

Global COE Program "Development and Systematization of Death And Life Studies" has Started



Part of the Staff of G-COE after the 19th DALS Workshop (p. 15)



Workshop: "Collaboration between Life Science and DALS" (p. 17)

INFORMATION AND ESSAYS

Masao Tachibana	Susumu Shimazono
Keiichi Nakagawa	Masahiro Shimoda
Sumihiko Kumano	Motoyuki Shibata
Hiroe Shimauchi	Go Kurihara

EVENT REPORTS

DALS TEACHING STAFF LIST



Symposium: "Interrelationship of Relics and Images" (p. 18)



Developing and Systematizing Death and Life Studies

Masao Tachibana (Dean of Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology/
Faculty of Letters, Psychology/ Visual Neuroscience)

The Global Center of Excellence Program, “Development and Systematization of Death and Life Studies (DAL S)” builds on the results of the 21st Century COE Program, “Construction of Death and Life Studies concerning Culture and Value of Life” (2002-2006). The aim of the 21st Century Program was to compare views about life and death in the past and present, East and West, and by taking into account theoretical studies about values concerning life and death, to seek answers to the myriad issues that arise on the ground where clinical medicine and medical care are performed and where life and death come to the forefront in modern society. In so doing we have developed and formed a cutting-edge line of inquiry which we believe has met the highest international standards. The team of scholars and young researchers from the Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology led by Professor Susumu Shimazono, gained familiarity with research being done in the Graduate Schools of Medicine and Education and deepened their interchanges with practitioners on the ground involved in patient care and medical treatment. Their enthusiasm and energy have helped carve out the new academic field of Death and Life Studies. In April 2007, the Uehiro Chair on DAL S was established as part of the Center for Evolving Humanities, set up by a grant from the Uehiro Foundation on Ethics and Education, under the charge of Professor Tetsuro Shimizu and Hiroshi Yamazaki, lecturer. This has functioned to promote further the success of the 21st Century COE Program. The high marks received by the DAL S project has led to its being selected for the Global Center of Excellence (G-COE) Program, “Development and Systematization of Death and Life Studies (DAL S)” in 2007. The Program’s central aims will be the further development of DAL S and the training of young researchers.

We have decided on the English translation of “Death and Life Studies” rather than the more commonly used “Thanatology” because our program is not concerned only with death. DAL S looks directly at issues arising from the cutting-edge of Life Science and from contemporary practical clinical medicine, such as gene therapy, regenerative medicine, Assisted Reproductive Technology (ART), cloning technology, anti-aging medicine, and terminal care. However, it is unsurprising that there should be inconsistencies between the (still unformed) concepts of life and death according to the rapidly expanding fields of Life Science and Medicine and the common-sense understanding about them developed by human beings over the centuries. Even with the enormous amount of knowledge



What is DAL S?

that is being accumulated, we remain ignorant about the dramatic emergence of material being, life, and consciousness; modern Life Science is still asking how life was created from matter and neuroscience cannot even explain consciousness. Under these circumstances, there is no meaning in questioning which is superior, the “old-fashioned” humanities or modern science. With the development of DAL S, it is necessary to tackle in a down-to-earth way the task of clarifying the conceptual differences between the two.

How the concepts of life and death are understood differs vastly according to civilization and culture. In clarifying these differences it is extremely important that we engage in academic exchanges with countries not only in Europe and America but in Asia as well. I am delighted therefore that this program will include short research trips abroad for young scholars.

Rather than trying to understand “Life and Death” or “Death and Life” as temporary phenomena marking the beginning and ending of life, we have to come back to the question asked by the Humanities and Social Sciences, “What is a human being?” if we want to comprehend the broader question, “How should we live our lives?” Hence we must attempt to deepen our understanding of the meaning of both life and death, through an active interchange between DAL S and the traditional Humanities and Social Sciences. Also essential in this is dialogue with the fields of philosophy, ethics, and law over ethical and legal issues arising out of current practices. In this sense, the development of DAL S through the Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology is closely concerned, not only with connections between other graduate schools at the university and society, but with the way we expect the Humanities and Social Sciences to grow in the next generation. I have great hopes for the healthy development of this program as it tackles these diversified and important issues.



Initiating the Global Center of Excellence “Development and Systematization of Death and Life Studies (DALs)” Program

Susumu Shimazono (Leader of the COE Program, Professor, Graduate School of the Humanities and Sociology, Religious Studies)

Death and Life Studies (DALs) is a new field of study. It seeks first of all to be a point of linkage between medicine and the humanities and social sciences. Modern hospitals have to expend a lot of care on patients facing death, yet they do not really know how to, being familiar only with modern medicine based on the natural science approach. The Hospice movement has made rapid strides in the west since the 1960s, encouraging education and research into thanatology in order better to meet the needs of both patients and their families.

At the same time, though, a number of ethical issues have arisen concerning bioethics. Organ transplantation, in vitro fertilization, and genetic diagnosis are all possible, greatly increasing the feasibility for people to realize their desires by surmounting difficulties that were unconquerable in the past. However, as medical treatment becomes more and more potent, we have to ask ourselves the difficult question whether we need at some point to draw a line on its intervention. This has meant that ethical judgments based on how life and death are to be understood are now being asked routinely of those working in clinical medicine and medical research.

Concerns have been raised demanding that educational institutions conduct “death education” to instruct children about respect for life. Certainly, modern people have lost sight of the need to confront death, and seem to be bewildered by it. Funerary rites and the burial system have been changing rapidly in recent years and people are perplexed. Disputes have erupted too over memorial services and mourning. The relationship between the living and the dead varies according to culture, and this is a fact strongly recognized today. Also, since life and death are the reverse and obverse of the same coin, it is a concern of DALs to think about issues related to how we face the critical events of life, such as conception and birth, as well as illness and old age.

But DALs is more than simply questions about how such crises are tackled. It cannot avoid the basic human questions of what is life and what is the meaning of life and death. While for the moment we are linking DALs to practical, contemporary issues, we need also to study the philosophies and religions of both East and West, of the past as well as the present, in order to pursue a new method of understanding. It is important for us to inquire again into the philosophical and ideological dimensions of the modern, new scientific knowledge regarding views about life and evolution. Issues revolving around environmental ethics and the relationship between human beings and animal and plant life, and practical philosophical questions about war and



punishment are also part of its area of concern.

As early as 1904 a book called “Views of Death and Life” (Shiseikan) was published in Japan, and so in one sense Japan led the West in research into life and death. Under the influence of Western culture at the time, there was a strong consciousness of how East Asians, and the Japanese, viewed life and death. Today people from all parts of the world are seeking to confront these new conditions by comparing varying views about these issues.

Such were the circumstances under which the Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology at the University of Tokyo instigated in 2002, with the cooperation of the Faculties of Medicine and Education among others, the 21st Century COE Program, “Construction of Death and Life Studies (DALs).” The Global COE Program, “Development and Systematization of Death and Life Studies (DALs),” scheduled to run from 2007 to spring 2012, will be based on this project, emphasizing the systematization of a strong educational and research program with the aim of developing a new field of study and educating young researchers in it. It thus has a heavy responsibility as the second stage of the University of Tokyo DALs project.

I have already mentioned that this second stage is regarded as the developmental and systematization phase of the project, building on the “construction” phase of the first stage, and in order to secure the long-term growth of DALs, there are a number of topics that should be addressed. Three in particular stand out: (1) comparative research into the culture of life and death; (2) theoretical and philosophical inquiry into

the ethics and actuality of life and death; and (3) how to apply DALs in modern, practical terms to the humanities. Regarding the first two points, DALs seeks a specific direction of research in order to develop, based on the accumulation of results gained from previous education and research conducted by the Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology. The aim is to describe a new horizon by bringing together non-Western traditions with theoretical and cultural studies on the theme of life and death undertaken through the initiative of Western thought and scholarship. Calling what is known in the West as Death Studies or Thanatology "Death and Life Studies" suggests a way that this new horizon may be drawn. The third topic involves a large number of new concerns for the Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, since they involve active issues about practical care, meeting the needs of patients facing death, people saying their goodbyes to the dying, those who wish to be with the dying, those who are feeling the pressure of life and death crises and decisions, and those who care [i.e., medical care] for all of these people. DALs thus seeks an interchange with on-the-ground medical treatment, education, and care. The example of palliative care for cancer patients is a case in point. In particular, there should be continuing education for those working at the forefront of treatment. DALs should consider what it can contribute to society from the study of humanities, while learning a great deal from the actual issues which the Faculty of Medicine and people in charge of medical treatment in the university face in their work. There is the prospect too that such studies will revitalize these fields of scholarship.



DALs: A Developing Framework

As we move from Stage 1 to Stage 2 of the Program, we would like to stress the following two points: (1) putting serious effort into educating and training young scholars, and (2) deepening scholarly interchange with other regions of Asia. First, we want to stimulate the participation of young researchers and graduate students in constructing academic knowledge concerning DALs, taking seriously into account the kind of human resources society needs. We will create, or look for possibilities of doing so, DALs as a new specialist field of academic knowledge, contributing at the same time to the strengthening of traditional specialist knowledge. We will also aim to communicate our research results through public relations activities in foreign languages. Second, there is a clear indication that there is a growing interest in DALs in China and Korea. At the same time, we will of course continue our research exchanges with Western countries and seek to expand them further. Our aim is to contribute to the development of DALs on a global scale, taking into consideration the situation in Islamic countries and in the various regions of Asia.

I am not optimistic that we will be able to achieve in five years a complete blueprint for the future of DALs. Forming and bringing to completion a new field of study necessitates a long period of time and the efforts of a great many people. However, we will work to create a rough sketch for the long term development of DALs in the time allocated to us. Despite these limitations, I hope we will be able to form a field of study and an approach to scholarly exchange, that are new on a global scale, and that DALs will become one small wellspring to revitalize global society.



Training Scholars for International Engagement



Points of Contact - Death and Life Studies and Cancer Treatment

Keiichi Nakagawa (Director, Department of Palliative Medicine, the University of Tokyo Hospital)

Having lost their contact with nature and religious faith while enjoying a rapid increase in life expectancy, today's Japanese appear to be under the illusion that they will never die. It is true that in urban life, death appears nonexistent as a daily-life phenomenon, and is absent even from people's thoughts. Death eventually comes to everyone, but now 95 percent of Japanese people die isolated in hospitals, making the death of others something most people no longer experience with their senses. Our country no longer engages in war or requires military service, so the image we now associate most directly with death is cancer. Cancer is very much our era's "memento mori."

Very simply put, cancer can be thought of as the aging of cells, and as the Japanese are the most long-lived people in the world, they also suffer from cancer more than any other nation. In fact, one out of every 2 Japanese people will contract cancer sometime in their lives. However, for those under the illusion that they will not die, cancer—that lone reminder of death—is seen exclusively as something that happens to other people, never to oneself. The result is that Japanese people's knowledge and attitudes regarding cancer and Japan's system of medical treatment for cancer are remarkably backward among the industrialized countries.

This can be observed most particularly in the imbalance between curing and caring for cancer patients. The overall mood among both patients and medical staff is that death equals defeat and is the worst possible outcome that must be avoided; this situation in treatment facilities can be expressed diagrammatically as "cure >> care." However, "*chi-yu*," the Japanese word for "healing," is made up of two Chinese characters; taken singly they are used for the verbs "*naosu*," meaning "cure" and also "*iyasu*," meaning "care." This in fact illustrates that the duty of all doctors and nurses in all medical institutions is to both cure and care for patients.

For incurable cancer patients and patients with pain or other severe conditions, in the United States and Europe the main thrust of treatment involves a holistic approach that aims to make both the mental and physical suffering of patients and family members more bearable, and this has given rise to the concept of palliative care. This approach has its origins in the Christian spirit of the European Middle Ages, which prompted the establishment of *hospitium* (a term from which the words "hotel" and "hospital" arose), places for taking care of pilgrims, the sick and the poor.

By contrast, the element most lacking in Japan's system of cancer treatment is palliative care. An emblematic example is the issue of dealing with cancer pain. Mitigating cancer pain is the most important task performed in palliative care, and the main method used is to administer morphine or other similar drugs as medicine. Most people have a

negative image of morphine as an addictive drug, but the method used to relieve people in pain is safe and without risk of addiction. The amounts of morphine used in Japan are about one seventh of the amounts used in Canada and Australia, and about one fourth of those used in the United States and France — Japan uses the lowest levels of morphine of any industrialized nation.

If we look at all the opioid drugs including morphine and related compounds, the levels used in Japan are lower than the world average - as low as one twentieth of what is used in the US. In other words, patients in Japan have to suffer that much more severe pain. However, at present, patients who are without pain because they are given appropriate treatment with morphine or other pain medications in fact tend to live longer. Naturally enough, they can take nourishment and get some sleep, but for some reason it is still difficult to dispel morphine's evil image. Could this be because of the same "cure >> care" mindset? Far from prolonging life even for a short time, increasing the duration of suffering in fact shortens life. The recent transformation of Japanese attitudes towards death and life is resulting in actual harm to patients undergoing treatment for cancer.

To begin with, the close link between cancer treatment and Death and Life Studies is clear in the core curriculum for the faculty of medicine in Japanese universities drawn up by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, as shown in the treatment of Life and Death Studies quoted below.

Objectives Relating to Human Death

- 1) Ability to explain the concept of death, how the fact of death is established, and individual biological death.
- 2) Ability to conceptualize the basic principles of Death and Life Studies.
- 3) Ability to explain how to care for family members in the case of death.
- 4) Ability to explain the concepts of dying with dignity and euthanasia.
- 5) Ability to explain the difference between a vegetative state and brain death.

I have recently been privileged to join the Global COE "Development and Systematization of Death and Life Studies" research group; in fact, one of my objectives when I started working on palliative care in The University of Tokyo Hospital was to promote research on death in every department of The University of Tokyo. In the future, the COE program will also emphasize putting the lessons of liberal arts studies into practice in actual, present-day situations, and so this represents a dream come true for me. I look forward to further expansion of contact between COE and the field of cancer treatment, and a dynamic process of development in which liberal arts and medicine will be stimulating one another.



Death and Life Studies and the Humanities

Masahiro Shimoda (Professor, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, Indian Philosophy)

The give-and-take involved in starting an inquiry is somehow like the process of creating a life. It is inter-generational, inter-sexual, and requires the presence as well as the collaboration of others. Moreover, the life that emerges, whatever it may be, is something brand new created by the participants. It is the same when an inquiry is started, as there is the side that conveys the initial inquiry and the side that takes it in, and when the inquiry is jointly engaged in and followed-up with persistence, something new is born out of this cooperative effort.

When an inquiry has been conveyed and joint work on it is to begin, the object of this inquiry does not have to be clearly outlined before being handed over to one's partner in this process. Rather, the receiving party must be given consideration so it can be the one to establish a framework. Such inquiries do not exist independently, but in the context of the inquirer. It's not unusual for the subject of the inquiry to transform with the progress of the study. However if the inquiry is to continue to be effective, it does not depend upon the immutability of the object of the question to be consistent; rather, it depends on the persistence of the inquirer. As long as the inquirer continues to have a strong desire to pursue the matter, even if the subject of the inquiry is not obvious at the start, or if it changes over time, the previously unknown subject ultimately emerges in a distinct shape according to the inquirer's interests and academic stance.

The field of Death and Life Studies that has emerged within the field of humanities has no precedent as a form of inquiry, and it remains a subject with an unknown profile. Revealing the nature of what Death and Life Studies actually is involves nothing short of giving birth to it. The humanities have the power to make Death and Life Studies into an academic inquiry, and we must work to have it sprout deep within the humanities and grow as much as possible. What is necessary at this point is not for Death and Life Studies to determine its own profile and pass this on to the humanities, but rather that it remains the object of inquiry by the humanities and continues to be sought. In this way, Death and Life Studies can find its own identity in the context of its relationship with the humanities. The realization of a true inquiry that brings to light something that lay hidden inside the inquiry and is not simply a pseudo-inquiry in which the answers have already been determined beforehand depends on the inquirer. If Death and Life Studies are to be a true inquiry the humanities have to take on the role of inquirer in order to determine the framework.

Death and Life Studies did not necessarily come into being through a demand from within

the humanities. Instead, the humanities have received "questions" from the outside from several different quarters, due to such things as the pressing issues surrounding medical care, nursing and caregiving, and rapid changes in attitudes toward death and life due to changes in technology and society. One major role of Death and Life Studies is to act as a bridge between those who need answers and those who can furnish them.

The traditional academic discipline of the humanities is not accustomed to problems originating from the outside. The humanities have accepted the externally driven question of Death and Life Studies with sensitivity; for it to flourish within the humanities it must be cultivated with care. We in the humanities, in response to these "questions" from a place unheard of before, must nurture this embryo within our own field, a tiny image held out in front of us, and give birth to a distinct and new concept. It is inconceivable that the humanities would not show an interest in issues relating to death and life. Indeed, the various disciplines of the humanities already carry within them an awareness of the issues that cause the development of Death and Life Studies. If death and life studies, as the kernel of an inquiry from the outside, are transplanted into this womb with great care, the humanities will nurture Death and Life Studies and incubate them; I am certain the humanities will have the power to give birth to a new life from within its own interior, and this will transform them into an even stronger existence.



Published Matters by DALs Project



Random Thoughts

Sumihiko Kumano (Professor, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, Ethics)

On weekends I usually go shopping with my wife. Since we are a so-called working couple, we go shopping to buy food for the week. On the top floor of our nearby shopping center there's a pet store that sells small animals such as rabbits and hamsters in addition to dogs, cats, and small birds. When we go shopping, we first go up to that floor to spend a little time looking at the animals. At the beginning, my wife liked the dogs while I myself preferred the cats and birds, but these days we stop exclusively at the rabbits and hamsters. Week after week, we invariably have the same conversation.

"They're cute, aren't they?"
"Yes, they're so cute."
"There's such a thing as a 'cute size' for living things, isn't there?"
"Oh yes, these are just the perfect cute size!"
"Should we buy a pet?"
"Should we?"
"Well..."

The conversation always ends the same way.

"But we're not home very much, and it wouldn't be fair to them."
"And also..."
"Also..."
"...They'd die so soon."
"Yes, and it would be heartbreaking to have them die."

Without fail, we have the same conversation. When you've been married for 20 years, that's what happens. We sometimes think that if we had a child, we'd probably buy a hamster for him or her. Even though when the hamster died, the child would certainly cry a lot. But even so...It would be good for a child to experience such things as well. It would be good for him (or her) to experience the life cycle of an animal first-hand, to see its beginning, living with it, and taking care of it, following its ups and downs until the time its life is no more.

*

Every person has only one individual life to live. Yet nobody remembers being born, and at the time of our own deaths none of us can witness that final moment, nor can we know what comes after we depart this life. Yet our own lives cannot begin until we are born into this world, and they can only be complete when we die. Thus we're not able to witness or fully know the entire span of our own lives. Perhaps it is fair to say that Death

and Life Studies tries to consider the entire expanse of birth and death (*shouji*), including the death and life (*shisei*) of one's individual existence. As with all fields of study, Death and Life Studies are not necessarily free of the tendency to objectify the subject of one's study. But is this even theoretically possible? Is it actually possible to try to objectify the entire expanse of death and life in detail, including one's own individual existence? At the present I think the answer would have to be "no."

But then again...I can consider the opposite. It is generally in the nature of any field of study to attempt to reach for things that have hitherto been somehow considered impossible. If we can say that the principle of incompleteness is part of the ethos of all fields of study, then a longing to overcome that incompleteness gestates within, and this longing is the basis for attempts to reach for the "impossible." These are the things I'm thinking about as we face the second stage of constructing Death and Life Studies. But I'm in no hurry to find the answers.





Death and the 21st Century American Fiction

Motoyuki Shibata (Professor, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology,
Contemporary Literary Studies/ English)

Humor was the strong point of the 19th century American author Mark Twain, and many of his masterful jokes are still remembered. One of my favorites is the following comment, issued by him after a newspaper stated that he had died.

“The report of my death was an exaggeration.”

Life and death – the two are usually thought of as having a most serious and clear demarcation; this joke is funny because it treats the two as being continuous. Reading recent American novels, I often wonder if the boundary between life and death is really so clear.

“Imagine that a dead man arrives in a city. For days he stumbles about, the way the dead, if they came back to life, might stumble from their graves; pale and puffy-eyed as though they’d slept badly, rubbing a three day’s growth of stubble and wondering what place this was. . . .” (Paul LaFarge, *The Artist of the Missing*, 1999)

“In the afterlife, Rachel lived alone. She had a clapboard cabin and a yard full of gray geese which she could feed or not and they would do fine. Purple morning glories grew by the kitchen door. It was always an early summer morning and had been since her death.” (Maureen F. McHugh, “Ancestor Money,” in *Mothers & Other Monsters*, 2005)

“There once was a man whose wife was dead. She was dead when he fell in love with her, and she was dead for the twelve years they lived together, during which time she bore him three children, all of them dead as well, and at the time of which I am speaking, the time during which her husband began to suspect that she was having an affair, she was still dead.” (Kelly Link, “The Great Divorce,” in *Magic for Beginners*)

Whereas I had wondered, in the 1980’s, why American authors always depicted so much reality, the American authors of the 21st century seem to find it surprisingly easy to shift, within the same story, from the ordinary to the supernatural world. They write about the supernatural as if it were the ordinary, or as if the two were jumbled together. Within this world of the supernatural, the realm of death is apparently a popular “destination.” An increasing number of writers try to convey the real feel of life by portraying the worlds of life and death as reflecting each other, like mirrors face to face.

We can see that what these works have in common is that their depictions of death or of the afterlife, rather than striking up vivid sensations of

fear, have a somehow comical, fairy-tale aspect to them. There is obviously no way of knowing the raw materials authors draw on to create their work, but my sense is that these authors use the images of death that have made an impression on them by way of stories and television, more than any strong real-life experiences from close contact with death, and each in their own way shapes these through the power of their own imagination.

Why do contemporary American authors write like this? My own hypothesis is that it may be in large part due to the fact that those authors who have been active since the beginning of the 21st century have been inundated by television and films since their childhood; they have become a generation whose subconscious has, in a sense, been formed by pop culture. One could comment that writing like this causes a loss of any direct connection to not only death but to reality, and lament the poverty of a contemporary society that only experiences things entirely through images; but lamenting gets one nowhere. Ultimately, however much you try to observe death with your own eyes at close range, it will not be your own death, and so one could say that the last bit becomes a job for your imagination. To start with, aren’t people (and especially children, although it is not wise to overemphasize the sensibilities of children) capable of experiencing the true feeling of death as death, even if it is from bad television dramas? Even the three works quoted above, while starting from fairy-tale like, humorous setups, all arrive at some poignant sentiments.



My Thoughts on Being Re-employed as a Specially Appointed Researcher with the COE Death and Life Project

Hiroe Shimauchi (COE Program Specially Appointed Researcher, Cultural Anthropology)

Two and a half years ago in the spring of 2005, the 21st Century COE Program “Construction of Death and Life Studies (DAL)” had reached a turning point. At that time I was just another unemployed PhD, and happened to notice an advertisement for COE researchers. Thinking there was no harm in trying, I applied, and much to my surprise was lucky enough to get the job. When I was recently re-hired as a specially appointed researcher for the Global COE Program “Development and Systemization of Death and Life Studies (DAL),” I recalled the surprise and joy I felt on the day I received my initial appointment notice, as well as the nervousness I felt the first time I spoke with Professor Susumu Shimazono, head of the program.

Though it is mere speculation on my part, I assume I was chosen for the job at least partly due to the doctorate thesis I submitted at Waseda University, “An Examination of the Ethnology of Death – the Feuermann Tradition and Perception of Death in Western Europe,” based on a long period of overseas study and analysis of traditions in Germany. Regardless, the Spring of 2005 marked a new beginning for me at Todai.

Until this point in time, I had never had any contact with The University of Tokyo, but thanks to the project leaders, senior and contemporary researchers, and office staff, I was able to carry out my work. This included doing research in my own field of cultural anthropology as it relates to Death and Life Studies, contributing papers to the bulletin “Death and Life Studies Research,” and submitting or presenting papers at meetings. I have also worked to support the project by helping prepare for symposia, doing budgets and other paperwork, and editing pamphlets and other publications. During the launch of the Global COE Program “Development and Systemization of Death and Life Studies (DAL),” I have been assigned as the leader of the specially appointed researchers who have been entrusted with much

of the office work; while feeling refreshed by the new departure, I also feel the weight of the responsibilities. The recollection of how hard our brilliant senior researchers worked and the image of the bright future waiting for the field of Death and Life Studies help me carry my heavy daily workloads.

To tell the truth, at first I was somewhat dazzled by the glamour of working at The University of Tokyo, and although some of the glitter has worn off, for me the COE Death and Life Studies project has been an irreplaceable research platform that constantly supplies me with intellectual stimulation.

For example, when I meet people in fields of study that would normally have little in common with my own, the subject of “death and life” usually provides a common thread that leads to a fruitful conversation. Even through such modest means, I hope to develop my own study of death and life. While contending with such ideas, but yet in a state of comfortable enough tension, I am constantly aware of the good fortune of being able to do my research here and so I enjoy every day.

This unique research platform is supported of course primarily by its leader, Professor Susumu Shimazono, and by the enthusiasm of the many other associated professors who have been dedicated to the “construction” and now to the “development and systemization” of death and life studies. The professors who decided to continue with Death and Life Studies for the 21st Century COE Program and into the Global COE Program have exhibited a level of dedication that defies description. In any event, my involvement so far with the COE Death and Life Studies Program means that, even if my situation changes, I will continue to be interested in some way with the field and monitor its progress. I welcome any guidance and instruction that might be offered, and look forward to leaning more in future.





What “Death and Life Studies” Means to Me

Go Kurihara (COE Program Specially Appointed Researcher, Ethics)

Five years have swiftly passed since I have been employed as a researcher in the Death and Life Studies research projects that are now moving from the 21st Century COE Program’s “construction” phase into the Global COE Program’s “development and systemization” phase. What have “Death and Life Studies” meant to me so far, and what will they mean to me in the future? I feel the time has come to express this in words, even though this might be difficult. If I were to boldly sum up the questions that have continued to confront me as I took part in numerous symposia and other events, the result would be as follows.

What about the people who are facing death right now? And what about those who are being born right now? (And, what about the people who are with them and taking very personal care of them?) What happens when such people are really before my very eyes, close enough for me to touch and facing me, what can I really say or do as students of ethics, or more broadly, as student of the humanities? My questions regarding Death and Life Studies can be boiled down to this.

Last summer I was with my grandmother when she passed away after a long period of hospitalization. Several years before that, I was also with my sister, who is only two years younger than me, when she gave birth to her first child. At both these times, I was a student of ethics and of the humanities and was already a researcher in the Death and Life Studies project. However, this gave me not a single advantage in helping my loved ones deal with the actual events of death and life. All I could do was very little – watch over them, quietly hold hands, gently touch their feet, or give them a hug. At these times, there was nothing I could do about the feelings welling up within me except hold back the tears.

In reality, these solemn moments clearly constituted truths that were miles ahead of the insignificant fact that my professional fields of study were ethics, the humanities, and even Death and Life Studies. Compared with these experiences, scholarship and the methods it uses to attempt to touch truth are wretchedly slow and laggard. The fields of medicine, religion and the arts, for example, most probably contain more direct ways and means that can catch up to and engage with the solemn majesties of death and life. However, scholarship itself is bound to lag behind when it comes to the actual events of death and life.

Speaking for myself, when I bring up the names of my professional fields, such as “ethics” or “history of Japanese ethical thought,” I feel that I ought to append some kind of modifier such as “laggard” or “tardy” to indicate how scholarship actually works. At the same time, I am

also aware that this is a given condition of the nature of scholarship, and also aware that it is a prerequisite for scholarship. We cannot attain achievement in any field of study if we feel dissatisfaction because it falls behind reality.

However, when it actually comes to hanging out my shingle as a “Death and Life Studies researcher,” the situation changes a bit. What can I really say right now, and what can I do? My recent experiences forced me into a corner on this, but such questions may in fact precisely represent the daring challenges being taken up by Death and Life Studies as a new field of scholarship. Being naturally somewhat dull-witted, I came to realize this bit by bit, but eventually quite acutely, during the 5 years I have been with the project. I consider this an important perception.

When the 21st Century COE Program “Construction of Death and Life Studies (DALIS)” was closed in last spring, our leader, Professor Susumu Shimazono, addressed the younger research associates, and one of the things he told us was, “I hope you will pursue studies in your own field together with Death and Life Studies as a double-feature program.” Professor Shimazono had put together the project, and remains on the front lines in his determination to meet real people’s needs, and I believe he chose the innocuous term “double feature” out of his unsurpassed consideration for us, the following generation that even now probably does not feel the pressures he has to bear. How do things occur as a double phenomenon? How will the roots of a tree that happens to grow up with two trunks be connected underground, and which way will its branches grow? As the death and life studies projects enters its new Global COE phase, and also as project researchers continue their own process of self-realization, I feel strongly that the qualities of “development” and “systemization” will be very much in demand.





Report on Prof. Gary Laderman's Lecture

"Death in the United States: Past, Present, and Future"

Susumu Shimazono (Leader of the COE Program, Professor, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, Religious Studies)

On August 2, 2007, Professor Gary Laderman presented a lecture entitled "Death in the United States: Past, Present, and Future" in Room 219 of the Faculty of Law and Letters Building No. 1 on the Hongo Campus. Prof. Laderman is Professor of American Religious History and Cultures at Emory University, outside of Atlanta, and is well-known for his research on the history of American funerals. He is the author of *The Sacred Remains: American Attitudes Toward Death, 1799-1883* (Yale University Press, 1996), and *Rest in Peace: A Cultural History of Death and the Funeral Home in Twentieth-Century America* (Oxford University Press, 2003), among other books.

In his talk, Professor Laderman summed up his research to date, and presented an overview of the entire history of funerals in the United States. The biggest change in US funerals came about in the latter half of the 19th century, after the end of the Civil War, when embalming techniques for dressing corpses were established and the prototype for the current "American-style" funeral came into being. The next change occurred after the 1960's.

That was also the time when Jessica Mitford's *The American Way of Death* (Simon & Schuster, 1963) was published, harshly criticizing the way that funerals had become commercialized, although that did not bring about a change in funeral trends. During that period, however, there was a growing trend for various ethnic groups in the States to conduct funerals according to their own ways, and funerals became increasingly diversified. I believe the future of American



funerals can be discerned from this process of diversification.

There were many questions from members of the audience interested in the changes that have taken place in funerals, the funeral services industry, and cemeteries in Japan, East Asia, Europe, and the United States. From the end of the 20th century and into the early 21st century there have been major changes taking place in funerals in East Asia and Europe, apparently even more dramatic than those that accompanied the urbanization of the 19th century, and there were discussions of how their circumstances differed from those in the United States. It was confirmed that in East Asia the spread of cremation, changes in kinship structures, and changes in government regulations have combined to bring about these complicated and ongoing shifts.

This field of inquiry is an important part of Death and Life Studies, and I would like to include meetings and exchanges such as this one in our research programs in the future. I would like to also acknowledge the cooperation of Nanzan University, the Japan-United States Educational Commission (JUSEC) (Fulbright Association), and *Le Centre national de la recherche scientifique* (CNRS) of France in presenting this lecture.





Report on Professor Ying-shih Yu's Lecture

Tsuyoshi Kojima (Associate Professor, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology,
Chinese Philosophy)

Dr. Ying-shih Yu is an authority of international stature in the field of Chinese intellectual history, and is at present Gordon Wu '58 Professor Emeritus of Chinese Studies at Princeton University. Dr. Yu's area of research is extensive, but within its vast scope lays the subject of the spirit (soul) in Confucian thought. This is a theme that is also closely connected to the issues in which the "The Development and Systematization of Death and Life Studies" project is interested. In addition, in fiscal 2007, Kansai University inaugurated a Center of Excellence program entitled "Project for the Cultural Interaction Studies of East Asia by Peripheral Approach" (Project leader: Tao Demin, Professor of Kansai University (<http://www.kansai-u.ac.jp/Kouhou/globalcoe/globalcoe1.html>)), and it invited several professors and arranged for a series of lectures to be delivered for the international symposium commemorating its inauguration. Taking this good opportunity, the University of Tokyo also arranged a lecture meeting, and asked Prof. Yu to present a paper on Confucian views of life and death, which he delivered on October 9, 2007.

The title of his lecture was "Chinese Views of Life and Death: With Special Reference to the Confucian Tradition." At the outset of his lecture, he quoted a saying of Confucius from *The Analects*, "You do not understand life yet; how can you understand death?" and spoke about how Confucian thought concerned itself with life first and then death, and not with death first and then life. Based on this saying of Confucius, there is a tendency to think that Confucianism does not talk about death, and this view serves as the basis for the pervasive view that Confucianism is not a religion. However, in several documents related to Confucianism, one can find explanations pertaining to the souls of the dead. While introducing these examples, Prof. Yu elucidated the ancient Chinese views of life and death.



This lecture was sponsored by the Department of Chinese Philosophy of the Faculty of Letters at the University of Tokyo, and held under the joint auspices of the university's Center for Evolving Humanities and Maritime Cross-Cultural Exchange in East Asia and the Formation of Japanese Traditional Culture: Interdisciplinary Approach Focusing on Ningbo, as well as the university's Global COE Program "Development and Systematization of Death and Life Studies (DALs)," which served as the managing organization. Originally, it had been planned to use classroom 211 in the Faculty of Law and Letters Building No. 1 on the Hongo campus, but so many people were drawn by Prof. Yu's renown that the audience exceeded the venue's capacity, so it was quickly arranged to change the venue to Lecture Hall No. 3.

Prof. Yu had already spoken in Chinese at Kansai University and Nagoya University at the 59th Annual Conference of the Sinological Society of Japan (held October 6–7), and for the University of Tokyo the co-sponsors requested that Prof. Yu make his presentation in English. Despite his busy schedule before he came to Japan, he willingly consented to prepare three different manuscripts. A brochure containing an edited version of Prof. Yu's paper with an introductory article on him was passed out at the lecture venue. Motonori Arata, a graduate student of the Department of Chinese Philosophy; Misato Minemura, of the office of the Maritime Cross-Cultural Exchange in East Asia and the Formation of Japanese Traditional Culture; and Kenta Suzuki of the Global COE Program of DALs were responsible for editing and publishing the brochure. In addition, it is planned to publish Prof. Yu's paper, translated into Japanese, together with a detailed explanation of the technical terms used in Chinese philosophy, in a forthcoming issue of *The Journal of Death and Life Studies*.

Report on the Workshop

“A Re-reading of the *Lebensphilosophie* of Bergson in *Les Deux Sources de la morale et de la religion* (The Two Sources of Morality and Religion)”

Izumi Suzuki (Associate Professor, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, Philosophy)

There are several conferences taking place in 2007 all over the world in commemoration of the centennial of the publication of Henri Bergson's third work, *L'Évolution créatrice* (Creative Evolution), and in Japan, three international workshops were held October 16-20 in Tokyo (Oct. 16-17) and Kyoto (Oct. 20). Planned in conjunction with this, a workshop was given on Bergson's fourth work, *Les Deux Sources de la morale et de la religion* (1932), the topic of which is very closely related to the interests of the Global COE Program "Development and Systematization of Death and Life Studies (DALS)." (October 18, 10:00 am ~ 6:00 PM, in the common room of the Faculty of Law and Letters Building No. 2 on the Hongo campus. Co-sponsored by the Steering Committee of the International Symposium to Commemorate the Centennial of Bergson's *L'Évolution créatrice*; with the support of the Embassy of France in Japan and the Société pour la Philosophie de Bergson (Society for the Philosophy of Bergson).

Published in his later years, in *Les Deux Sources* (1932), Bergson (1859-1941) reexamined the essence of morality and religion from the viewpoint of his unique theory of life, and in this book, which is his philosophical legacy, he may be said to have extended his thinking onto a wide variety of themes that were based on the two genres of "closed morality/static religion" and "open morality/dynamic religion." Even taking the revolutionary advances in the life sciences in the latter part of the last century and large-scale changes in social structures into account, as well as the advance of secularization, this classic work still remains pertinent today. The main purpose of the workshop was that, through digging up the significance of Bergson's thought regarding the essence of morality and religion, which serve to support our fundamental concepts of human life and death, several contributions might be made in the principle area of death and life studies. Furthermore, it was also hoped that this workshop would serve to create a substantive debate between the Japanese and French participants.

On the Japanese side, five researchers read papers that had been sent to the French participants ahead of time, so the workshop was arranged around hearing the papers and the comments of the French side. There were 80 eager participants, and their participation helped bring about an intense debate, as we had hoped.

After the opening comments by Prof. Susumu Shimazono, leader of the G-COE, the first session (Facilitator: Izumi Suzuki) began with two presentations: "Hajime Tanabe, Lecteur des *Deux Sources*-un cas de reception du bergsonisme

dans «l'École de Kyôto»)," by Haruhiko Sugimura (University of Kyoto), and "*Les Deux Sources* dans l'histoire des religions," by Fumiaki Iwata (Osaka Kyoiku University). These papers were followed by enthusiastic comments from Frédéric Worms (Université de Lille), at present the leading expert on Bergson in France, and a brief discussion. Further discussion was postponed until the general debate.

In the afternoon, the second session (Facilitator: Prof. Masanori Tsukamoto [Associate Professor, University of Tokyo]) was held, consisting of a presentation entitled "*Les Deux Sources* adossées à une esthétique de l'analogie," by Ichiro Taki (Osaka Kyoiku University), to which the young and distinguished Arnaud François (xxx [title], Université de Lille) made substantive comments, and a lively debate between the two ensued. This was followed by the third session (Facilitator: Naoki Sugiyama [Associate Professor, Gakushuin University]), which began with two papers, "*Les Deux Sources de la morale et de la religion* dans l'histoire du mysticisme-Une lecture par un historien des religions," by Yoshio Tsuruoka (Professor, University of Tokyo), and "Morale du philosophe et *Les Deux Sources de la morale et de la religion*," by Yumiko Nakamura (Ochanomizu University), after which François once more commented, followed by a reading of the comments of Jean-Christophe Goddard (Université de Poitiers), who was unable to attend due to illness. After a short question-and-answer period, the general discussion was opened (Facilitator: Shin Abiko [Professor, Hosei University]), and a lively debate ensued centered on the ardent questions from the floor.

After the workshop ended, participants moved to the Faculty of Engineering for a friendly reception, where, after a greeting from Prof. Masao Tachibana, Director of the Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, the fervent debates that had begun during the workshop continued.

The quality of the papers presented by the Japanese side, the straight-forward responses of the French commentators, and the extraordinary work of the interpreters (Hisashi Fujita [Japan Society for the Promotion of Science] and Kaoru Taniguchi [Lecturer, Shikoku University]), in the friendly atmosphere amid all the participants, all helped to bring about a substantive debate and create an opportunity in which everyone left with a sense of satisfaction. Beginning with the subject of fellowship with the dead, innumerable important themes concerning death and life studies were debated, and the details of those discussions can be found in the soon-to-be-published minutes of the symposium (to be released in a Japanese and French edition).



Report on the Workshop

“Contemporary French Philosophy and Theories on Life”

Izumi Suzuki (Associate Professor, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, Philosophy)

On the afternoon of October 19, 2007 (1:00 pm ~ 4:00 pm), in the Sanjo Conference Hall on the Hongo Campus of the University of Tokyo, a workshop entitled “Contemporary French Philosophy and Theories on Life,” to which Prof. Pierre Montebello (Université de Toulouse II-Le Mirail) had been invited, was held. In 1994, Prof. Montebello published his voluminous doctoral dissertation on Maine de Biran (1766-1824), *La décomposition de la pensée* (Millon), followed, in 2003, by a work on the philosophy of nature as being “another type of metaphysics,” which focused on Ravaissan, Tarde, Nietzsche, and Bergson titled *L’autre métaphysique. Essai sur Ravaissan, Tarde, Nietzsche et Bergson* (Desclée de Brouwer). Last autumn he published the subsequent volume, *Nature et la subjectivité* (Millon). One can say that he is a central philosopher in contemporary French thought, who, mainly drawing on French philosophical ideas and based on his own unique concept of the philosophy of nature, deepens our observations about subjectivity as it relates to life and the body. As a fellow researcher in death and life studies, in principle, I promote fundamental research on life rather than on death, and am planning to hold a series of seminars next year entitled “Contemporary French Philosophy and Theories on Life,” and it was as a kind of preview for these seminars that I invited Professor Montebello, who is the perfect representative of this field, on this occasion and decided to organize this event in the form of a workshop, which would guarantee a substantial discussion.

As Prof. Montebello is in the midst of preparing a publication on the representative contemporary French philosopher Gilles Deleuze (1925-95) entitled *Deleuze, philosophie du paradoxe* (Vrin), I had asked him to present part of his research in this workshop, to which I added comments about the total scope of the professor’s work, which was followed by a discussion.

In the hour-and-a-half presentation, “How Do We Think About Nature?,” Prof. Montebello primarily presented a lucid reading of the “The



Topography of Morality” chapter in *Mille Plateaux: Capitalisme et schizophrénie*, by Gilles Deleuze and Pierre-Felix Guattari (Paris: Minuit, 1980) (the fundamental concepts of this



work are often presented in a very eccentric manner) and then elucidated on the significance of Deleuze’s philosophy of nature. Although the thought of Deleuze (and Guattari) had been given attention in a somewhat journalistic manner in Japan at one point, even in France there is still no comprehensive treatment of it. Prof. Montebello’s lecture was therefore extremely interesting as it accurately shed light upon the importance of the dehumanistic aspect of Deleuze and Guattari’s thought, through lucidly extracting the topography of their various concepts.

Following the rise of modern French philosophy, which was based on the idea that humans only exist as part of nature and society, a notion that gained influence against background of the development of structuralism and the life sciences, there was a return to various forms of humanism. However, humans are merely a product of nature and therefore it is exactly for this reason that Professor Montebello’s reading of the thought of Deleuze and Guattari, which stresses anthumanism in the sense that humans can also become something other than human, is extremely valuable.

Based upon this, there were discussions and comments for about 30 minutes upon points of contention concerning the explication of the overall view of Deleuze’s philosophy. After that, there were so many questions asked by the approximately 20 participants—including Yoshio Tsuruoka (professor in the Department of Religious Studies, Faculty of Letters, The University of Tokyo) and Masanori Tsukamoto (associate professor at the Department of French Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters, The University of Tokyo)—concerning the significance of Deleuze’s methodology and his theories of language (as well as Deleuze’s relationship to the contemporaneous philosopher Michel Henri [1922-2002]) and his thought, that everyone forgot to take a break. We enjoyed a most fulfilling session that lasted for more than three hours.

How the central achievements of Death and Life Studies and this type of unique thought can be linked and joined together will no doubt be a topic for the future, and I would like this inquiry to develop into the seminar series that will begin this year.



Report on the 19th Death and Life Studies Workshop

(24 October, 2007)

Tetsuro Shimizu (Professor, Uehiro Chair for DALs, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, Philosophy/ Clinical Ethics)

The Death and Life Studies workshop series provides younger researchers in this program an opportunity for study, and were started during the 21st Century COE Program phase of the program. Eighteen workshops have so far been held, and the 19th was the first one to be held since the program shifted into its Global COE phase. Our specially appointed researchers and research assistants mostly started on their jobs in mid-September or early October, so this workshop in one sense marked the start of the Global COE phase of the program.

The workshop was held from 16:30 to 18:00 in Room 312 of the Faculty of Law and Letters Building No. 1 in the Hongo Campus; as one of the project leaders, I gave a talk entitled "The Range of Clinical Death and Life Studies." Six professors and 21 younger researchers attended. As the speaker assigned to give this lecture, my understanding was to recognize the G-COE program's responsibility to actively meet the needs of society and to consider its potential for making a contribution to actual, on-site health care service as the Death and Life Studies program moves from the "construction" phase under the 21st Century COE program into the "development and systemization" phase under the Global COE program. I also felt that this was an opportunity for me to express my understanding of my duties in view of my appointment starting this year to the Uehiro Chair for Death and Life Studies, a position from which support for the Global COE Program is expected.

So, now that it comes time to record a summary of my talk, I am somewhat concerned because I find it difficult to distinguish among what I intended to say, what I thought I said, and what I actually did say. What follows is what I, as speaker, thought I said.

In the first half of my talk I explained my views on the field of death and life studies and how clinical death and life studies can meet social needs from its position within that field. In the second half, I related two examples involving Death and Life Studies/Clinical Death and Life Studies, and pointed out their instructive potential. [Death and Life Studies/Clinical Death and Life Studies] is not only a promising academic field but, more importantly, is the object of special expectations from society. These expectations involve the potential for Death and Life Studies to discover and offer some kind of practical knowledge for dealing with the fact that everybody, and not just other people, will eventually die. In the course of actual medical treatment and care that deal with death and life, it is Clinical Death and Life Studies that need to meet these expectations, as they serve as people's point of contact for Death and Life Studies in the real world. Also, communicating with practitioners at the actual site of health-care service, Clinical Death and Life Studies promotes "active research," in which research is practically applied and practical applications contribute to research. (For more on active research, see Newsletter No. 18, p. 11).

[Topic 1: On understanding "death"]

The verb "to die" in Japanese (*shinu*) is used both transitively and intransitively, that is, it is used to say of a subject "He/she/it is dead," and also in saying, for

example, "My father died." This implies a distinction between death of the body and death of a person, as seen in the story of Izanagi and Izanami, male and female deities in Japan's creation myth. Izanami dies in giving birth to a fire deity, and Izanagi



comes after her to the land of the dead where he speaks to her and tries to convince her to come back to the land of the living, but abandons her when he discovers the horror of her rotting corpse. This has some correspondence with the difference between biological life and what I call biographical life, or life's story line. Also, we understand a person's death as an irreversible severing of communication (or "departure") [but] as seen in the way we speak of "joining the long line of the dead," we [also] accept the wisdom that assumes people are not rendered completely solitary by death.

[Topic 2: What is "Hope" for Those Facing Death?]

"Hope" in the face of imminent death from serious illness or other causes does not involve expecting a "cure" or hoping for "life after death;" rather it is the hope that one can muster the courage to live what remains of life in a positive way. What supports such courage is an understanding of one's situation in the sense that "we are not alone, but are perforce part of a network of other people." This realization serve as a crucial point for understanding how the opportunity to communicate with others supports people when their lives are entering their concluding phase.

After the workshop, a party to commemorate the launch of the Global COE Program was held at the Nemuno-ki restaurant at the University of Tokyo Hospital. Many of the program leaders and young researchers gathered for the event, which began with a short speech by project leader Professor Susumu Shimazono. With the project being extended for the next 5 years, all resolved to do their best, and enjoyed a pleasant evening.



Report on Dr. Sara Heinämaa's Lecture "Phenomenologies of Sexual Difference: From Fecundity to Generosity"

Tetsuya Sakakibara (Associate Professor, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, Philosophy)

Over the past 10 years a new movement has been observed in Scandinavian countries, where the sway of analytic philosophy has always been quite strong. Members of a comparatively young generation have been grouping together in the name of phenomenology and have become active. Young philosophers from five countries - Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, and Iceland - banded together in 2001 to form the Nordic Society for Phenomenology, and have been exchanging their research ever since. The following is a short report on a lecture presented on November 7 by Dr. Sara Heinämaa, Docent of Philosophy at the University of Helsinki, Finland, and the current President of the Nordic Society for Phenomenology.

Dr. Heinämaa, the author of *Toward a Phenomenology of Sexual Difference: Husserl, Merleau-Ponty, Beauvoir* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2003), is an up-and-coming scholar of phenomenology who has approached several philosophical issues concerning sexual difference based on the phenomenology of Husserl, Merleau-Ponty, and Beauvoir. In recent years she has widened her interest to include the thinking of Husserl and Lévinas on ethical issues. In light of our Global COE program "Construction and Development and Systematization of Death and Life Studies (DALIS)," however, for this lecture Dr. Heinämaa presented a phenomenological inquiry on the subject of sexual difference, based on her most recent studies of the philosophical differences between Heidegger and Lévinas on the subject of death and life.

Her lecture, "Phenomenologies of Sexual Difference: From Fecundity to Generosity," can be summarized by the following four points:

1) Lévinas criticized Heidegger, who stipulated that Dasein, or being-in-the-world, should anticipate death, which cannot be overcome, by existing in the face of being-toward-death and claiming it as one's own. From the standpoint of Lévinas, this overlooks the possibility of a different future as seen in the sensory relationships of Eros found in parent-child relationships (or between the "father-and-son"



relationship).

2) Present-day feminists, however, have criticized Lévinas' thinking regarding Eros and the father-son parenthood/relation, because such relationships are not seen as being the sole means for the future that is passed along to children and such thinking is inherently patriarchal.

3) Beauvoir, who was a contemporary of Lévinas, had already criticized him for overlooking sexual difference; according to Beauvoir, men and women have fundamental differences in that there is an essential difference between male and female sexual desire.

4) In spite of this, from the above, one can see in Beauvoir the suggestion for the possibility of realizing a willing (or intentional) form of mutual generosity through the Erotic relationships of men and women.

The paper was extremely stimulating, and after the lecture a lively question-and-answer session continued past the scheduled time, centering on two questions. The first question was, which was did she consider the more fundamental, sexual difference as delineated by Beauvoir or the existential construct of the more general Dasein (being-in-the-world) as argued by Heidegger? The second question was how, if there is a fundamental difference in sexual desire, can there be generosity? Dr. Heinämaa seems to take the term "generosity," as used by Beauvoir, to mean recognizing differing sexual intentionality between men and women. I was very impressed by her comment regarding the second question, that "cultivating this difference" was itself very important.

Dr. Heinämaa responded to the first question by using the example of a pregnant woman that experiences space and time in a completely new and different way when she becomes pregnant. It was felt that both the sexual difference point of view demonstrated here and the intercultural point of view that has been attracting attention in recent years are extremely important to our Global COE project, which is trying to further develop and systematize the study of issues concerning death and life.





Report on the Workshop “Collaboration between Life Science and Death and Life Studies”

Masaki Ichinose, (Professor, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, Philosophy)

A workshop entitled “A Collaboration Between Life Science and Death and Life Studies” was held under the joint sponsorship of DALs and the Applied Ethics Education Program from 11 AM on Saturday, December 1, 2007 in the common room of the Faculty of Law and Letters Building No. 2 on the Hongo Campus of the University of Tokyo. DALs inevitably calls to mind themes connected with the humanities, such as bioethics, the right to self-determination, and views about the nature of life and death, but in fact this academic area has a broader implication, crossing the borders between a wide variety of research fields and covering themes such as medical decision making, homicide, capital punishment, war, food, and environment ethics. As the words “Life Studies” in the title suggest, there is a necessary cross-over into Life Science. The workshop was held based on this understanding, that we need to create a starting point to work together with Life Science, and to this end we invited leading scholars in the fields of evolutionary theory, radiology, psychiatry, and genetics to participate.

The workshop opened with a welcome address from Professor Susumu Shimazono, leader of our program. Masahiro Shimoda, associate professor in the Department of Indian Philosophy and Buddhist Studies, and Sumihiko Kumano, professor in the Department of Ethics, presided over the meeting. In the first session, Professor Ken'ichi Aoki of the School of Science at the University of Tokyo presented a paper entitled “The Drama of the Shift between Neanderthal Man and Homo Sapiens.” Professor Aoki made extensive use of the most recent research and empirical data to discuss why Neanderthals became extinct in the course of competition with Homo Sapiens. His argument took the form of a comparative study of a number of rational hypotheses from the standpoint of evolutionary theory, based on contrasting individual and social learning, and using a mathematical approach. With the intention of deepening the discussion, the commentator, Masaki Ichinose, brought up basic points of concern, such as what is evolution as it is understood here, how is it different from genetic drift, and is it possible to distinguish at the level of molecular biology between individuals and social learning?

The paper of the second session entitled “Why Do People Commit Suicide?” was given by Yoshinori Cho, associate professor (Psychiatry) at the Teikyo University School of Medicine Hospital. Professor Cho first of all stated that there are many types of suicide. Though suicides can occur based on a self-determined, rational decision, he stressed that a large number stem from psychological factors like melancholia brought on through circumstances in the social environment, such as stress, bullying, and financial problems. He persuasively backed up his argument with a large amount of practical data. Accordingly, psychiatric treatment should be recognized as having the potential to prevent suicide, he added. Professor Sei'ichi Takeuchi

commented on this issue from an ethical standpoint, indicating that suicide needs to be seriously considered through the influence it has on human relationships.

Session Three was presented by (do you actually say this? Changed the sentences for session 1 and 2 above) Associate Professor Ke'ichi Nakagawa, director of the Department of Palliative Medicine at the University of Tokyo Hospital, under the title “Cancer Treatment and Ideas about Life and Death Held by the Japanese.” This is a topic already closely linked with DALs. Professor Nakagawa pointed out that while Japan has the highest life expectancy in the world, it also has the highest incidence of cancer, with one in two Japanese suffering from it at some stage in their life. Despite this, the Japanese have little knowledge about cancer itself, its treatment and care, and palliative medicine. As a result, there is a vital need to educate the Japanese about these issues. Professor Tetsuro Shimizu of the Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology at the University of Tokyo made a comment concerning the differences between cure and care, pointing out that we need to address how we understand ambiguities caused by the differences between these two words.

Session Four was the final presentation of the day and in it Professor Shoichi Ishiura of the Graduate School of Arts and Science at the University of Tokyo gave a paper entitled “Workings of the Mind at a Molecular Level.” Professor Ishiura used a great number of fascinating studies to explain how human illness, character, and disposition can be clarified at a certain level through a molecular biological and genetic analysis employed to study the workings of the mind and genetic structure. This seems to suggest in principle the possibility of improving the human condition and that there is hope that this condition will be improved in the future. Professor Shimazono brought up the notion that the comfort and competence achieved through the technologies of the natural sciences can be seen as constituting a false self, and he explained that this workshop served as a new meeting-point between Life Science and the Humanities. Finally, Professor Sei'ichi Takeuchi, chairman of the Applied Ethics Education Program, brought the workshop to a close. The participants went on to the Sanjo Conference Hall, on the university campus, for a welcome party, where they were greeted by Professor Masao Tachibana, director of the Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology. Discussions continued during the party, the culmination of a meaningful day of academic pursuits.

Future development and continuity of the collaboration between Life Science and DALs will testify how successful the first attempt at collaboration has been. The fact that the first step has been taken is of particular significance. I look forward to further association with fields such as nutritional science, pharmacy, ethology, forest ecology, and others.

Report on the Symposium “Interrelationship of Relics and Images: An Attempt at a Comparative Art History”

Akira Akiyama (Associate Professor, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, Art History)

The Global Center of Excellence (=G-COE) hosted a public, international symposium, "Interrelationship of Relics and Images: An Attempt at a Comparative Art History," on December 16, 2007. The event took place 1:00 PM on the Hongo Campus, in Lecture Hall No. 1 of the Faculty of Law and Letters Building No. 2. Between 130 and 140 people attended the meeting, more than we had anticipated, so it was our happy misfortune that the 150 copies of handout materials we had prepared for distribution soon ran out.

The symposium consisted of two sessions. The first was devoted to presentations by four scholars—two specializing in Buddhist art and two specializing in Christian art. To start things off, Prof. Susumu Shimazono, the leader of the G-COE Program "Development and Systematization of Death and Life Studies (DALIS)," offered welcoming remarks and spoke about the G-COE project.

Prof. Romi Hida (Waseda University) then spoke on "The Cult of *Sarira* and Sovereignty" and the historical evolution of the veneration of Buddha relics in China. Her comments about how relics were tied in with sovereignty, the various aspects of their presentation and display, and the sense that some Chinese had the feeling of being in a remote region [remote from the "center of civilization," i.e., India] was of interest to scholars of medieval Christianity for purposes of comparison, and I was impressed to see our two participants from overseas vigorously taking notes.

Next, Prof. Erik Thunø (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) discussed the Sancta Sanctorum Chapel in Rome, which houses the enameled reliquary cross, the Reliquary of the True Cross that contains a fragment of the True Cross and, also in Rome, the mosaics of the Basilica of Santa Prassede. He also discussed the diverse reciprocal relationships between relics and images of early medieval Christianity.

Following this, Prof. Scott B. Montgomery (University of Denver) presented fascinating examples of figured reliquaries, which proliferated during the late medieval period. Explaining their use in religious rites, he discussed his own research and argued for the possibility that the saints, their relics, and the reliquaries



were considered to be one and the same.

Finally, Prof. Kensuke Nedachi (Kyoto University) discussed Japanese portrait images and their intimate connection with the veneration of the bones of the deceased, commenting on earlier examples for this practice in China. Going beyond the narrow framework of relic cults, I believe his remarks suggested to Western scholars the possibility of comparative research (for example, of wax portrait images) from the viewpoint that three-dimensional function as substitutes for the human body.

For the second session, citing Hans Belting, I commented briefly on possibilities of an East-West comparison of the correlation of relic and image. This was followed by a discussion based on the first session. Details will appear in proceedings due to be published in the next academic year. Although the session went over the scheduled time, the topics for discussion were not exhausted, and succeeded in heightening interest in the topics of relics and an attempt at an East-West comparison. Over half of the attendees were scholars of Western culture, however, and as noted in the closing remarks by Prof. Shigetoshi Osano, vice-director, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, Faculty of Letters, it is hoped that henceforth scholars of Japanese culture will actively play an increasing role in implementing comparative studies that are more thoroughly international.

More than a few of the participants came from a considerable distance. Furthermore, many attendees kindly filled out the questionnaires that were handed out at the meeting, and the responses included valuable suggestions and proposals. We will refer to these, which will enable us to plan symposiums with enriched discussions. In closing, in addition to the professors who made presentations I would like to thank everyone who participated, as well as the research staff and students who helped so much in the preparation and management of the event.

This symposium was held as "Death and Life' and Visual Culture I." "Death and Life' and Visual Culture II" will be held on May 31 (Saturday) with the theme, "Miraculous Images in Christian and Buddhist Culture." Details will follow.





DALS TEACHING STAFF

PROGRAM LEADER

SHIMAZONO Susumu

Religious Studies

REPRESENTATIVES

AKIYAMA Akira	Art History	SHIMODA Masahiro	Indian Philosophy
ANDO Hiroshi	Japanese Literature	SUZUKI Izumi	Philosophy
IKEZAWA Masaru	Religious Studies	TAKAHASHI Miyako	Public Health/ Psycho-Oncology/ Internal Medicine
ICHINOSE Masaki	Philosophy		
OTOSHI Tetsuya	West Asian History		
KUMANO Sumihiko	Ethics	TAKEUCHI Seiichi	Ethics
SATO Kenji	Sociology	NAKAGAWA Keiichi	Palliative Medicine
SHIMIZU Tetsuro	Philosophy/ Clinical Ethics	YAMAZAKI Hiroshi	Medical Sociology/ Qualitative Research

AFFILIATED PROFESSORS

(WITHIN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIOLOGY)

AKAGAWA Manabu	Sociology	TSUKIMOTO Masayuki	Japanese Philology
ICHIKAWA Hiroshi	Religious Studies	NOJIMA Yoko	Japanese History
ONUKE Shizuo	Archaeology	HAYASHI Toru	Linguistics
OSANO Shigetoshi	Art History	FUKASAWA Katsumi	Occidental History
KARASAWA Kaori	Social Psychology	FUJII Shozo	Chinese Literature
KINOSHITA Naoyuki	Cultural Resources Studies	HONDA Hiroshi	Korean Studies/ Social Anthropology
KOJIMA Tsuyoshi	Chinese Philosophy		
SAKAKIBARA Tetsuya	Philosophy	YANAGIHASHI Hiroyuki	Islamic Studies
SHIBATA Motoyuki	Contemporary Literary Studies/ English and American Literature	YOKOZAWA Kazuhiko	Psychology
		WATANABE Hiroshi	Aesthetics
TSUKAMOTO Masanori	French Literature		

AFFILIATED PROFESSORS

(FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS)

AKABAYASHI Akira	Biomedical Ethics (Graduate School of Medical Science)	KITO Shuichi	Environmental Ethics (Graduate School of Frontier Sciences)
ISHIURA Shoichi	Molecular Cognitive Sciences (Graduate School of Arts and Sciences)	EINOO Shingo	South Asian Studies (The Institute of Oriental Culture)
OUCHI Yasuyoshi	Reproductive, Developmental and Aging Science (Graduate School of Medical Science)	NISHIGAKI Toru	Fundamental Informatics (The Interfaculty Initiative in Information Studies/ Graduate School of Interdisciplinary Information Studies)
KAI Ichiro	Social Gerontology (Graduate School of Medical Science)	HIGUCHI Norio	Anglo-American Law (Graduate School for Law and Politics)
KANAMORI Osamu	Ethics of Science (Graduate School of Education)	MIYASHITA Mitsunori	Palliative Care Nursing (Graduate School of Medical Science)
KAWAMOTO Takashi	Ethics/ Social Philosophy (Graduate School of Education)	MUTO Kaori	Sociology/ Medical Welfare Studies (The Institute of Medical Science)

CONTENTS

● INFORMATION AND ESSAYS ●

Developing and Systematizing Death and Life Studies

Initiating the GlobalCenter of Excellence “Development and Systematization of Death and Life Studies (DALs)” Program	Masao Tachibana	2
Points of Contact - Death and Life Studies and Cancer Treatment	Susumu Shimazono	3
Death and Life Studies and the Humanities	Keiichi Nakagawa	5
Random Thoughts	Masahiro Shimoda	6
Death and 21st Century American Fiction	Sumihiko Kumano	7
My Thoughts on Being Re-employed as a Specially Appointed Researcher with the COE Death and Life Project	Motoyuki Shibata	8
What “Death and Life Studies” Means to Me	Hiroe Shimauchi	9
	Go Kurihara	10

● EVENT REPORTS ●

Report on Prof. Gary Laderman’s Lecture “Death in the United States: Past, Present, and Future”	Susumu Shimazono	11
Report on Professor Ying-shih Yu’s Lecture	Tsuyoshi Kojima	12
Report on the Workshop “A Re-reading of the <i>Lebensphilosophie</i> of Bergson in <i>Les Deux Sources de la morale et de la religion</i> ”	Izumi Suzuki	13
Report on the Workshop “Contemporary French Philosophy and Theories on Life”	Izumi Suzuki	14
Report on the 19th Death and Life Studies Workshop	Tetsuro Shimizu	15
Report on Dr. Sara Heinämaa’s Lecture “Phenomenologies of Sexual Difference: From Fecundity to Generosity”	Tetsuya Sakakibara	16
Report on the Workshop “Collaboration between Life Science and Death and Life Studies”	Masaki Ichinose	17
Report on the Symposium “Interrelationship of Relics and Images: An Attempt at a Comparative Art History”	Akira Akiyama	18

● DALs TEACHING STAFF LIST ●

19



DALS NEWSLETTER No.18&19

Published on March 28th, 2008

Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, the University of Tokyo
Global COE Program “Development and Systematization of Death And Life Studies”

Leader: Susumu Shimazono

TEL&FAX: +81-(0)3-5841-3736

<http://www.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/shiseigaku/>