

# Reappraisal of the Educational Paradigm for Embodiment of Buddhist Idea

Park, Beom-seok\*

1. Raising the problems
2. Modern paradigm of education
3. Buddhist paradigm of education
4. Conclusion

## 1. Raising the problems

It is not only a recent concern resulting from our awareness of crisis and criticism about educational reality. At any time or in any society, problems of education is the object of our universal concern that has never been dealt with carelessly. While the critical minds in education can bring about diverse diagnoses and prescriptions according to various standards or levels, the common basis of these concerns premises the educational situation of “cramming-oriented” learning, prioritizing entrance examination for universities rather than centering around knowledge itself. As it is general to censure the problems of cramming, memorizing, and competition-oriented education for the only goal of passing the entrance examination, our solution to the problems is also schematized that we have to emphasize reinforcement of moral or ethical education.

But do educational problems and the evil practices continue being reproduced even if the clear awareness of the problematics and diagnoses

---

\* Dongguk Univ.

have long been discussed? Such a question makes us review the existing viewpoint of common sense that we can cure the educational problems by adding such elements as morals, ethics or human nature. This means that educational problems should be approached through the more original awareness of the era and in-depth analysis of social relations rather than analogy through a partial section of the present educational problems.

Ultimately, the fact that modern educational situation cannot be cured by partial improvement or addition of new portions reveals that it is necessary to take more microscopic and synthetic views considering conversion of times or change in the history of civilization. If the frame of the tendency can be presented, partial efforts can be reconstructed while giving new significance. And also, an effort for partial improvements reveals itself as a completely new whole that surpasses the simple sum of all the parts when they are combined altogether. Consequently, if the approach to the crisis of educational reality is examined through the enormous paradigm of the modern times, the problems related to those parts can be newly illuminated, and points of improvement can be embodied through dissolution and conversion of enormous paradigm.

If we pay attention to the major viewpoints of deconstruction theories and post-modern theories, we can agree to the awareness that the whole contemporary discourses have already been presented in Buddhism. Most of all, it is vividly revealed in the problems of views of the world, humans, and knowledge which makeup the educational paradigm in modern times. In other words, it is the holistic view to overcome the worldview of reductive mechanistic view of the universe that lies parallel with the view of Yūngi(緣起) where all the creation is penetrated with each other like net of Indra. Also, it would correspond to post-subject-centered criticisms about modernistic view of reasonable human being based on the instrumental rationality of the modern society. It cannot be irrelevant to the Buddhist view of the enlightenment. Furthermore, considering the criticism against the intellectual-centered view of knowledge which has been inciting

expansion of human desire, the modern knowledge-centered education needs a conversion into the view of Pan-ya wisdom emphasizing mercy and emptying.

These tendencies are not a coincidence. In any period of times, we could find the seeds of awakening which were revealed in the criticism of the limits of the modern paradigm. One thing clearly premised here is that the educational problem is not that of itself. From that point of view, this thesis will reappraise the problem of education today and reveal that Buddhist ideas of education are deeply permeated in the tendencies of the resolving measures by criticizing the origin of enormous paradigm which has created the problems of modern education. This is an attempt to call attention to the fact that embodying the Buddhist value in education is not adding another value in the educational reality but revealing the original value of education through the dissolution of the modern paradigm.

## 2. Modern paradigm of education

### 1) The mechanical structure of the world view

The formation of modernity include various opportunities such as Scientific Revolution, Enlightenment and the Industrial Revolution. These have led new discoveries and changes in various fields but ultimately have formed the paradigm of the modernity, the foundation of Western civilization. It is the paradigm of the modern period which implanted the idea of universal progress and infinite possibilities. But it has been criticized as a cause of the whole crisis of nature and human beings. Present awareness of the crisis does not just reflect self-examination of visible and partial problematic situations, but the despair and the skepticism at a macroscopic dimension.

Such a recognition of the crisis is the basis for understanding the problem of the world that has been formed in the grand frame of modern

times. Especially, the discovery of science, as a powerful tool, has made sure that this world can reveal itself entirely by scientific causality and rationality. Of course, we can never overlook the affirmative contribution of modernity resulting from scientific advancements but we also cannot disregard the negative influences in the worldview(Wilber, 2002).

Through the modern times we experienced powerful humanistic progress such as liberal democracy, idea of equality, freedom and justice for all regardless of race, rank, belief, gender. There are benefits of advancement in medical science, physics, biology, chemistry, the end of slavery, rise in feminism, and universal right of the mankind. But behind the idea of the splendid progress, there lies the situation of whole crisis which cannot be concealed any more. After the modern period, science could not contribute to mankind along with the growth of capitalism any more and has been degraded as means that contribute to commercial capital. Most of all, numerical representation and digitization through quantification is distorting the relationship between the world and the human being by trying to raise the possibility of prediction and control. Accordingly, understanding the world in modern times is recognized not as an activity of embodying while tasting, enjoying and participating in the world, but as that of observing each part of a mechanical apparatus intertwined complicatedly. It is the human desire of omniscience which assumes that new dissolution and assembly are possible after the observation of the function of each part.

It has been officially recognized through the epoch-making achievement of almost all natural sciences including physics since the 18th century, such as mechanical and reductive viewpoint of the world by Descartes-Newton. All the natural laws have been able to become formalized into mathematical method, measurable through quantification, and also explained by causal principles. Furthermore by being utilized in applied science such as technology and engineering, it has become settled as an enormous paradigm of progress linked with profits and convenience to mankind.

It is considered an object to be removed as an obstacle, anything lying in front of the parade of scientific progress. In this sense, nature is still primitive and underdeveloped so it is recognized as an object which should be cultivated by the hands of human beings. Namely, the early scientism, trying to discover the mechanic principle which can explain the world of objects, is degrading all things with life as objects of mechanical maintaining which can be owned freely through governing and control by man. The world is discriminated as ranks and orders through strict division and separation by the desire of human beings.

By division of human beings and nature as the subject and the object, the center and the surroundings, it has given rise to environmental calamity that the modern times cannot recover by separating what should not be separated. It is the result of forgetting the basic truth about life, that the vitality which has been maintained as a whole loses its vitality by disunion and disconnection. In the world of the whole, which means “Non duality of oneself and others(自他不二),” it can also be viewed as the cost of a lack in understanding of *pratīya-samutpāda* in Buddhism.

The mechanical structure of the world by progress is finally not different from a mechanism that tries to rule over ecology and the environment for the blind convenience and satisfaction of desire, neglecting the organic and indiscriminate relationship between a part and the whole. Everything means the absence of the view of *Avatamsaka*(華嚴) and the complete denial of the perception of mercy based on ecology-environmental recognition. In that sense, mechanical view of the world in modern times possesses a tool of science but is an era which has lost value of vitality and the relation within all of nature.

## 2) Reasonable human beings based on substance

The view of human beings, which is the center in the modernistic view of the world, shares the awareness of same sort of problematics with the view of the world. Especially, the idea of modern human beings,

represented as Enlightenment, focuses more on 'means' or 'function' rather than 'purpose,' conflicting with nature and separate themselves from the relationship with others. Namely, they assume they can observe and dominate nature by conflicting with nature and form an image of a selfish human being centering on it ego by separating oneself from a relationship with others(Lee, Jin-wu, 1993:16). The belief of infinite advancement in human reason functions as a mechanism that justifies the objective 'frame,' the subject and the object, which is the relationship between human beings and nature or among human beings.

The spirit as reason has never experienced, nor does it set up a limit to itself. Human spirit in modern paradigm cannot have the experience of self-denial or disconnection of itself because it lies on the continuity of self-development and expansion. Rational recognition based on self-confidence as a subject justifies the self-consciousness as a subject, separating things that cannot be received as self-identification from oneself(Kim, Sangbong, 2002:21). The awareness of the human being as a subject is narcissistic because it continues to objectify this world based on self-centeredness. It tries to possess all objects by stipulating a classification, not accepting them in the relationship(Üm, Tae-dong, 1999: 12).

In the end, the individual as 'the other' is negated and excluded in the narcissistic world. In that sense, epistemology since modern times has been considered a negative concept representing modern narcissistic view of human beings. As Foucault presented, modernistic humanism connote anthropocentrism. No matter what kind of 'ism,' it can be developed into 'selfishness' or 'centrism' when focused one-sidedly, ignoring its meanings in the whole while connoting affirmative significance as a subjective existence which does not alienate oneself. Especially humanism, if founded on narrow understanding of human beings, cannot escape criticism of 'narrow anthropocentrism.'

Such anthropocentrism has a long history in Western Europe. Christian

speculation affected by Platonic dichotomy of Idea started to justify this dichotomous division that has still been affecting since modern times. Of course, dichotomous thinking assumes the discriminate and hierarchical authority where higher rank dominates and controls the lower rank. Because human beings were assumed as a reasonable subject, he has separated into two parts such as human and non-human, reason and non-reason, and rationality and non-rationality. This lies in the continuity of dichotomous theory of substance and attributes, mind and matter, soul and flesh, and the good and evil which has continued from ancient Western society.

From this viewpoint, *subjectum* as the etymology of subject can be interpreted as lower(sub) and throw(jectum). Namely, it means that the subject has the power to manipulate and control everything else and thrown under itself according to its own will. Once the subject is set, the rest becomes objectified, marginalized, and instrumentalized. The modernistic concept of reason is based on the atomic thinking, which is abstract universalism or abstract identity about all human beings as one species. The number is a typical quantitative sign to indicate an abstractive identity well. As each number doesn't connote any features or quality of individual property, human reason means the universality being immanent in human just as abstract identity of each number. In the modernistic society, the concept of the individual also expresses the numerical identity as an identical unit, assuming such abstract universalism. As Latin etymology of '*individuum*' shows, an individual means an atomic existence, the minimum unit which cannot be divided any more.

As the view of numerical abstract identity in modernity, the idea of human being has been degraded as quantitative evenness of human value rather than realized equalitarianism founded on human dignity. Furthermore, human reason as a substance justifies others as objects to be possessed and dominated by acquiring authority as a subject. This reflects the awareness of the modern times which adheres the phase of the human being as an

administrator who maintains and supports the mechanical view of the world as presented in the previous section.

### 3) Intellectualistic knowledge based on positivism

The formation of the intellectualistic view of knowledge is connected with mechanical view of the world and of reasonable human being. As knowledge reflects the recognition of the world and the human in the present age, modernistic knowledge can be understood in the extension of the modernistic world and human being. It considers knowledge itself as an objective and value-neutral product of historical discovery that has been formed in terms of the progressive point of view, even if it contains a specific intention and purpose. Therefore, the text in school is not organized and selected according to the situation and requirement of the era, but adhered as a concept of scriptures that contain the sole and absolute knowledge.

A text is settled as a standard and core managing all educational activities rather than a medium as an intellectual stimulus while expanding the students' experiences in the practical field of instructing knowledge. If a text is considered in terms of what objective and universal knowledge has been organized into, a text-centered curriculum will inevitably be a mechanical course of teaching and learning. Because knowledge reflects objective and universal truth in modern sense, the relationship between teachers and students can do nothing but form mechanical relationship which efficiently communicate materialized knowledge(W.F. Pinar, 2001: 135-136).

In that sense, Tyler's model of curriculum can be understood as reflecting the economic structure of 19th and 20th century. The mass production system in the early stage of the industrial society which requires effective manufacturing process and laboring procedures, needs more concrete and systematic plan to implement. Consequently organizing the curriculum in a single line of educational purpose, educational contents,

educational method and educational evaluation, makes it possible to centrally control and manage in order to acquire the most returns in the shortest period of time. One of the biggest problems in the curriculum, as a system to manage efficient manufacturing process, is that the teacher and the student cannot participate in producing knowledge itself. In other words, they can be expressed as simple distributors rather than producers of knowledge. The knowledge produced by authoritative producers is conveyed as sturdy canned goods of which the contents cannot be screened.

In the intellectual view of knowledge, the problem of school education can be seen as accelerating deterioration of education resulting from its connection with commercial capitalism in the highly advanced industrialized society. Marcuse stipulated that an advanced industrialized society is a 'one-dimensional society' because it is dominated by technological rationality and positivism (H. Marcuse, 1964: IX-X). In the one-dimensional society, one should accept domination and control of social systems while forbidding criticisms and oppositions by members in the society which is founded on materialistic abundance

The members of this kind of society are satisfied with a one-dimensional reality composed of superficial knowledge so that it becomes impossible for them to speculate the contrary, the heterogeneous, and the transcendental of the other side of reality. In the end, natural repression of materialistic civilization works as limitations on the view of knowledge in a society because it makes people give up the ability to criticise reality, of transcendental speculation, and of artistic imagination. With this background, modernistic knowledge depends on technical or instrumental rationality.

This tendency of intellectual view of knowledge continues with justification of mechanical causality such as learning programs controlled by 'cause and effect,' teacher efficiency, measuring and estimate, effective school management, administrative system, and linear order of development.

As a result, educational purpose cannot be integrated into the method, and educational process cannot become the process of conversation, research, and transformation. Also the dimension of fact and value breaks up, question for essential value cannot but be alienated because of blind pursuit of factual knowledge. In the end, we can evaluate modernistic knowledge that separate purpose from process, values from facts and experience from knowledge.

Modern knowledge reveals desire of man for domination and control of world while presenting value-neutralization and objectivity on the face of it. Desire for possession of the world, based on narcissistic rationality, has give rise to a form of knowledge as an objectified system, so we should not overlook the world as control and regulation. Such view of knowledge, which means accumulation and expansion as a process of self-development, cannot but be inevitably degraded into a process of knowledge-acquiring school education through unlimited competition lacking mercy and love.

### 3. Buddhist paradigm of education

#### 1) Ecological recognition of life and world

The recognition of *hetu-pratyaya*(緣起) is the starting point of Buddhist awareness which can overcome mechanical and element-reductive view of the world in modernism. There is no independent being such as a particle or an element because everything is composed relationships between direct cause and indirect cause. Self-consciousness based on 'Emptiness' means recognizing not a divided or a disrupted individual but the organic whole as animate life where nothing can exist without depending on other things. In that sense, post-modern discourses, such as deconstructivism, post-modernism, or ecological environment, are not new discoveries or new awareness, because they assume an aspect of annotation of karma

recognition of the world in Buddhism. As there is nothing new under the sky, post-modern discourses also do not mean new wisdom but offers a clue of Buddhist awareness against distorted view in modernism.

Among them, one of the biggest characteristics of change is that education is to restore organic awareness of the universe which has been lost in modernism. The organic awareness of the universe is the holistic view which means the restoration of ecological, relational, and spiritual awareness of the world in order to overcome mechanical, individual, and disconnected awareness of the world (J.C.Smuts, 1961: 85-87). The holistic view of the universe is the transformation of modern world-view and also an attempt to overcome reductive recognition in which curricula are disrupted due to the fragmented atomic theory of existing objective epistemology and scientific positivism. Namely, education based on recognition of atomic theory separates human life and human recognition from all the others in the surrounding and make believe that what has been observed and organized by division and disruption is the systematic truth.

On the contrary, paying attention to relation of the universe, in terms of holistic view, is realizing that the whole universe is one united body of life. Spiritual and animated awareness of the universe means disillusionment about value of life as a whole excluded from modernistic recognition of the world. All the problems of modern recognition have been emerged as contradictory reality of the ecological environment on the entire earth. The contradictory reality here means that a human being is an offender and a victim at the same time. In other words, the ecological crisis of the present time is the human crisis and human beings themselves are the cause of the crisis.

But this is not the contradiction but inevitable result from the absence of recognition in terms of relation network as a whole. The subject and the object are essentially the inseparable whole so everything becomes a cycle of self-recurrence. It means a kind of metaphor where all pebbles which I

throw are toward myself and all arrows which I shoot aim at myself. The object and I cannot be divided, the whole and I are one which cannot be separated in a holistic view of the world.

Such a spatial revolution can also be explained with simultaneity. Awareness of *pratītya-samutpāda* that everything is the whole of relation of direct and indirect causes means that everything is intertwined as a cause and an effect of others at the same time. All causes do not spread straight on a standardized time line but coexist as a circulating whole. So the cause bears the result and the result bears the cause, which constitutes causal system at the same time. The parents are a cause which bears the child but as there is no child without parents and no parents without a child, the child becomes the cause of parents born as they are, the parents. Similarly, the relationship between the teacher and the disciples or the teacher and students are not a single connection of cause and effect but inevitable meeting in causality and simultaneity.

Consequently, wisdom, that all causalities are born simultaneously, is the recognition of simultaneous-causal holism drawn out of the organic recognition of life as a whole. The solution of modernistic problem in education should start from ecological self-consciousness of life founded on *prajñā* view of the world. Educational activity of a teacher and students, which can be explained as mechanical interaction without liveliness, reflects modern-physical recognition of the world, where the individual particles interact in the class. Without conversion about these basic recognitions of the world, no matter what kind of systematic or behavioral reorganization, all the modernistic changes would be degraded into irresponsible and meaningless attempts. Namely, it should be the only starting point of educational recognition through ecological awakening that all life forms as connected with the whole.

## 2) Buddha-nature of human beings

It is a kind of common sense to say that education starts from the trust

of human beings. But the education since modernism has, more precisely speaking, been formed based on the trust of human reason rather than human himself. The absolute trust of mental abilities of reason has been the process of concealing a variety of human abilities by consciously eliminating all the abilities other than reason. In that sense, modernistic anthropocentrism has included reason-centrism. Self-centeredness in modernistic ego, like the absolute Spirit(Geist) which is exposed to the history of progress, tries to subsume and dominate all the objects inside its own identity. It means ego as a reasonable subject does not achieve oneness with the world through relation but achieves totalization of the self through possession and subsumption.

Consequently self-actualization, based on concept of modernistic subject, can be interpreted as an ideology of infinite self-expansion. To overcome the limitations of self-centricism, we should realize Buddha-nature in our mind. Buddhism emphasizes the true nature of human beings, so called Buddha-nature, saying "all things have Buddha-nature(一切中生 皆有佛性)." That means any human being can become a Buddha if he knows and believes Buddha-nature in his own mind. Accordingly the human image of Buddha does not only apply in the boundary of Buddhist groups but reveals universal value. From here comprehension doesn't mean the outcome of calculation or judgment but self-consciousness and awakening about original self of *tathatā* (如來). It is neither attachment to self-conception nor substantialized ability of the human being.

Accordingly when there 'is' Buddha-nature, it is different from when there 'is' reason. It is an ontological meaning and does not contain the meaning of substantial particle such as reason. Traditionally etymology of substance in West Europe is added from "sub(under)" and "stance(existence)" and it means "existence" under sensory or phenomenal world. It has become the object of metaphysical speculation, same as pursuing "existence" behind(meta) nature(physis). After all, it is assumed that the concept of substance as unchangeable existence enables change

behind the changing phenomenal world. Consequently, as unchangeable substantiality separated from time and space, when one say “there is real nature” it means that there is nature as substance which stipulates the human being.

On the contrary, when there “is” Buddhist nature, it transcends the division between being and nil in the ontological coherence. It transcend and include as well so that it can only be explained as Emptiness. Theory of Emptiness cannot be expressed as “Emptiness is this”, or “Buddha-nature is this” because of its unstipulatedness. According to substantial speculation, unchangeable and permanent, something is assumed without spatial-temporal limitation so it is possible to call an object “this” in whatever spatial-temporal context. But basic standpoint of moderate speculation, something continuously changing, cannot be abstracted and separated from space and time. Accordingly, because there cannot be any conclusive or stipulated indication in the world that never acknowledges anything unchangeable and fixed, only negative expressions like “it's neither this nor that” can figure things.

The fact that it's not substantialized as absolute 'being' means that it can be recognized in terms of a creative and transformative dimension according to its own situation and context. Transcendence means true freedom and liberation of the self surmounting closed limitation of the self. It is not the infinite expansion due to the affirmation of self but the affirmation of the absolute ego through self-negation and self-surrender. So the transcendence is neither self-identical narcissism nor carries the subjective concept of self-centeredness. The direction is not 'outward' or 'upward' but contains the metaphorical depth and immanence which goes 'inward' or 'downward.'

The concept of Buddha-nature, founded on Emptiness premising transcendence, means essential self-educating process of newly progressing self through endless negation which never attaches to anything. It is clear that the languages which have been used as means in Buddhist experiential phenomenon, especially the self-conscious experience of “awakening.”

cannot be explained through conceptual expressions. What we can merely try is to draw out educational significance through practical self-consciousness in terms of Buddhist perception, which is immanent in these concepts recognizing the limitations of languages. Especially, the assurance that all human beings possess Buddha nature is infinite trust about human potential to improve and an endless affection of the learner.

### 3) *Prajñā* wisdom in education

Preceding *pratītya-samutpāda* view in Buddhism and Buddha-nature, the human mind, after all, requires conversion to the view of *prajñā* wisdom which means unified recognition of truth. It contains the alternative meaning against narrow intellectual-centered view of education centering knowledge in modernism. The knowledge in modern times has led human being to continuous accomplishment to accumulate quantitative contents, but it could not be able to accomplish the qualitative improvement of it.

The value neutral knowledge, under pretense of actual proof, brought forth the result which separates knowledge from life and experience from the world. The dynamic movements of split-integrated process has degraded to split-exclusion system of knowledge which has accumulated the simply objectified contents. Like this, Kierkegaard negated modernistic view of education that truth is objective knowledge. He claims that the important thing for an individual is the problem about not 'what' knowledge is but 'how' he is related to knowledge. 'How' means an attitude of an individual who tries to make himself understand the eternal truth that belongs to the temporal dimension and struggles to renew himself with a 'passion for infinity.' Therefore by saying 'subjectivity is truth,' he urges to reappraise the problem of objective character of knowledge.

Similarly, M. Polanyi has groped for conversion into human speculation based on the world of universe and tried to solve the problem of objective view of knowledge from the point of 'personal knowledge.' He shows that

tacit elements of knowing cannot be judged by 'scientific' standards because tacit dimension is immanent behind elucidated knowledge(M.Polanyi, 1958: 132). Therefore, problems of objective knowledge can all revert to problems of subjective knowing. Of course, the knowledge or subjectivity he intended was a reflection of the aspect of unified recognition, but not as an exclusive modernistic meaning. The core role of his tacit dimension is 'integration' of recognition. Integrated whole can not be reduced to parts and is not mechanical compounding but it can be the whole of organic knowledge. He says that activity of understanding meaning is not looking at the objective universe impersonally but dwelling in it(M.Polanyi, 1967: 18). This speculation of Polanyi reveals well Buddhist characteristics of speculation such as “no setting up of words and letters (不立文字).” Of course, this direct intention cannot be found in Polanyi but can be read as doubt and criticism of overall Western history of ideology.

After all, integrated realization of truth which speak for *prajñā*(般若) wisdom can be seen as ecological awakening which means animated recognition of the world as a whole. Fostering ecological literacy can be presented as an educational method for such ecological awakening(D.W.Orr, 1991: 93-95). Ecological literacy refers to ability that can understand complex problems of environment through various sides such as biology, physics, society, culture etc. In other words, it is an attitude that prepares ecological life in the future by making 'Life' a standard of all value judgment and establishing Eco-centered Life Values. Ecological literacy, taking a serious view of value of life, can be an area that requires continuous educational concern because it integrates crisis of the fragmented curriculum centered view of life.

The reason why education pays attention to holistic relation is to overcome narrow scope of self-understanding and realize the self as a life of the universe. It can be seen as a kind of ecological identity that maturing process of ecological self allows self-consciousness of relation between the self and the world in terms of life. As W. Fox cleared,

identity, based on ecological viewpoint, is divided into processes of personal, ontological and cosmological identities depending on the degree of realization of the relation. The latter two which apply to ontological and cosmological processes are 'transpersonal' process of transcendence. It is the process of formation of human character that is available through *prajñā* wisdom based on integrated recognition.

Integrated recognition of truth which speaks for the *prajñā* wisdom means realization. Integration is not merger and abolition of uniformity oriented but, to the contrary, is an ideology of inclusion where others have a different voice. *Prajñā* wisdom is not to 'Fill' through knowledge but is fullness through 'Evacuation'. It is self-consciousness of 'Emptiness', that is, 'Getting' through 'Desertion'. That is, knowing of own confidence that Self-negation can consist of affirmation because there are no difference between part and whole, me and the world, and life and extinction. It is knowledge of self-consciousness about the worldview of Avatamsaka(華嚴) where everything is the "I" in the world where the "I" disappears.

#### 4. Conclusion

Educational alternatives of Buddhism to overcome the modern paradigm of education have been discussed. It is impossible to solve the problems of modern education with existent ephemeral and temporary reorganization of education. In order to do that, it is necessary to make efforts to reaffirm and excavate Buddhist aims of education from the original formation of educational view.

The Buddhist aims of education based on *prajñā* wisdom is to realize tathatā(如如) state as it is. It is the state of not being different between my mind and the object world, that all of nature is closely associated. It is not activity of possessing knowledge as a form of satisfying desire but is being spontaneously embodied by wisdom itself through mercy. Modern

educational processes do not require realizing tathatā(如如) state but reiterating self-repetitive cycle of actualizing desire based on modern knowledge. In a modern paradigm, educational model of self realization has focused on extraction of specific labor power for national and social needs rather than embodiment of original nature of human being. Individuals become degraded into batteries as expendables that have to pour all energy until the end. What kind of educational value and improvement can we talk about in such structural reality of modern education?

Nevertheless, we will still have to talk of hope. It's because education itself is an enterprise of hope and value, and because of the simple wish that the darker and the more hopeless it is, the nearer to daybreak of awakening comes.

### Glossary of Terms

Notes: K=Korean

Avatamsaka(S) 華嚴

Buddha-nature 佛性

Dharma-dhātu(S) 法界

no setting up of words and letters 不立文字

great compassion raised by the enlightenment of wholeness between lives  
同體大悲

śūnyatā(S) 空

Emptiness 無

hetu-pratyaya(S) 因緣

non duality of oneself and others 自他不二

post-subject-centered 脫主體中心的

prajñā(S) 般若

pratītya-samutpāda(S) 緣起

tathatā(S) 如如

## References

- D.W. Orr, 1991, *Ecological Literacy: Education for the Twenty-First Century.* ed. by R. Miller. *New Directions in Education.* Holistic Education Press.
- Hegel, G.W.F. 1955, *Die Vernunft in der Geschichte.* trans. by Im, Seok-jin. Jihaksa.
- J.C. Smuts, 1961, *Holism and Evolution.* New York: The Macmillan Company,
- Kim, Sang-bong, 2002, *Dream of Narssis.* Hangilsa.
- Lee, Jin-wu, 1993, *The Philosophical understanding of post-modernism.* Seogwangsa.
- Marcuse, H., 1964, *One-dimensional Man.* Beacon Press.
- Park, Beom-seok, 2003, *The religious educational approach on human nature.* Korean Journal of Religious Education Vol. 16.
- Park, Sun-young, 1989, *The theory of Buddhist education.* Donghwachulpansa.
- Pinar, W.F., 2001, *Understanding Curriculum.* trans. by Kim, Bok-young. Wonmisa.
- Ŭm, Tae-dong, 1999, *New-pragmatism and education.* Wonmisa.
- Wilber, Ken, 2002, *The eye of Spirit.* Cambhala Publications, Inc.
- Polanyi, M., 1958, *Personal Knowledge.* London: RKP.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1967, *The Tacit Dimension.* Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

## &lt;국문요약&gt;

## 불교이념 구현을 위한 교육 패러다임의 재검토

박 범 석

근대 이후의 교육문제에 대한 근본적 비판과 총체적 반성에서 주목할 점은 탈근대 관련 논의와 해체이론의 주요 관점들이 불교에서 이미 제시해온 세계인식과 일치한다는 점이다. 이러한 인식은 교육패러다임을 구성하는 세계관·인간관·지식관의 문제에서 여실하게 드러난다. 즉, 근대의 요소 환원적인 기계론적 세계관을 극복하기 위한 전일적(holistic)·생명적 세계관은 만물이 인드라의 그물처럼 상호 침투되어 있는 연기적(緣起的) 세계관과 같은 맥락에 놓여 있다는 것이다. 또한, 도구적 합리성에 기반한 근대의 이성적 인간관에 대한 탈주체중심적 비판들은 비실체화된 깨달음의 전제를 가진 불성적 인간관과 무관할 수 없다. 나아가, 객관을 가장한 지식의 소유를 통해 욕망의 확장을 부추겨온 근대의 주지주의적(主知主義적) 지식관에 대한 비판은 결국 자비와 비움을 강조하는 반야적 지혜관으로의 전환을 의미한다.

여기서 분명히 전제되는 것은 교육문제는 더 이상 교육자체만의 문제가 아니라, 이들 배후에 근대의 세계관과 인간관이 뿌리깊게 얽혀 있기 때문에 드러난 현상이라는 점이다. 그런 관점에서 본고는 근대의 교육문제를 형성해 온 거대 패러다임에 대한 근원을 비판함으로써 현대의 교육문제를 재검토하고, 이들의 해결방안의 경향들에 불교적 교육이념들이 깊숙히 침투되어 있음을 드러내고자 한다. 이것은 교육에서 불교적 가치를 구현한다는 것이 교육현실에 불교라는 새로운 가치를 부가하는 차원이 아니라, 기존의 근대패러다임의 해체를 통해 드러나는 교육 본연의 가치임을 환기시키려는 작은 시도이다.