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Prof. Dr. Hiroshi KOJIMA (1925-2006)
In memoriam

Tadashi OGAWA

Hiroshi KOJIMA died on September 23rd of this year, 2006. As one of the founders of the Japanese Phenomenological Association, he established a relationship with the American phenomenological world. He was acquainted with famous American phenomenologists such as A.-T. Tymieniecka, Algis Mickunas and Lester Embree. But my first meeting with him was not in Japan or America, but in Germany. It was Oct. 1975. He suddenly visited the seminar on Husserl, *Ding und Raum* by Prof. Ulrich Claesges in Cologne. He had much enthusiasm and passion for phenomenology. We met after that in Trier (1980), Sanda, Japan (1990) and Sendai (1996). Personally, I felt a slight distance to his phenomenological thinking, but I have discussed many topics with him and always found these occasions beneficial. His thinking on Intersubjectivity is expressed in his Doctoral Dissertation and he wrote some very interesting articles on Haikai-Haiku.


Michael LAZARIN

I first met Prof. KOJIMA at the Japanese-American conference in Sanda (1990). As the conference proceeded, one of the themes that emerged was the universality of the phenomenological method. Both Japanese and American participants often remarked, “They think just the same way we do on this issue.” This is not to say that there was total agreement on what was true, but rather agreement on the discourse structure in which truth could occur. If we had been better students of Husserl, then it should have been obvious that national differences would not count for much in eidetic accounts of the lifeworld. Evidently, Prof. KOJIMA was a good student of Husserl and rightly foresaw that there would be no “Japanese style” or “American style” of doing phenomenology. As one sign of this, and I have always been extremely grateful for him doing so, Prof. KOJIMA listed me with the Japanese participants since I was teaching at Hiroshima University at the time. By the end of the conference, we all came to understand that the truth of Being is not different for East-Asian man and Western man, but Prof. Kojima knew this from the outset.