The Book of Historical Documents*), Part II, The Books of Yü, Book III The Counsels of Kâo-Yâo, trans. by James Legge, 1879. “The work is Heaven’s; men must act for it.”
- ⁴⁰ *Chung Yung*, 22, trans. by Charles Muller.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 20.
- ⁴² Wang Yang-ming, *op. cit.*, 273.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, 30.
- ⁴⁴ “Treat others as you would like them to treat you.”(Mt 7: 12, in Christianity); “Treat not others in ways that yourself would find hurtful.”(Udana-Varga 5. 18, in Buddhism); “What you do not wish for yourself, do not impose on others.”(Analects, XII, 2, in Confucianism).
- ⁴⁵ Pope John Paul II, Encyclical Letter *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 38.
- ⁴⁶ Pope John Paul II, Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Ecclesia in Asia*, 6.
- ⁴⁷ According to one estimate, of 1.3 billion poor who live less than one dollar a day, 73% are in Asia. Cf. World Bank, *Poverty Reduction and the World Bank: Progress in Fiscal 1998*.
- ⁴⁸ Cf. *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, 482.
- ⁴⁹ Pope John Paul II, Encyclical Letter *Fides et Ratio*, 104.