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Abstracts

How can we bio-graph? To consider such a question, this paper studies the passages on Emil Ludwig’s Wilhelm II in Carnet de la drôle de guerre (1980), written by Sartre from 1939 to 1940. The paper consists of three parts. The first part introduces the dichotomy between history and the life of a historical figure, Wilhelm II. Known as the King of Prussia or the German Emperor who occupied the throne when World War I began, Wilhelm II was also a man with a disability of the left arm. Though his foreign policy and his disability are usually understood as being separate, Sartre tries to find an “internal relationship” between them. How can we understand the relationship between the historiography (=foreign policy) and the biography (=disability)? The second part of the paper deals with Sartre’s analysis of the king’s disability, which he compares to that of the free citizen. While the disabled citizen can freely choose a life in which the disability would not be questioned, the king, being condemned to reign, is innately obliged to live with his disability. Sartre sees how the king’s “inferior complex” about his disability gradually transforms into “pride.” We may see here one of the origins of the Sartrean philosophy of “bad
faith” developed in *L’être et le néant* (1943) and his biographies based on “existential psychoanalysis.” The final part compares Sartre and Barthes from the viewpoint of “biography.” Sartre tries to unify the life of an individual with the history in which he or she lives, while Barthes introduces the neologism “biographeme” to avoid narrating his or her whole life as a story. Confronted with these two different attitudes, how can we (re-)consider the question of biography in literature? In place of a conclusion, we propose some possible points concerning the “philosophy of disability” in Sartre.

**Aya Nakamura, “(De)mythification in *Adieux*: Sartre’s Old Age as Seen from Beauvoir’s Perspective”, pp. 61-70.**

In this paper, we will consider Sartre’s old age as seen from the perspective of Beauvoir through a study of Beauvoir’s *Adieux: A Farewell to Sartre*, which will enable us to think about the ambivalence in the relationship between the two thinkers. We will first examine descriptions of the couple Sartre-Beauvoir in *Adieux* in order to see how Beauvoir idealizes her relationship with Sartre on the one hand, but on the other hand implies that there were also serious conflicts, suggesting an ambivalence in their relationship. The idealization of the couple implies that she treasures this relationship, but at the same time, by writing the conflictual side of it, she resists easy mythification of it. With regards to the figure of Sartre in *Adieux*, we could say that while praising a “strong Sartre,” Beauvoir also seems to reveal without hesitation a “weak Sartre.” This can be interpreted firstly as a practice of her own philosophy of aging, and secondly as her will to write about Sartre’s life as she saw it, not only as a militant intellectual, but also simply as a human being.

**Yuta Komura, “Physiology and Dysgnosia in the Epistemology of Avicenna”, pp. 71-83.**

This article examines Avicenna/ Ibn Sīnā (980–1037)’s theory of internal senses, especially the relationship between the problems which occurs in *sensus communis* (al-hiss al-mushtarak) and the dysgnosia which is caused by them. Firstly, we review the history of the development of the theory of internal senses up to Avicenna. Although the medieval Arabic philosophy is basically based on that of Aristotle (BC 384–322), the doctrine of the relationship between internal senses and a brain has a different origin, and later integrated into the Aristotelian scheme. The doctrine was originally invented by Plato (BC427–347), and Galen (c.129–
c.200) elaborated upon it. Secondly, we examine Avicenna’s theory of internal senses, and define the role of sensus communis in his epistemology, and delineate the differences between sensus communis in his theory and that of Aristotle. The term sensus communis, which has a different origin from the Aristotelian tradition, was lost in the philosophy of late antiquity and medieval Arabic world, but Avicenna re-integrated it into his theory of internal senses. Finally, referring to the explanation in his Canon of Medicine (Qānūn fī al-ṭibb), we focus on the relationship between the role of sensus communis and the dysgnosia.

Masahito Nangaku, “Problems of Poster Children and the Concealed Others: Through Lévinas, Derrida, and Van Manen’s Theories of Others”, pp. 117-130. Poster children are disabled children who appear on charity TV shows and call for donations. Throughout history, children raised money better than adults, but consequently, care for disabled adults always fell behind. In this paper, I shall offer an explanation for this phenomenon by referring to Lévinas, Derrida, and Van Manen’s philosophy. Lévinas’ idea of “le visage” (the face) offers an explanation for why children raise money well. Derrida and Van Manen teach us that when we care one child, we fail to care all the other children in the world. The problem concerning poster children is similar to these philosophers’ arguments but different in one important sense. The problem here is, that when we care a disabled child, we tend to forget about disabled adults, and we don’t even notice them or their pain. From this problem we can notice that when we care a specific figure, the others who don’t share the same character are concealed by the presence of the specific figure and forgotten. This phenomenon of “concealed others” has not been dealt by the former philosophers. The idea of “concealed others” provides us explanations for many issues in disability studies such as why young physically handicapped person is a stereotypical figure of the disabled, and why early disability welfare policies only targeted disabled children and physically handicapped person.