Abstract

We tend to think that the various forms of Buddhism are ethnic in nature, as if the practitioners of a certain Buddhist tradition are either non-Asian converts or Asians from a particular ethnic group. This is not borne out by the study of Buddhist groups in Ontario. Language and cultural identity may have been a barrier in the past for people who wished to follow a Buddhist tradition other than that practised within their own nationality. However, as more and more people are able to speak more than one language, and as Buddhism becomes more of a spiritual practice rather than a cultural identity, the barriers between cultures and languages recede. For example, not only can we observe many Chinese immigrants going to Vietnamese Buddhist temples, and receiving guidance and instruction toward initiation under Vietnamese monks, we can also observe Japanese attending the Korean Zen temple, Chinese learning Tibetan Buddhism, or Vietnamese following Japanese Rinzai Zen training. This paper studies the development of the diverse ethnic Buddhist groups in Ontario, with emphasis on the roles that language and cultural identity play in that development.

This paper focuses largely on the academic study of Buddhism in Ontario. In 1999, Charles Prebish published a work entitled Luminous Passage: The Practice and Study of Buddhism in America, wherein Buddhism in Canada was mentioned only briefly, in a single short paragraph. This is, of course,
understandable since that book focuses on Buddhism in the United States of America. However, when it comes to the study of Buddhism in Canada I find there is often a problematic assumption that Canadian Buddhism displays the same characteristics as Buddhism in America. In a recent survey of the study of Buddhism in the West, a table providing the number of Buddhists and Buddhist groups in fifteen countries in the mid-1990s is included, and curiously omits Canada – even though Canada is mentioned in the discussion of Buddhism in America in a subsequent paragraph.\(^3\)

Such neglect is, of course, a result of a lack of serious study of Canadian Buddhist groups. One way to illustrate the advancement of a field of study is to examine the doctoral dissertations conducted in that field. With regard to American Buddhism, for example, Duncan Ryuken Williams has compiled a list of dissertations and theses on the study of this subject from 1937 up to 1997. This can be found in a volume he co-edited with Christopher Queen, entitled *American Buddhism: Methods and Findings in Recent Scholarship*.\(^4\)

In this list we find some 75 works, including doctoral dissertations and M.A. and B.A. theses on American Buddhism. If we take a closer look at this compilation, we find that interest in scholarly studies of American Buddhism did not really begin until the 70s. So, more than seventy serious studies on American Buddhism within the span of around 40 years strikes me as a fairly significant number, especially when compared to the study of Canadian Buddhism. When I searched for dissertations on Canadian Buddhism I found, rather surprisingly, only two: Janet McLellan’s doctoral dissertation on Japanese and Vietnamese Buddhists in Toronto, *Many Petals of the Lotus: Redefinitions of Buddhist Identity in Toronto* (York University, 1993); and Angie Danyluk’s dissertation, *An Ethnography of Western Tibetan Buddhists in Toronto* (McMaster University, 2003).\(^5\) McLellan’s dissertation was later edited and published in 1999 by the University of Toronto Press. Reference must also be made of Terry Watada’s *Bukkyo Tozen: A History of Jodo Shinshu Buddhism in Canada 1905-1995*.\(^6\) These are, to my knowledge, the only two published book-length works on Buddhism in Canada. Of course, there are also journal articles and conference papers on Buddhism in Canada.\(^7\) But, again, when compared with the quantity of similar research conducted on American Buddhism, it seems that the study of Canadian Buddhism is still a rather unexplored field.

The few studies that I mentioned were mostly conducted in Ontario, even though the first Buddhist temple, as we know, was established on the West coast in 1905, and Buddhism was first officially recognized by the Canadian government in British Columbia in 1909. Part of the reason is that among all Canadian provinces Ontario has the largest number of resident Buddhists. In the 2001 Statistics Canada Census, the total Buddhist population was said to number 300,345, but the figures are widely believed to be underestimated.
The actual number of Buddhists in Canada is estimated to be at least 500,000. Of the reported 300,000 Buddhist population in Canada, more than 128,000 live in Ontario, the most Buddhist-populated province, compared to 85,000 in British Columbia, the second-most Buddhist-populated province in Canada, while in the Yukon and New Brunswick there are just over a hundred Buddhists. Another possible reason for the paucity of studies of Buddhism in Canada is the lack of the specific graduate programs and teaching faculties in Ontario universities that would make these studies possible.

In Ontario universities, we have an interesting mix of scholars whose areas of research lie not only in the historical and philosophical study of Buddhism, but also in contemporary Buddhist movements, as well as Buddhist immigrants and refugees in North America. Mavis Fenn at St. Paul’s United College of University of Waterloo, for example, has conducted research on the Buddhists in the Kitchener-Waterloo area, the relationship of religion to adaptation and identity in Buddhist university students, and the range of issues involved in the development of computer-based courses for teaching Buddhism. Lynn Edlershaw, at Waterloo University, has conducted detailed analysis of the Shambhala International, which has its headquarters in Nova Scotia. Graeme MacQueen, retired professor at the Department of Religious Studies at McMaster University, is a long-standing supporter of the Centre for Peace Studies at McMaster University and has taught a course on Socially Engaged Buddhism for many years. Recently James Benn, a scholar of Chinese Buddhism has joined the staff of McMaster University. At Wilfrid Laurier University, Janet McLellan continues her research on Buddhism in the multicultural context of Canada. Kay Koppedrayer, professor at Wilfrid Laurier, has a wide range of interests in South Asian religions and emerging trends in American Buddhism. At York University, two anthropologists contribute to the study of Buddhism in Canada: Judith Nagata, who conducts field work and research with Chinese and Malaysian scholars; Penny Van Esterik, the co-director of York University’s Thai Studies Project, has focused her Buddhist research on cultural factors affecting the Southeast Asian refugees, and in 1993 published *Taking Refuge: Lao Buddhists in North America*.

There is also quite a number of distinguished scholars in Ontario who are interested in the historical and doctrinal sides of Buddhism, including retired professor Jan Yun-hua at McMaster University, Professors Koichi Sinohara and Phyllis Granoff, who have been teaching at McMaster for many years and have only recently left the university for Yale; and Jacob Dalton, who joined the McMaster faculty for a year in 2004, also followed the steps of Sinohara and Granoff to Yale. At the University of Toronto, there are: Professor Emeritus A.K. Warder, well-known for his work, *Indian Buddhism*; the late Julia Ching, who specialized on Chinese Buddhism; Leonard Priestley, who...
specializes in Pudgalavāda Buddhism and the philosophy of Nāgarjuna; and Neil McMullin, who has for many years overseen the grants from the Numata Foundation and has invited many distinguished Buddhist scholars from around the world to the University of Toronto. Frances Garrett recently joined the University of Toronto and offers, for the first time at the university, courses on Tibetan Buddhism and Tibetan language. It is apparent that we have had a very impressive list of scholars in Ontario universities, although sadly many of these scholars have retired. Also, Suwanda Sugunasiri, founder of the Nalanda College of Buddhist Studies, organized in 1993 and 1994 a series of seminars on Buddhism at the University of Toronto; organized a conference on Professor Rita Gross’ Buddhism After Patriarchy in 1995; and in 2005, on the 100th year of Buddhism in Canada, organized a conference, Buddhism in Canada: State of the Art and Future Directions.

Due to the lack of detailed study of the characteristics and nature of Canadian Buddhism, it is also generally assumed that Buddhism in Canada shares a similar pattern of historical and social evolution to that of Buddhism in America. There is a widely accepted system of classification in America that divides Buddhism into two distinct groups, denoted by the terms ‘ethnic Buddhist’ and ‘Western Buddhists.’ The former comprises ethnic Asian-Buddhist immigrants, while Euro-American Buddhists constitute the latter. Such a contrast might help us to understand how Buddhism reached North America by way of the migrating Asians, as well as to recognize the conflicts between the traditional cultural Buddhist practice and the converts’ modernization efforts. Charles Prebish is one of the first who used the model of dual development to understand the struggle of the Buddhist tradition to accommodate itself to Western society and culture. Relying upon an historical analysis of Buddhism in the West, Prebish constructed the model of what he called “two Buddhisms”: the first group consists of the practitioners of Asian descendants, including both those who immigrated from Asia and those who were born in North America; the second group comprises European descendants who are either converts or have been highly sympathetic to the philosophy or practice of Buddhism. Charles Prebish’s model suggests that the form of Buddhism practiced by Asian immigrants and their descendants plays a key role in transmitting and preserving cultural values and identity, and the Buddhism practiced by European-descended converts is more concerned with transforming themselves and American society.

There were also other attempts in recent years to clarify the trajectory of Buddhism in North America through dualistic models. Rick Fields echoes Prebish’s model and reports that scholars and critics of Buddhism in North America have spoken about the “dual development” of Western Buddhism, even though only one is spoken of in terms of its influence on the West, and
often at the exclusion of the other.24 On the other hand, Jan Nattier provides a more comprehensive model by focusing on the threefold ways Buddhism is transmitted to American society, which she characterizes as “import,” “export,” or “baggage.”25 These represent categorization according to mode of transmission, rather than the more customary method of categorizing according to doctrine, practice, or national origin. The first type of transmission, “import,” is often labeled “elite Buddhism.” This group predominately comprises Westerners who are well-educated and financially stable. Most of them have a strong interest both in meditative practice and Buddhist philosophy, rather than devotional or ritualistic practice. The second classification is akin to “devotional” or “missionary” Buddhism, which attracts followers with a much broader ethnic demography, including Asian Americans and African Americans.26 “Baggage Buddhism” refers to the form of Buddhism practiced by those born into traditional Buddhist families. Thus it is also called “ethnic Buddhism.” Hence, the labels, “elite Buddhism,” “evangelical Buddhism,” and “ethnic Buddhism,” also apply to Nattier’s typology of the transmission of Buddhism to America. However, it should be noted that Prebish’s model and Nattier’s research were conducted in the United States and focused on American Buddhists, and one should question if such American-based models could be applied to characterize Buddhists in Canada.

It is generally acknowledged, of course, that popular Canadian culture is strongly influenced by its southern neighbour, the United States. In recent years America has become fascinated with Buddhism. This interest manifests itself in mainstream Hollywood productions, pop-culture, as well as best-selling books on Buddhism, and the conversion of celebrities to Buddhism. This general awareness of, and curiosity about, Buddhism also extends to Canada. The American influence was therefore partly responsible for the success of Buddhism in Canada. As a result of this, many non-Asian Canadians developed an interest in or were converted to Buddhism.

However, there are also cultural differences between the two countries. As mentioned earlier, Nattier equates “elite Buddhism” with upper middle-class Euro-Americans; “evangelical Buddhism” with lower middle-class racial groups; and “Baggage Buddhism” with American-born Asians whose families practice Buddhism inherited from their ancestors. These categories are clearly not applicable to reflect the Buddhist diversity in Canada. In Ontario, ‘elites’ are not confined to upper middle-class Euro-Canadians. Many of them are well-educated professionals who came to Canada from Asia under the Immigration Act of 1962, which allowed immigrants to be selected on the basis of education rather than race. Together with the point system of immigration, introduced in 1967, these new policies introduced a large number of professional, “elite” Asian immigrants to Canada.
McLellan calls our attention to a much more realistic distinction between immigrant Buddhists and refugee Buddhists in Canada, a distinction which is completely ignored in the models we just mentioned. The needs and difficulties of these two Buddhist groups are quite different, and hence the temples or Buddhist organizations of these two groups respond very differently in the social and cultural fields. It is important to recognize and understand the differences: on the one hand, refugees, often impaired physically and mentally by trauma, encounter immense difficulties in resettling and re-establishing their cultural and religious identity; on the other hand, immigrants are generally wealthier and keep a closer connection with their homeland. For example, the Chinese immigrants donated generously to alleviate the suffering caused by the numerous floods and droughts that have afflicted China.

In the context of Canadian multiculturalism we find an unprecedented level of interaction among Buddhist groups, united as they are in the attempt to maintain their form of Buddhism as a non-ethnic, non-sectarian tradition. For example, in 1979 the Toronto Buddhist Federation was founded as an umbrella organization representing sixteen Buddhist groups in Toronto. The following year, the Federation gathered more than 1,500 Buddhists for the celebration of Wesak. The Buddhist Federation later underwent several changes, trying to establish itself as a national body that represents all Buddhists in Canada. Unfortunately, these early efforts have not yet culminated in a strong, dynamic federation.

One of the factors that differentiate Canadian Buddhism from American Buddhism is the spirit of multiculturalism in Canada. The Multiculturalism Act promulgated in 1971 made Canada the first country in the world to adopt such a policy. It goes without saying that the concept of multiculturalism was instrumental in Buddhism taking root in Canada. However, this only accounts for the general acceptance of Buddhism in Canada: the immense increase in the number of Buddhists is largely a result of the changes in Canadian Immigration Laws. Many of the new immigrants were skilled and well educated, and a large number of them were of the Buddhist Faith. Since then, several waves of Asian immigrants have occurred, most notably the influx of Chinese immigrants from Hong Kong, Taiwan, and China. In the late Sixties thousands of immigrants came from Japan, and, in the Eighties, from Singapore. In addition, there has also been a large number of Korean, Thai, and Sinhalese immigrants to Canada. There were also Burmese refugees who fled because of social and political changes resulting from Burma’s independence from British rule. Vietnamese, Cambodians and Laotians arrived in Canada after the Communists took over Saigon in 1975. A significant portion of these immigrants and refugees settled in Ontario.

The policy of multiculturalism provided the cultural pluralism that allows
Buddhists to adopt a variety of identities in the Canadian society. One can also observe various transformations of Buddhist practice along doctrinal and ethnic lines. Diversity in ethnic culture is seen as an added value in Canadian multiculturalism. All three Buddhist ‘vehicles’ (Theravada, Mahayana and Vajrayana) thrive in Canada. The diversity is evident in the presence of various lineages, teachings, ritual forms, and methods of meditative practice.

As a result of the socio-cultural dynamics of multiculturalism, there has been no concerted effort on the part of the various Buddhist traditions to divest themselves of their sectarian identity. Neither is there evidence of an urge to ‘fundamentalism’ in the sense of a need to make one’s particular sectarian tradition an absolute. On the contrary, it seems that it is indeed the sectarian distinctions that make these Buddhist schools appeal to a diverse range of people.

For example, while most of the Buddhist temples or meditative centres in Toronto – which number more than sixty – are of Chinese origin, twelve of them are of Tibetan tradition. According to the Canadian Tibetan Association of Ontario, a non-profit organization incorporated in 1980, there are about 3,000 Tibetans living in the province of Ontario. Many of these Tibetan Buddhists have shrines in their homes, and many of them also attend Tibetan Buddhist temples or organizations. In Toronto there is a colorful mix of different Tibetan Buddhist organizations, each having its unique identity, emphasis, and participants. The Riwoche Pemavajra Temple and the Vajrayana Buddhism Association teach Tibetan Buddhism in a traditional way. The Riwoche temple is attended predominantly by non-Asian members in its regular meditative sessions, but ethnic Tibetans also attend the temple for cultural events. The Vajrayana Buddhism Association is attended mostly by Chinese immigrants, but also offers workshops and classes in English that attract non-Asians. In addition to these two, there are the Gaden Choling Mahayana Buddhist Meditation Centre, the New Kadampa Tradition of Tibetan Buddhism, and the Friends of the Heart Meditation and Healing Centre. These temples illustrate a great diversity of interests and programs.

In Toronto, as amply demonstrated in Janet McLellan’s studies, there are the ethnic Buddhist groups of Vietnamese, Japanese, Chinese, Tibetan, and Cambodian. There are of course also Euro-Canadian Buddhist groups. Among the Japanese, adaptations within the Toronto Buddhist Church reflect the influence of the generations of Japanese-born within Canada rather than immigrants. The second and third generation of participants are linguistically and culturally different from their parents or ancestors. Each generation within the Toronto Buddhist Church has its own symbolic markers for identity and different attitudes towards religious practices and spiritual needs. For example, the five different groups of Vietnamese Buddhists in McLellan’s study exhibit economic, political, and class differences, as well as different
levels of integration into mainstream Canadian society. In other words, the diversity of religious identity of the Vietnamese Buddhists alone cannot be classified under simplified categorical divisions such as “ethnic Buddhism,” or a kind of Buddhism that only aims at transmitting Buddhist teachings and practices without also transforming, and being transformed by, Canadian society.

In many Buddhist organizations, there is a remarkable mixture of different ethnicities or nations. The Ching Kwok Temple in Toronto, for example, is equally attended in numbers by Vietnamese and Chinese Buddhists. The Buddhist Light Temple (Foguang Shan) in Mississauga attracts not only Taiwanese Buddhist practitioners, but a major portion of the attendants are Buddhists from Hong Kong and China. The Vajrayana Buddhism Association, with its headquarters in Scarborough, which advocates the practice of the rNying ma School of Tibetan Buddhism, is attended mostly by Chinese, but there are also classes offered in English that attract mainstream Euro-Canadians. These groups all manifest multi-level, multi-faceted identities which go beyond the flat, one-dimensional descriptions of the models we have seen in Prebish’s or Nattier’s works. In Ontario, we also find international Buddhist organizations, including the Tiep Hien Order (Order of Interbeing) with its headquarters in France headed by Thich Nhat Hanh, the Fo Guang Buddha’s Light International Association founded by Master Hsing Yun, the Tzu Chi Foundation under the leadership of Ven. Zhengyen in Taiwan, and the Shambhala International founded by Chogyam Trungpa with its headquarters established at Nova Scotia. All these Buddhist groups have global notions of ethical values, which go beyond national, geographical or cultural boundaries.

These critical observations do not mean that the models proposed by Prebish, Nattier, and others are not useful. On the contrary, it is true that non-Asian Buddhists are generally more concerned with the practical side of Buddhism. In other words, these non-Asian Buddhists are more interested in the attainment of either mental health or spiritual insight through regular meditative sessions under the guidance of a qualified master, guru or roshi than participation in traditional religious, communal activities. The Asian practitioners, however, tend to emphasize more their social interaction with other group members, and many see the temples as a places that foster the continuation of cultural identities. In the Buddhist temples which are attended mostly by Asians, there are also non-religious activities such as ESL classes, employment talks, citizenship classes, Sunday schools, youth groups, day care centres, senior services, etc., which are all modeled after the Protestant churches’ social ethos. So, there are differences between Asian Buddhists and non-Asian Buddhists, and the models proposed by Prebish and others sometimes do help us to see their differences. However, on a
cautionary note I would like to observe that these models are, in a traditional Buddhist way of speaking, ‘conventional’ by nature: they have their limitations and should not be seen as absolute. These models are also developed in the context of American culture. Because of their tacit assumptions, it is often problematic to use them to study Buddhism in Canada, and to assess the impact of religion on the multicultural communities within the country. It would be much safer to study Buddhism in Canada along the lines of their various traditions rather than to force on them generalized models based on ethnicity, social status, and other artificial parameters. As Donald Swearer aptly pointed out in his work *Buddhism in Transition*, there are three ways a religious tradition might respond when society undergoes changes: 1) remaining unchanged, as it isolates itself from the society; 2) adapting itself to the changes while still retaining its values and character; 3) undergoing changes with the society with little or no regard for what it was. 29 We can observe all three responses to change when we examine Buddhist traditions in Canada. One possible direction for studying Buddhism in Canada is to focus on the distinctive traditions and sects and to observe their varying responses to their social context.

Although 2005 marked the 100th year of the official recognition of Buddhism in Canada, the history of Buddhism in Canada is still too short to allow for the flowering of Buddhist traditions that can be considered ‘Canada’s own.’ Buddhist doctrines and meditative practices have not had the opportunity to integrate seamlessly with Canadian culture and give rise to a new Buddhist identity. For example, in terms of Zen practice, many practitioners are still following the English translation of the centuries-old Asian koans, not contemporary Canadian koans. Nevertheless, Canada’s unique multicultural policy does provide a secure foundation on which Buddhist groups can evolve and flourish in their colourful diversity benefiting Canadians with very different spiritual needs. Moreover, the Canadian academy may assume its own prominent role in the study of the distinctive forms of Buddhism in Canada.

NOTES

1 My study of Buddhism in Canada was initiated in 1998 when I was the research assistant to Prof. Charles Prebish, who came to the University of Toronto to research Buddhism in Canada, funded by the Rockefeller Foundation. The research was intended as a follow-up to his earlier study of American Buddhism, and there were plans to publish either a book or a long article on the basis of the research. However, this did not happen.
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22 The conference included: “Buddhism in Canada: an Historical Overview” by Victor Hori; “Buddhism in Nova Scotia” by Terry Woo; “Two Traditions, Two Teachers, One Dharma” by James Mullens; “Buddhism in Ontario” by Henry Shiu; “Buddhism in the Capital: The Case for an Ottawa Dharma Council” by Angela Sumegi; “A Comprehensive Curriculum in Buddhadharma Studies at Nalanda” by


26 Ibid, 89.


29 Donald Swearer, *Buddhism in Transition* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970), 13: “At one extreme is the view that holds the authority of religious claims to be absolute and resolutely rejects culture’s claims to loyalty. At the other extreme is the position in which religion and its sociocultural milieu are so homogenized as to be nearly indistinguishable. … In between these two extreme approaches … include the synthesis of the religious and the cultural….”
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