News of the Society

2007 ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY
AAR/SBL Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA, USA

SBCS Board Meeting
Friday, Nov. 16: 9:00-11:30 AM; 1:00-3:30 PM
Manchester Grand Hyatt San Diego, Edward C

SBCS Panel Session #1
Friday, Nov. 16: 4:00-6:00 PM
Manchester Grand Hyatt San Diego, Gregory A
Manchester Grand Hyatt San Diego, Manchester G

Theme: “In or Out: Homosexuality, the Church, and the Sangha”

This session explores issues relating to sexual identity and sexual codes within Buddhist and Christian traditions. It has been organized in honor of the late Roger Corless, longtime member of the SBCS, dual practitioner of Roman Catholicism and Vajrayana Buddhism, and a voice for “queer sangha.”

Harry Wells, Humboldt State University, presiding
Robert Fastiggi, Sacred Heart Major Seminary
“The Catholic Church and Homosexuality”
Ilene Stanford, Harvard University
“In or Out? Marriage as a Social Practice”
José Ignacio Cabezón, University of California, Santa Barbara
“Is Homosexual Sex ‘Sexual Misconduct’? Critical Reflections on Some Classical Indo-Tibetan Sources”

Michael Sweet, University of Wisconsin, Madison
“Shameless Discretion: Insider and Outsider Perspectives of Homoeroticism in the Sangha”
Respondent: Richard Reilly, St. Bonaventure University

SBCS Business Meeting
Friday, Nov. 16: 6:00-6:30 PM
Manchester Grand Hyatt San Diego, Manchester G

SBCS Panel Session #2
Saturday, Nov. 17: 4:00-6:30 PM
San Diego Convention Center, 31C

Theme: “The Thought and Legacy of Masao Abe”

This roundtable session focuses on the contribution of Masao Abe (1915-2006) to Zen studies, interreligious dialogue, and comparative philosophy. A general discussion will follow the panel presentations.

Christopher Ives, Stonehill College, presiding
Panelists:
Donald W. Mitchell, Purdue University
Michiko Yusa, Western Washington University
James Fredericks, Loyola Marymount University
John B. Cobb, Jr., Claremont School of Theology
Stephen Rowe, Grand Valley State University
William R. LaFleur, University of Pennsylvania
Steven Heine, Florida International University
IN MEMORIAM: JAN VAN BRAGT (1928–2007)

James W. Heisig
Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture

Early on the morning of Easter Thursday, 12 April 2007, Jan Van Bragt passed away quietly at the age of seventy-eight. During the year previous his health had begun to deteriorate until in the final days of 2006 he was obliged to leave Kyoto and take up residence with his religious congregation in Himeji. On 21 February, he was hospitalized with lung cancer and was operated on some weeks later. After a brief period in a semi-comatose state, he regained consciousness but was never to speak again.

Jan was born in Flemish Belgium and entered the Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary at age eighteen. Six years later, he was ordained a priest. After receiving his Master’s degree in philosophy, he entered the doctoral program and at the same time lectured at the Congregation’s seminary. Five years later he received his doctoral degree in philosophy from the University of Leuven with a thesis on Hegel and immediately set sail for Japan, landing in December of 1961.

Jan undertook eighteen months of training in the language and then spent another eighteen months working as an assistant pastor at the Sakai Catholic Church near Osaka. In 1965, he was accepted as a research student at Kyoto University, where he spent the next six years studying with Takeuchi Yoshinori and Nishitani Keiji. In 1971, he was named provincial superior of the Congregation in Japan, a post he held for five years until it was interrupted unexpectedly by the request to serve as the first acting director of the newly established Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture.

For the next fifteen years he brought the fledgling Institute to maturity, galvanizing the young and inexperienced staff into a community of scholars devoted to exploring the largely unknown and uncharted waters of interreligious dialogue in Japan. Among his first projects was the inter-monastic exchange that brought leading Buddhist monks and nuns from Japan to European monasteries and vice-versa. At a concluding symposium in Japan he served as chair juggling Japanese, Flemish, German, French, and English with the skill and poise for which we all remember him. After a flurry of publications on the project, he left the project to others to carry on—as it has to this day, having reached a second generation, most of whom no longer know the inaugural role that he played.

Jan was also a key figure in the Japan Society for Buddhist-Christian Studies, founded in 1982. In addition to bringing the central office of the Society to the Nanzan Institute, he served as president from 1989 to 1997. During his years at the Nanzan Institute, he was in demand around Japan as a lecturer or partner in dialogue. For many years he traveled around the world in the same capacity and was invited to teach in Canada, Belgium, the United States, and the Philippines. From 1985 to 1990, he served as a member of the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue. In his thinking and writing, his study and reading, as well as in his moral concerns, Jan straddled any number of civilizations, histories, literatures, and cultures. In the end, however, it was in Japan that he felt most at home, where he found a loom on which to weave the things of life into a single view of the world.
At his funeral, Jan Swyngedouw, a fellow Flemish missionary and longtime colleague at the Nanzan Institute, delivered a thoughtful and touching tribute to a man who had always shied away from honors and recognition, preferring to let others stand on his shoulders and even accept the credit that was rightly his. He told of going through Jan’s library (the philosophical portion of which he graciously donated to the Centro Studi Asiatico in Osaka) and being struck by the number of volumes on mysticism. Like all of us, he knew of Jan’s academic interest in the Christian mystics as a bridge between religions, but as he read through comments in the margins he came to realize what most of us had never noticed: how deeply Jan’s own spirituality was rooted in the mystical tradition, where he found a way to ground his ideals as priest, educator, and scholar. The simple life he led and the simple tastes he cultivated were his way of resisting the relentless pressures of the age to acquire more and consume more.

I lived with Jan for eighteen years in Paulus Heim, a small home we had made to house a community of scholars and to give lodgings to hundreds of men and women from around the world who came to spend time at the Nanzan Institute. Of the many memories that crowd in on me as I look at his photograph sitting on my desk, most of them have to do with discussions we had at home. How many late nights we spent sitting in our living room discussing religions and philosophies East and West with visitors from abroad like Fritz Buri, Hans Küng, Raimund Panikkar, Frederick Copleston, Ivan Illich, Ernesto Cardenal, Jon Sobrino, Gustavo Gutiérrez, Bryan Wilson, Heinrich Rombach, William Theodore de Bary, Julia Ching, Sulak Sivaraksa, and Frederick Franck—not to mention the almost endless stream of scholars from within Japan! Whether the visitor was a young graduate student or a world-renowned scholar, Jan had a way of making everyone feel comfortable so that the center of conversation could move gracefully from one person to the next. Quietly, undramatically, often with good humor but just as often without any visible sign of his own presence, he had a way of keeping a discussion breathing in and out.

Two memories stand out above all others as typifying the kind of man he was. The day I arrived in Japan, I headed straight for the Institute. Jan had been alerted to my coming and stood there waiting for me at the front entrance. He reached out his hand, introduced himself, and welcomed me. As I pulled away after a polite handshake, he reached out and took hold of me with his other hand. “Two trunks of books have arrived, Jim, and we put them in your office. Please take what you need from them and have a good look around the building. We are only a few people and most of the rooms are still unoccupied, but do have a good look around. It will be the last time you pass through these doors until you can read and write and discuss freely in Japanese. Until then, we can get along better without you.” And then he smiled and led me in. At the time I remember finding his words strange—warm, but strange.

It was only when I had completed the task he had set for me and returned to the Institute that I realized how generous his gesture had been. Beginning a new Institute without any experience, the skeletal staff was overworked and disoriented, with nothing to guide them but the vague ideal of creating an oasis for people from different religions to talk to one another on a scholarly level. The amount of work that had to be done to organize an office, compile a library, arrange for scholarships, consult with religious and academic leaders, and the like was immense. And yet there he was, telling me that the only thing I had to worry about was getting as good a preparation as I could get. No schedules, no deadlines, no pressure. This was only the first of many occasions that he took to insure that organizational concerns would always come second to making the Institute a center of excellence able to adjust to the needs of its members. Whatever our personal failings over the years to live up to the ideals, Jan was always there to remind us when we forgot, to catch us when we fell, to get us back on track when we were distracted.

I also remember the intense experience of having Jan as my teacher. When he had completed his translation of Nishitani Keiji’s master work Religion and Nothingness, after sixteen years of consultation with colleagues and countless hours of discussion with Nishitani himself, Jan felt that the manuscript needed one more thing: the touch of a native English hand. I was flattered when he asked for my help and set about as best I could to remove some of the rough edges and bring a certain flow to the prose. I would work during the day, the Japanese text open before me, to produce a few pages of what I thought was flawless work. Then
at night, after we had cleared the supper table and watched the evening news, he would sit down with me and go through my work word by word, unraveling one thread after another of what I had woven so carefully.

In the course of many months, I learned more about the scholarly conscience of reliable translation work than I would have imagined possible. There were no computers to lighten the load; I would have to type and retype the pages over and over until he was satisfied that I had gotten it right. Every few hours he would become all excited over the smallest turn of phrase that I had gotten right. For the rest, he was all doubts and questions. When it was done, I never had the slightest thought that it was my work. But neither did I feel that he had taken advantage of me. It was a teacher’s gift that in satisfying the demands he made on himself he taught me to demand more of myself than any teacher I have had before or since.

When Jan retired from Nanzan University, he spent two more years at the Institute as a professor emeritus and then moved to a small room on the north end of Kyoto where he lived until the final months of his life. From the time of his years at Kyoto University, the city had a special place in his heart. When there would be a lull at the Institute, or when he was facing a deadline for an essay and needed to get away from everything, he would often announce at supper, “I am going to disappear tonight for a few days.” We all knew this meant he was heading for Kyoto and would return in two or three days with a smile on his face and a completed manuscript in his briefcase.

Even after retiring to Kyoto he would visit us every couple of months to catch up on periodical literature and renew contacts. These were visits we looked forward to as much as I know he did. Beginning in 2006, we began to discuss with him the possibility of having him return for a year to inaugurate a new Chair in 2006 for Interreligious Research that we were establishing at the Nanzan Institute. The offer coincided with a rapid decline in his health, and in the end he told me, choking back the tears, that he did not think he would have the strength to take the position on.

His academic contributions and the development of his own thought are matters that require more attention than this short memorial can give them. He was a good teacher and a better friend. Our world is a size smaller without him.

[The above is an edited version of Heisig’s memorial essay. The full text, along with a list of Jan Van Bragt’s writings, can be found at http://www.nanzan-u.ac.jp/SHUBUNKEN/staff/Van_Bragt.htm.]

CORRECTION

In the spring 2007 SBCS Newsletter, Dr. Duane Bidwell, a presenter at the 2007 annual meeting, was incorrectly identified as David Bidwell. Sorry, Duane!

ROGER CORLESS MEMORIAL FUND

Please consider donating to the SBCS Roger Corless Memorial Fund, CSSR Executive Office, Rice University, MS 156, P. O. Box 1892, Houston, TX 77251-1892 USA. (713)-348-5721.

CONFERENCES and DIALOGUES

European Network of Buddhist-Christian Studies
Salzburg, Austria, June 8-11, 2007

John D’Arcy May
Irish School of Ecumenics, Trinity College Dublin

Is it a problem for Buddhists that what is generally regarded as religion can be profoundly different from tradition to tradition? Is it appropriate or even desirable to speak of a Buddhist “theology of religions”? Does Buddhism have its own ways, however subtle, of affirming its superiority over all else that claims the name “religion”? The European Network of Buddhist-Christian Studies set out to find answers to these questions at its seventh conference, held at the splendid Catholic conference centre of St. Virgil on the outskirts of Salzburg, Austria.

Given the demographic realities in Europe, the Network has inevitably tended to be a group of Christians discussing Buddhism, as far as possible with the participation of Buddhist guests but without really providing a platform for a thoroughgoing Buddhist discussion of religious plurality. This time, more Buddhists than ever before, including significant scholars from America and Asia as well as Europe, participated in the conference. We were thus treated to a discussion of Buddhist attitudes to the religions which
broke new ground and presented a vivid picture of Buddhism’s own internal diversity as its various Asian incarnations are brought into physical proximity and public confrontation in the plural societies of both Asia and the West.

In his introductory address the President of the Network, Prof. John May, paid tribute to the University of Salzburg’s newly established Centre for Intercultural Theology and the Study of Religions, whose Director, Prof. Gregor Maria Hoff, welcomed participants on behalf of the university, while Dr. Ulrich Winkler contributed substantially to the organisation of the conference.

Dr. Kristin Kiblinger (Winthrop University), author of the first systematic treatment of Buddhist “inclusivism,” opened the conference proper by distinguishing between “open” and “closed” forms of inclusivism. She suggested a parallel with George Lindbeck’s “experiential-expressive” paradigm of religious doctrine in order to make clear that Buddhists, like Christians, have ways of privileging their own positions, though these generally remain unacknowledged.

“One vehicle” (ekayāna) theories of Buddhism have something in common with “common core” theories of Christian pluralism in that they presuppose a “single end” inclusivism. Whether the “positionless position” derived from Buddhist “emptiness” (śūnyatā) is a better guarantee of genuine pluralism than the Christian notion of “self-emptying” (kenōsis), as suggested by Masao Abe, remains an open question. The Buddhist doctrine of “two truths,” one expressed in the “higher” language (paramārtha-satya) accessible only to Buddhist practitioners and the other in the “lower” language (sa v ti-satya) of discourse with others, does not hold out much promise of true mutual respect between traditions.

Prof. John Makransky (Boston College), an ordained Lama and meditation teacher as well as a renowned scholar of Tibetan Buddhism, took up the challenge of developing a Buddhist “theology” which avoids the claim to superiority. What matters to the Buddhist practitioner is to cut through all subconscious clinging, even to approved teachings and spiritual results. “Ultimate truth” can be known, directly but non-conceptually, yielding a “non-conceptual compassion” comparable with what Christians call “totally undivided oneness with God.” Lacking historical consciousness, however, teachers have tended to project their understanding of skillful means back on to Śākyamuni Buddha, each school assuming that other schools are merely preparations for itself. The same pattern is evident in the integration into Buddhism of indigenous religions such as Shintō, which enriched Buddhism but also assimilated it to themselves. Prompted by his contacts with Christian colleagues to venture beyond practice into Buddhist self-reflection, Makransky is now prepared to see in conceptions such as the Dharmakāya (“Dharma body” of the Buddha or ultimate reality) an equivalent of what Christians understand by God. The Body of Christ, with its implications for ecclesiology, could open up a further avenue for comparison.

Existing under the conditions of late or post-modernity, Buddhism is forced to come to terms with pluralism and ecumenism. Prof. Kenneth Tanaka (Musashino University, Tokyo), an ordained Jōdo Shinshū priest, sees himself as incapable of saying to a non-Buddhist, “You’re not saved,” because the practice of prajñā and karuṭā (wisdom and compassion) is not restricted to Buddhists. Even within traditions, however, spiritual attainment is not equivalent, nor are all religions equally valid. “Prophets can’t be pluralists,” but like Shinran they can be mindful that all religious language is relative and we are saved by “other power” (tarikī) as well as by our “own power” (jirikī).

Prof. Peter Harvey (University of Sunderland, UK), a practicing Theravāda Buddhist, gave a detailed account of the objections of what eventually came to be called the Theravāda to the Mahāyāna, notwithstanding the more recent co-operation of both in the ordination of bhikkhunī (nuns) and the renowned Thai monk Buddhāsā’s engagement with the Dalai Lama, who has always tried to transcend sectarianism. Northern Buddhism was mediated by China, where each school classified the parent Indian systems in such a way as to demonstrate its own superiority. All should remember that they take refuge, not in the various yānas, but in the Buddha.

There followed a day of astonishing discoveries as Buddhism’s relations with some of the other major religions were explored. Prof. Perry Schmidt-Leukel (University of Glasgow) reviewed the ways in which Buddhism has lent itself to violent conflict and polemics, from the “Buddhist-Tamil wars” of Sri Lanka
to Ambedkar’s opposition to Hinduism; from the anti-Vedic polemics of the early Buddhists to Buddhism’s virtual excommunication by Hinduism. By a sort of “reciprocal inclusivism,” Hindu deities and practices were integrated into both Theravāda and Mahāyāna, while Hindus interpreted the Buddha as an *āvatāra* (“descent” or incarnation) of Viṣṇu, sent to deceive the unwary. Such polemics rarely led to outright persecution, however, and in modern times the Buddhist Dharmapala and the Hindu Vivekananda found more benign ways of interpreting the “other” tradition. Today, both religions need to draw closer together as they come to terms with their powerful rivals, Islam and Christianity.

Dr. Alexander Berzin (Berlin), internationally known lecturer on and translator of Tibetan Buddhism, unfolded the little-known story of 1,300 years of Buddhist relations with Islam. Whereas Muslims generally tried to interpret Buddhism in Muslim terms, Buddhists showed no interest in Islam whatever unless forced to do so by political expediency. Better mutual understanding is now becoming urgent in such contexts as southern Thailand and Indonesia, where a “Buddhist-Muslim ethic for Southeast Asia” is needed, and the Dalai Lama has shown an interest in Sufism.

Treating the better known area of Buddhist-Christian relations, Prof. Andreas Grünschloss (University of Göttingen) reminded us how exclusivist some of the pioneers of Western Buddhism, such as Grimm and Dahlke, had been, a tendency that continues in their modern successors such as Mumonkai. Such hybrids as “Christian Zen” are as unacceptable to these Buddhists as the Buddhist interpretations of Christianity by Thich Nhat Hanh, the Dalai Lama or Ken Leong are to many Christians. When converts to Buddhism such as Ayya Khema re-read the Sermon on the Mount or I Corinthians 13 with Buddhist eyes, the text appears spiritualised and de-contextualised.

An especially fascinating presentation was that of Prof. Nathan Katz (Florida International University) on Buddhist relations with Judaism. There are ancient linguistic traces of links between India and Israel, and in modern times mutual attitudes have been ambivalent: Martin Buber relished the East, whereas Franz Rosenzweig resisted it, and Gershom Scholem admonished his fellow-Jew, the future Ayya Khema, that “Jewish mysticism is not for women,” whereupon she found her way to Buddhism while remaining Jewish. In Asia, where there have been substantial Jewish communities, Jews were used by Rama VI of Thailand to make coded references to the Chinese as a “parasitic commercial class,” while Christian missionaries saw the “bloodsucking” Brahmins as they had been taught to see Jews. Katz’s account of a dialogue between representative Jewish scholars and Tibetan Buddhists in Dharamsala showed how difficult mutual understanding can be. Yet when Ven. Geshe Lobsang Tenzin was asked how Jews could best help the Tibetans he replied: “Just be who you are, just be Jewish. . . . The fact that you are still here, the fact that you still worship in your way—this means more to us than anything you could possibly do.” “Just like that,” Katz concluded, “Geshe-la revealed our own wisdom to us.”

Prof. Paul Knitter (Union Theological Seminary, New York) was given the daunting task of outlining a comparison between Buddhist and Christian attitudes. He began by asking whether the diversity of religions is seen as a problem or a blessing in the two traditions. For the popes, religious pluralism is the case *de facto* but not *de jure*, while Buddhist thinkers such as Rita Gross are more likely to ask, “What’s the problem?” Whereas theologians have an urge to seek unity, for Buddhists diversity is normal, even ontological. Do the religions have anything in common? “Identist pluralists” answer Yes; “deep pluralists” say No. Buddhists negate incommensurable differences among religions, believing that we are not imprisoned in the particularity of language; Christians differ according to the ways they understand the Trinitarian nature of God. Contradictory answers are also given to the question of superiority. Each of these answers has to be constructed, not excavated from the traditions, because pluralism is a specifically modern idea. Buddhist theologians, however, have the resources to move beyond the exclusivism and inclusivism that have marked Buddhist history.

Although the Dharmakāya is inexpressible, statements of universal truth can be made, a stance that invites dialogue. This need not mean relativism; there is good and bad religion, and each tradition has criteria for identifying its ethical fruits. Despite stark differences, Buddhists and Christians have much to learn from one another. “Buddhists remind Christians what they already attest but all too often forget: that the God revealed by Jesus as ‘greater than I’ (mysterious)
and ‘still to come’ (eschatological) cannot therefore be limited to Jesus. Christians challenge Buddhists to take history and historical particularities more seriously... Every historical form may be utterly empty. But Emptiness is each Form, in all its historical particularity.”

In a moving response to this paper, David Brazier, the head of the Pure Land movement in Britain, began: “Amida wants to save all, speaks to all in their language; yet I don’t know his name!” None of us knows what we would do given certain circumstances, or what real faith is. We are always trying to appropriate the other, to recruit Buddhism and Christianity for “eco-humanism.” Dr. Elizabeth Harris (Liverpool Hope University), who has studied the Theravāda extensively in Sri Lanka, said that we can only use our own tools to explore each other’s traditions—Christians, for example, could make more use of the ministry of Jesus as portrayed in the Synoptic Gospels—but we will never really enter into the other’s viewpoint unless we let go of our conditioning. If we do so, we can draw deeply from others’ wells, as she has been privileged to do.

In the mid-twentieth century, Christianity went through a process of “demythologising”; one preliminary outcome of this conference is that there is scope for deconstructing familiar myths about Buddhism’s tolerance of and openness to its “others.” As David Brazier put it, “Our dialogue must be grounded in our failures.” The conference offered a growing number of younger scholars the opportunity to present their research projects, which bodes well for the future of Buddhist-Christian studies in Europe. A whole new field of Christian and Buddhist “theology of religions” has been opened up.

The next conference of the Network will be held in the Benedictine Archabbey of St. Ottilien, near Munich, 12-15 June 2009.

International Society for Universal Dialogue
Hiroshima, Japan, June 1-5, 2007

Peter A. Huff
Centenary College of Louisiana

This past summer I participated in the Seventh World Congress of the International Society for Universal Dialogue (ISUD) in Hiroshima, Japan. Founded in 1989, the ISUD is an interdisciplinary professional organization committed to intercultural dialogue. The keynote address on the Islamic just war theory was delivered by Prof. Hanafi Hassan (Cairo University). Papers from the Hiroshima conference can be found at http://www.isud.org.

One morning participants at the meeting toured Hiroshima’s beautiful Peace Memorial Park, which includes the Peace Museum, the famous A-Bomb Dome, and a number of other shrines dedicated to victims of the first wartime use of a nuclear weapon. Participants also took a day-long excursion to Miyajima Island, the site of the Itsukushima Shrine and the O-Torii (Grand Gate). The visit included a tour of the Daishoin Temple, headquarters of the Omuro branch of Shingon Buddhism, and a presentation from the temple’s chief priest Rev. Yoshida Shoyu. The day ended with a tea ceremony at Hambe-teien Garden.


An unforgettable part of my visit was the opportunity to hear the testimony of Akihiro Takahashi—former director of the city’s Peace Museum and a hibakusha (A-Bomb survivor). His presentation, using childhood paintings and autobiographical narrative to recount a schoolboy’s life-changing experience on August 6, 1945, was profoundly moving.

The ISUD will sponsor a roundtable session at the XXII World Congress of Philosophy in Seoul, Korea, July 30-August 5, 2008. Information can be found at http://www.wcp2008.or.kr. The next ISUD meeting will be held in Beijing during 2009.

SBCS WEBSITE
www.society-buddhist-christian-studies.org

To list an event or site, please contact Harry Wells: hlw2@humboldt.edu.

BURMA (MYANMAR) ACTION ALERTS

Visit the Buddhist Peace Fellowship website for up-to-date information: www.bpf.org.
CONTRIBUTE TO THE NEWSLETTER

The Society for Buddhist-Christian Studies Newsletter is published two times annually: in the spring and the fall. Please contact the Editor to share information with our readers. The deadline for the spring issue is March 1. The deadline for the fall issue is September 1. Your contributions ensure the continued existence of our newsletter. All submissions are subject to editing for clarity and length. Send items as MS Word attachments to Peter Huff: phuff@centenary.edu. All other correspondence may be sent to:

Peter A. Huff  
Religious Studies Department  
Centenary College of Louisiana  
2911 Centenary Boulevard  
Shreveport, LA 71134-1188 USA  
(318) 869-5049  
FAX: (318) 869-5168

MEMBERSHIP IN THE SBCS

To enroll as a member of the Society for Buddhist-Christian Studies, send your name and address to:

CSSR Executive Office  
Rice University MS 156  
P. O. Box 1892  
Houston, TX 77251-1892 USA

Enclose a check for $45.00 ($25.00 for students, senior citizens, and monastics) payable to CSSR, indicating that it is for SBCS membership. The Society cannot accept foreign currency or personal checks from foreign countries unless drawn on a U.S. bank. International money orders in U.S. dollars are acceptable. Payment by credit card is possible by calling 713-348-5721. Members receive the CSSR Bulletin as well as our Society’s Newsletter and our annual journal Buddhist-Christian Studies.