

---

GLOBAL PHILOSOPHY  
FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF  
LIVING FLESH

T a d a s h i O g a w a \*

“Listening not to me but to the Logos it is wise to agree that all things are one.” Heraclitus, Fragment 50 (Diels-Kranz).

*To Dean Komel with a lot of memories in Kyoto, Ljubljana and Koper*

I am from the land of the tragic earthquake on March 11, 2011. For Professor Dean Komel's efforts in arranging this trip to Slovenia, I am very grateful, but at the same time, I am full of sorrow thinking of my friends in Tokyo and Sendai who have experienced this tragic catastrophe. The preparations for this trip to Slovenia took place long before the earthquake. Considering all that has occurred since this visit was proposed and the current circumstances in which I stand is an example of relation-thinking; it is the means by which the distant comes near. This relation-thinking is the theme of my talk today. I always think that the philosophical thinking is universal and not regional. As you know, there are always two movements in philosophy. On the one hand, there is the Euro-centric efficiency in the Hegel worldview or the Euro-centric finality of Husserl, who – in the interpretation of Klaus Held – insisted on the Europeanization of mankind. On the other hand, I would like to insist on the simultaneous happening of Europeanization and de-Europeanization in the world. That is the happening of the relation.

In this article I would like to talk about my confrontation with European philosophy. If a Japanese philosopher speaks of confrontation, then you will expect that I will give prominence to the historical tradition of Japanese or East-Asian thought. But this is not the direction I want to take the discussion. My aim lies in a higher dimension. It is the global dimension of philosophy and thinking. Philosophy is, as I am convinced, an international and common spiritual activity of human being. Although philosophy is originally from archaic Greece, there

were at the same time great thinkers in India and China considering the relation of humans and the world, nature and the cosmos. Regarding methodology and terminology there were certainly great differences, but it is clear that at the level of questions, the matters about which they wondered—these were the same: the relation of Humans and Nature, Mankind and the Cosmos.

My aim in this article is firstly to elucidate the possibility of Global philosophy explicitly and secondly to explicate the relation of Global philosophy to the embodied existence of mankind. This discussion will be an attempt at a fundamental synthesis of two directions in philosophy: world philosophy as objective sense and existential philosophy as subjective sense, coming together through the viewpoint of the body-living flesh. Roughly said, the point of connection is my existential human living body-flesh. If this synthesis can be achieved, on the fundamental basis of my existence, I can think about the possibility of Global philosophy. But first, I must explain what I mean by the technical terms: ‘body’ and ‘flesh’. I understand ‘body’ as a three-dimensional thing and ‘flesh’ as my subjective experience bound to the body. This subjective feeling is nothing other than my inner perception of my flesh. Otherwise put, it means “instinctively sensing and noticing”. Hermann Schmitz calls it “*Spüren*”. Plato and Aristotle explain the difference as that between the *σῶμα*, *soma* and *ἐμψυχον ὄν*, *empsychon on*. The dimension of the living flesh is all things intuitively and directly perceived in the human living flesh.

## I.

Is philosophy regional or global? My answer to this question is that philosophy is global. I have two reasons for this answer: first from a historical perspective and second from a systematic and factual-*sachlich* way of thinking. It is a historical fact that the concept of philosophy was founded by the ancient Greeks, especially by pre-Socratic philosophers such as Heraclitus, Parmenides, and post-Socratic philosophers such as Plato. *Olof Gigon*, a respected scholar of ancient Greek philosophy, once said that Heraclitus based his philosophical thinking on three principles of Greek culture, namely the Homeric *epos* (epic), Ionian natural sci-

ence and the monotheism professed by *Xenophanes*. This movement of philosophy spread throughout the whole human world. Philosophy is an attitude of human being for the world, the thinking of the relation between Ego and world, as I will explain later.

To elucidate the concept of philosophy, I would like to gain a vantage point from the view of structural linguistics. The word *philosophy* is a kind of linguistic expression, a term or at any rate a literal sign. It has, as a sign, dual sides: *signans* and *signatum*. *Signans* is a series of voicings, letters, and phonemes. This *signans* brings the side of concept, *signatum*, with itself. *Signatum* is the concept of the word, the essential meaning of the *signans*.

Philosophy is a word, a linguistic element. As *signans*, philosophy is a series of letters or phonemes, “p-h-i-l-o-s-o-p-h-y” which means according to its Greek etymology “love of wisdom” or “being friendly with knowledge”. What are we to make of these expressions? Once again in terms of structural linguistics, *philosophy* as *signans* is a historical notion developing since its origin in Hellenic culture meaning the *logos* of human being and nature (world) at the fundamental dimension. The Greek expression *logos* (λογος) means “relation” in English. “Relation-thinking” is the *signatum* of the concept of *philosophy*. Relation-thinking, however, between the Ego and the world is also found in India, China, Mesopotamia and also in the culture of the American Indians. The eminent English anthropologist, Radcliffe-Brown stated that the main thought of Heraclitus will be found in the traditional myths of American Indians. (The Comparative Method in Social Anthropology, Huxley Memorial Lecture for 1951.) They also think of *logos* as the coincidence of oppositions.

In the human world, intellectuals think of the relation between the Ego and the World, birth and death, the beginning and the end, the mode of my being in the world. Especially in the socio-ethical dimension concerning the relation of the Ego and others, Jesus Christ said to his disciples: “Treat others exactly as you would like to have them treat you.” (Luke, 6–31) When a disciple asked Confucius to give a word that one could live by unto death he answered: *shu* in Chinese, *jyo* in Japanese. *Jyo* means originally that one sees one’s counterparts as oneself. *Jyo* means therefore to treat others with warmth and with friendliness. Confucius crystallized his thought in the following expressions: “Do

not treat others in ways that you would not want to be treated.” Confucius and Jesus Christ say the same thing, but in different ways; Jesus expressed his thought positively and Confucius negatively. In ethics this maxim is called the *Golden Rule*, because this is the basic rule in human society, and abiding by this rule renders human beings as incorruptible as gold. The so-called *Golden Rule* is supposed to be in every human culture and society. It is related to the fundamental humanity of mankind.

What then is the Buddhistic *Golden Rule*? It is expressed by the dogma of *Jiri-Rita* in Japanese, *Atma-Hita*—*Para-Hita* in Sanskrit. *Ji-ri* (*Atma-Hita*) is self-benefit, and *Ri-ta* (*Para-Hita*) is the good for others. The spirit of Buddhism is this principle, self-benefit means at the same time the good for others. There is a relation of the self and others. My main point in this talk should now be obvious: the simultaneous happening of relation. This type of thinking is none other than Buddhism. There are several elements of relation-thinking in this religion, for example, the thinking of *Engi* and *Shoki*. The *en* of *Engi* means that all things happen by direct or indirect causality, each is a condition of the other. *Gi* means happening, occurrence. The East is the co-relate of the West. Men only have meaning if there are also women. In Buddhism such relations are interpreted *engi*. It means the occurrence through the relation of two elements. *Engi* does not mean simple relative difference, but rather the structural relation of two elements in the wholeness: simultaneity. *Engi* is not simply a relation standing between the terms; it also subtends the relation and allows the relation to happen. The *sho* of *Shoki* means the true essence, the truth. *Ki* means the occurrence, the happening. Heidegger will express it *das Ereignis*. It is nothing other than the occurrence of the true self. In Buddhism, too, it is clear that the good for me means the benefit of others. With this thinking, it is clear that egocentrism, or selfishness, is not good and well to evaluate. The ideal human relation is, according to Buddhism, this simultaneous happening of self-benefit and the good for others.

What, then, are the concrete forms of relation that philosophers think about? As formerly mentioned, there are many kinds of relations in philosophy, the relation between the Ego and the world (the epistemological attitude in Husserl), the I and thou (social-phenomenological attitude based on the intersubjectivity), and the living flesh and the

body (new phenomenological cosmology in my interpretation of Plato's *Timaeus* and *Philebos* or "System der Philosophie" of H. Schmitz), and finally between birth and death (as in Heidegger's *Daseinsanalytik*). You could increase this list with many examples and cases of the relational structure like parts and whole (as in Husserl's 3<sup>rd</sup> *Logical Investigation*), love and hate (in Scheler's and Schmitz' phenomenology) and so on.

In this context I will mention that perhaps the most important discipline in philosophy, "ontology" is not universal and global. "Ontology" is originally expressed as a technical term for the observation of statements like "it is", "to be", "beings" and so on. Indeed ontology is a very important technical term in the European philosophical tradition since Parmenides, the forefather of ontology. He stated, "being is and not-being is not" (χρη το λεγειν τε νοειν τ' εον εμεναι εστι γαρ ειναι, μηδεν δε ουκ εστιν. Fragment, B6) Obviously this word "to be" is common in the Indo-European languages, Sanskrit (*asmi*), Greek (*ειμι, εσμι*), Latin (*esse, est*), English, German (*Sein, ist*) and French (*être, est*) and so on.

But in other cultures, we can find languages with no equivalent term for "is" or "being" or "to be". The verb "to be" means simultaneously the existence of something and the predication. In the first case, you will say, the desk is in my hotel room. In the second, the desk is small. But in Chinese as well as in other languages, there is nothing that corresponds to the onto-logical signification of "is". In Japanese, however, you will find the correspondence. "To be" corresponds in Japanese to "*ari, are, araware*". *Ari* means existence and predicative function, *are* "to be born", *araware* means to appear. Paradoxically the Japanese verb, *ari* is almost the same as what Heidegger says "to be", namely *Sein*, means. Because of this difference of meaning in Chinese and the coincidence of meaning in Japanese, we can say that the onto-logical meaning of "being" is neither universal nor particularly European. Therefore, we might have to dispose of the term "ontology", if my thesis that philosophy obtains only when it is global is right. At the very least, we have to look further than ontology to find a truly global philosophical concern.

In my view, that concern is relation, or *logos*, which I understand as structure. The thinking of relation, or *logos*, is the core of philosophy. Philosophy is the thinking of "between", namely: relation, *logos*, structure. The theme "thinking of the relation" transcends the binding nexus

to the cultural sphere. Transcendence is possible because of the insight into the identical structures in every culture, which is based on carrying out the re-thinking of the re-analysis of the most fundamental matters. It is not based on the correspondence of similarities. To count the similarities in every culture is not philosophical thinking, but nothing other than taxonomy which is a species of empirical research. Empirical research will count the facts and enlarge the stock of factual knowledge. The act of counting facts has nothing to do with philosophical evidence. It is juxtaposition of facts. What then is philosophically worthy in a philosophical method that elucidates and observes the identity in the difference?

As a Husserlian scholar, I would like to emphasize that every philosophical truth must be based on a rigorous method and not on contingent happenings. "To emphasize" or "to place the emphasis on" is etymologically derived from a special kind of insight: to let something appear well (*εμφασις-εμφαινειν*). This method is therefore the process by which the essential relation or structure becomes clear. What then is this method of elucidation in concrete terms? It is, as I think, the method of free variation which Husserl established. I can grasp the essential structure of something through the steps of going-through it in possible permutations. At the beginning I must see a factual thing as a starting point of free variation; then proceed with the variations. Variant (a) will produce variant (b) on the basis of insight into the similarity of both variants. The production of variant (b) means that I have insight into the identity between both. As I think, the prediction or assumption that there must be an essential structure between two variants is a necessary presupposition. This presupposition sees beforehand the orientation and production of the free variation. This foresight is decisively important. This insight is the activity of seeing through (*noein: νοειν*). This *noein*, direct intuition into the unity of difference is, I will say with Heraclitus, *logos*. *Logos* and *nous* are co-primordial.

I have once co-edited a volume of the American philosophical journal "*The Monist*" on the topic of "Cultural Universals". According to my thesis on the Husserlian method of free variation as the intuition of essence, there are three stages:

(1) I begin with some thing: For example a table, given in perception or imagination. I then allow this example to vary in my mind along

all conceivable dimensions, but always in such a way that it remains *a table*. Such variation is a potentially endless open process. Its openness is shown in the fact that the real or imagined example that is taken as starting point is chosen arbitrarily.

(2) Through all the differences that are yielded by the performance of variation there will be some invariance—there will be an overlapping, or “coupling”, as Husserl calls it. The progression of variants converges around what is common in all the variants and there is generated thereby a unity which binds them together. Starting with a particular table which we see, and going through a series of other tables which we also see or merely imagine, we eventually arrive at the *eidōs* “table” as “this here necessarily common structure”. If we started a new process of varying with a new example of a table, we should discover that the two processes merge into one as far as their result is concerned, that the variants occurring in either are those of one common *eidōs*.

(3) The identity of the overlapping moments is then grasped by active intuition. This identity is the *eidōs*. In grasping it, intuitions which come from the empirical level of what is spatio-temporally defined begin to transcend this dimension and take in what is ideal.

Husserl’s phenomenology has many, different moments and motivations. His philosophical method is, as I interpret it, originally and essentially almost the same throughout his life, although he allowed a historical and genetic aspect of the essential intuition in his later stage of life. This thesis was constantly alluded to in his posthumous works such as the “*Krisis*”. It is very similar to the *eidōs*-theory of Plato. Then what is the so-called Platonism in Husserl? That is this doctrine of *eidōs*, essence or the identical entity which he saw in everything. This *eidōs*, this identity is “everywhere and nowhere” as essence. It is the synthesis of the individual and the universal, namely the *genos* which I would like to express with the term “structure”.

Plato nurtured philosophical thinking from three traditions, namely poetry (*Homer* and *Hesiodos*), natural science (*Thales* and the Ionian school) and monotheism (*Xenophanes* and *Parmenides*). In this genetic and historical sense, philosophy was originally bound to the regional tradition of philosophy. This regionalism insisted that Europe, especially Greece, is the homeland of philosophy. But I must inquire: Is

philosophy totally a European happening as Nietzsche or Heidegger insisted? I will not agree with this attitude of Nietzsche or Heidegger, although Nietzsche and Heidegger are for postmodern people now the most popular and authoritative thinkers. Therefore you may ask why I differ from the prevailing view.

My argument for this position is as follows: As mentioned previously, the essence of philosophy is relation-thinking. The problem of relation-thinking is, however, in every culture, that is to say it is global. Philosophy is a global event. The transcendence of one's own culture is for the culture itself a kind of self-negation. Asia was as matter of fact Europeanized. The Euro-centrism of Europe must deny itself and transcends to the global dimension which I name de-Europeanization. Parallel to these phenomena, as matter of facts, there is the simultaneous happening of de-Europeanization and Europeanization. This encounter and crossover of two movements is what Max Scheler called "*Ausgleich*".

The progression of "*Ausgleich*" in human society is the fate of mankind. In the 20<sup>th</sup> and now 21<sup>st</sup> century mankind has arrived at a very complicated stage in human history. That step is characterized as the simultaneous existence of differences and identity. For example, in his lecture "*Der Mensch im Zeitalter des Ausgleichs*", given at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Scheler predicted that the contradiction between elites and democracy will be nullified, women will be like men, the opposition of Marxism and Capitalism will be neutralized, and the difference between the West and the East will be overcome. These phenomena will be found in every cultural sphere of Mankind. This neutralization and overcoming of every difference is *Ausgleich*. We can understand it as "re-conciliation".

The new tendency and spirit of re-conciliation between every contradiction is, as I hope, now able to be positively postulated. Now in this new age of 21<sup>st</sup> century mankind should come to the global dimension of philosophy.

## 2.

From this point of view, e.g. from the global philosophy, how can I understand the property of my existence, or my "*Jemeinigkeit*" in the sense of Martin Heidegger? My proper existence cannot be exchanged



with another person, let alone with others. The truth of my proper existence is what I am living in every moment, now and here in the world. This notion of my proper existence in the sense of Martin Heidegger is understandable only through the way of focusing on the living flesh or my living body. What then is the I? The ego possessing my viewpoint in the world is existential. My viewpoint is defined as Here-Now-Individual. This definition: Here-Now-Individuality shows that my living flesh is situated in the world as a viewpoint. This point is not a geometric point, but it has the thickness of my bodily functions, for example, the use of my eye, arm and so on. My eyes are embedded in my living flesh. The eyes without a body are impossible. We cannot imagine the eyes without the body in which the eyes are embedded. The eyes which are not embedded in the living flesh could not see anything. And on the other hand, in Japan we will say: if the mind were not here in living flesh then one cannot see anything.

My point of view is, however, for the observation of the world nothing but the narrow and compact point. My living flesh at the starting point of the worldview means therefore a compact and narrow point. Imagine how your living flesh would cringe if you happened upon an escaped tiger. Due to shock and anxiety, your perceptual and conscious field would deflate into a narrow and focused view of the impending danger.

On the other hand, imagine that you are lying on the gentle slope of a hill under the spring sunshine, then your living flesh will relax and expand into the outer world. You would like to breathe in the spring breeze; your spirit and living flesh will be greater and lighter in the environment, floating to the utmost horizon. Not only your consciousness but also your living flesh itself will become identical with the whole world.

There are two extremes in the modes of appearance of living flesh: contraction and expansion, or more exactly contracting and expanding. It is a movement of two directions, widening from me to the outer world and on the other hand, narrowing from the outer environment to my viewpoint.

If you breathe air into your body, then you will be expanded. But simultaneously you have some tension of the stomach muscles and you

are, as a whole spirit, at the same time fore-shortened and narrowed to a point. To inhale and to exhale is the act by which human beings continue to live in this world. You must take another breath in order to live another moment. As I said previously, the flesh is not the same as the three dimensional body but a movement of spirit or air—the “Breath” of life. The ancient Greeks called this *pneuma*, and the same thing is expressed in Chinese by the word *qi* and in Japanese by the word *ki*. (cf. my book, *Grund und Grenze des Bewusstseins*, Würzburg 2001, p. 107 ff.) In this paper, I will use the English word “Breath” with a capital “B” to express the sense of the ancient Greek word *pneuma*, the Chinese-Japanese sense of *qi-ki* and my own idea of the living-flesh. I have chosen to use this English word rather than Latinate possibilities such as efflation, perflation, sufflation, etc. because the Old English root combines both directions of contraction and expansion, while the words based on “*flare*” tend to express only one direction and also tend to have very materialistic, medical meanings. For the opposite reason, Latinate words based on “*spirare*” such as respiration, inspiration, expiration, etc. are weighted too much on the side of the soul.

What is the essence of this *qi-ki*? It is not something purely material, nor something pure spiritual. It is something material to the extent that a breath has the force to flutter the flame of a candle. At the same time, it is something spiritual and ideal because it is the force of life pushing on from one moment to the next. This movement of Breath belongs to the whole world and makes the unity of the world. The essence of this pure experience of the world is “atmosphere.” The atmosphere which I experience is always directly above the difference of spirituality and materiality. This atmosphere is the Breath, *qi-ki* that fills the world. You can live because of this Breath, on the ground of this spirit.

When you breathe in, you will be unified with the outer world through the breathing. When you breathe out, the Breath is moved from the inside of your body into the outer environment. This movement shows the direction of air. It is from the body to the outer world. What does this direction mean? The direction is the neutralization of the opposition of the compact and expansive point of view, the narrowing and widening of the inner and outer world. The difference of inner and outer would be neutralized by the act of breathing. It is the synthesis of

the flesh and the outer environment. You will feel in the flesh brightness and a loosening of restraints. The direction of the Breath, this movement of Breath from my flesh to the outer world is the synthesising direction of the inner and outer world. This synthesis is nothing other than the neutralisation of binary oppositions of outer and inner world.

You can now understand the wide sense of my concept “Flesh”. My own flesh and blood is not the body, not the three dimensional thing, but it is a movement of Breath, because it is the spirit which can be understood as the true sense of synthesis of the inner and outer world; The Breath is *qi* or the spirit of every body. Jesus said, “The wind blows where it wills, and you hear the voice of it, but you do not know, whence it comes and or whither it goes; so it is with everyone who is born of the Spirit.” (John, 3–8) The Spirit and the Breath is the same word: *pneuma*.

The spirit is the Breath. And everyone is an existence of Breath *qua* Spirit, or in ancient Greek *pneuma*, πνευμα, the movement of “expanding and contracting”. Everybody is the ek-sistence from Breath which is ek-sistence into Breath. Everyone is the ek-sistence from Breath into Breath. Everybody is transition from the Breath and spirit into the Breath and spirit. Therefore the Japanese people think in the theory of Shintoism, for example in the book of Hayashi Razan’s “*Shinto-Denju*”, that humans are both before birth and after the death a spiritual god. Only while humans are alive do they think of death, but death is not the end of life, but rather the beginning of another life. (cf. my book, *Grund und Grenze des Bewusstseins*, Würzburg 2001, p. 107 ff.)

Relation-thinking is structural thinking. It focuses on the *logos* as relation of the opposition of the inner and outer world, parts and whole, ego and world, ego and the others, and life and not-life. What then is the ego? The ego possesses my viewpoint to the world. And this viewpoint is possible only in the systematic relation with others.

If it is argued that my emphasis on relation and *logos* is a species of logo-centrism, then I would reply that I do not use these words in the sense criticised by Derrida. This criticism is mainly directed at a historical tradition from Heraclitus to Hegel that puts structure at the center of European philosophy. But we must proceed from “the things themselves” that is, not how things stand within a particular tradition but

how they stand before all humanity. My proposal of a Global philosophy draws on both European and non-European philosophy.

Global philosophy stands on both the *logos*, *ratio* and structural thinking of Western thinking and the Japanese understanding of “*ri*”. And as mentioned above, this same thinking can be found in American Indian culture as well as the Chinese notion of *Yin-qi* and *Yang-qi*. The cultural invariance in all these expressions is: “the unity of contradiction”, or in other words, the fact that two things, no matter how different, nonetheless exist in unity. Derrida rightly criticises the Western onto-logical tendency to brush aside difference in its rush to unity through a superficial equivalence or equivocation, but even in this tradition, things are not always so simplistic. Goethe once sang about the leaf of a gingko tree in this way:

“Dieses Baums Blatt, der von Osten  
Meinem Garten anvertraut,  
gibt geheimen Sinn zu kosten,  
Wie’s den Wissenden erbaut.

Ist es ein lebendiges Wesen,  
das in sich selbst getrennt?  
Sind es zwei, die sich erlesen,  
Dass man sie als eines kennt?

Solche Fragen zu erwidern,  
Fand ich wohl den rechten Sinn:  
Fühlst Du nicht an meinen Liedern,  
Dass ich eins und doppelt bin?”

To overcome logo-centrism Derrida must presuppose the logos-structure of language. It is impossible for him to oppose this in any other way than by speaking and writing in language. For his thought to be thinking at all, he has to allow the *ratio* of language to have some sway, and this can be seen first of all in Derrida’s attempt to discuss the matter with another. Moreover, Derrida does not reach out to any random other, but his remarks are pointedly directed to a specific community—philosophers, who are most mindful of the *logos* or structure of language.

Contra Derrida we can say, the criticism of the so-called logo-centrism of European philosophy has no object, then philosophical thinking is always logo-centric and we have no other way than to deal with *logos*, structure, language and dialogue. We have to put a simple but definite question: What enables us to philosophize with each other? What is the condition of the possibility of philosophical thinking? It is language, conversation and dialogue among ourselves. Language is always the presupposition of thinking and persuading.

What is then the origin of philosophical thinking? It is the disciple-teacher relation. And the medium of this relation is language and the energy that sets this relation to work is structure.

The dialogue of teacher and disciples is the presupposed condition of the possibility of philosophy. Therefore it is not an accident that the first recordings of the thoughts of Socrates, Confucius and Mencius appear in the form of dialogues. In this sense, both European and Eastern philosophy is, if I can call the latter philosophy, logo-centric, or structural thinking. And as I have already remarked, the primary topic of these earliest and universal discussions is the unity of contradictions.

In this sense, Kitaro Nishida, the founder of the Kyoto school of Japanese philosophy, expressed the essence of the life as the “self-identity of absolute contradictions”. It is Heraclitus who insisted that existent things are brought into harmony by the clash of opposing currents. He said, he had no teacher and he declared that he inquired into himself and learned everything from himself and above all in the medium of language. His influence is so strong among the Stoic philosophers that it came to define the separation of the common nature and human nature through the Stoic philosophers. It is perhaps the origin of the subject-object separation.

The beginning of philosophical thinking is the dialogue of teacher with disciples. Without language this thinking is impossible. The medium of the relation of teacher-disciples is possible by and through language. Language is the medium of this relation. The medium as language enables the structure of teacher-disciples. That Derrida is regarded as an important philosopher owes to the fidelity with which his disciples promote his ideas. His unique standing as an individual depends on his diffusion through the coherent voices of his disciples.

What is then the ego? The ego possesses my viewpoint in the world. It is the ek-sistence transcendence to the world. My viewpoint to the world is defined as here-now-individual which you can understand in the sense of the “*Jemeinigkeit*” of Martin Heidegger. My living body, my living flesh and blood is the starting point of my understanding of this world. Without this flesh which I perceive directly in my body I cannot exist in this world. From the window of my study I can see the three trees outside of the house. It means these trees could appear from another side quite differently. My viewpoint is lived and experienced originally by me.

My question now is: How can I reconstitute the sense of world for everyone? In which sense can our world be reconstituted from the Breath-flesh (*Fuh-tei*) of everyone? The world appearance could be gained by singing. Whether solo or choral, singing implicates three elements: breathing, voice and the sense of song. Every song has original meaning. Singing together is being with each other in the same song. You must express voice through sending Breath and getting the Breath.

What is breathing? As I mentioned above it is the movement of Breath between the inside and outside of the body, and this is the occurrence of *qi* in the world. My body occupies the absolute place “here”. This absolute place means not a point like a geometric point but has endless depth and breadth in the world. Out of the viewpoint of *qi* the every individual body is identical with the whole wide world. The whole wide world signifies the expanse of my flesh. The body as flesh swells and flows to the ends of the world. Body-states appear in the awareness of powers in the body: the awareness of hunger, vigor, fatigue or languor.

The founder of the phenomenological movement, Edmund Husserl, was always grasped by two motivations. On the one hand, he sought new ideas, and on the other hand, he interpreted his new creative ideas in terms of his perennial scheme of thinking. Therefore we must always interpret the Husserlian texts with two attitudes, namely “with Husserl” and at the same time “against Husserl”. This was the maxim of Ludwig Landgrebe, one of his best disciples.

The phenomenological concept of the body in the Husserlian sense lies in the consciousness of the spontaneity: I-move-myself. But the phenomenology of *qi* and global phenomenology elucidates the fun-

damental base of this spontaneous body concept. At the base of the spontaneous body, there is also passivity. The passiveness of the body means the direct influence of the contact of inner and outer world. It is the relation of my flesh-body and the world. This relation is nothing but the appearance of *qi* and atmosphere which is the most passive and deep dimension of the body and the world. The same idea can be found in Plato's *Timaeus*. Expiration and inspiration, the movement of Breath, the *pneuma* between the world and me appears as the deepest dimension of *physis*.

Atmosphere shows itself as the pre-predicative and even evident *logos* of world. I think Hermann Ammann provides an excellent descriptive analysis of the relation of *logos* and mood. In the dark, children will sing loudly because the sound of their own singing voice dispels the atmosphere or the mood of solitude. By singing a song or whistling which is nothing but the activity of breath and *qi* one escapes his own solitude. *The song is a language*. The unity of atmosphere with language, that is, the pre-logical *logos* of world is elucidated by him as choral language.

For example, consider this situation: A group of men are waiting for a train while a gale howls around them. The delay of the train infects them with irritation. One man's grumbling is implicitly understood by the others, while another man voices his complaints explicitly. Both the linguistic utterances and the general atmosphere are experienced inter-subjectively as an internal language form that Ammann calls "choral language". (Hermann Ammann, *Die menschliche Rede*, 1925, *Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft*, Darmstadt 1974, p.171 ff.) Hermann Ammann was a philosopher of language at Freiburg and a colleague of Husserl, who wrote a contribution to Husserl's *Festschrift*.

This choral language will be accepted and strengthened in the real chorus of music. You can imagine that the above mentioned choral language on the platform would be much more impressive if the people on the platform were to voice their criticisms by singing a song. This imagined chorus is nothing but a part of an opera. People sing at the same time with emphasis a lot meaningful songs. In everyday life, it happens quite often. I recently attended the funeral ceremony of one of my friends. The Catholic priest, along with other friends and relatives, sang songs together. This phenomenon of singing together was impres-

sive. Not long ago, I saw a documentary on Japanese television about the Slovenian capital Ljubljana. This show was all the more impressive and sympathetic when a student choral group sang the national anthem. This tragic land which was always ruled over by foreigners, Romans, Italians and Austrians was, as you know, set free after the war of independence with Yugoslav National Army in 1991. Therefore I listened to the students singing the national anthem with keen interest.

How did this student chorus enhance the atmosphere of solidarity! The members of the chorus sang in the unity of the spirit and for the unity of the group, and this created an atmosphere of spiritual unity.

What kind of the atmosphere is decisive for the genesis of choral unity? The voice and the Breath, the breathing-out and breathing-in, in any event, the movement of Breath is possible as inspiration and expiration. You and I sing, you and I both are singing together, we both have the same inspiration and expiration in the same time and in the same place and situation. At the same moment we sing together the same melody and music. We have the song and the singing in common. And the subject of the song symbolizes the unity of the nation and state. You and I, we sing together in the same situation. And you and I are the members of the same state and nation. To sing together is the making of one "Flesh" with each other. As bodies you and I are separate, but in the spirit we are the same. We breathe the same Breath and sing the same song, the national anthem.

How will the experience of "One Flesh" be generated out of many voices? Everybody is separated in a geometric sense, but they are the same and "One Flesh" in the spirit. This spirit is nothing other than the *pneuma*, the Breath. Everybody expresses his/her voice and expiration from his/her geometric body. The spirit, however, is mixed with each other in the same situation.

*Otsu-Hiedaira, Sept. and Oct. 2011.*

\* Tadashi Ogawa is Professor Emeritus at Kyoto University, where he was Professor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies and the Graduate School of Global Environmental Studies. Now, President of Coshien University, Takana-zuka, Japan.