

“Voluntary Death” in Japanese History and Culture

© 2003

Lawrence Fouraker, Ph.D.
Department of History
St. John Fisher College
Rochester, NY 14618

Introduction: Voluntary Death as Japanese Culture

25 November, 1970. Japanese novelist Mishima Yukio strode onto the balcony of the Self-Defense Force Headquarters at Ichigaya. After haranguing the crowd below, reading them his “Manifesto” lambasting Japan’s materialism and disrespect for traditional values (designed to rouse the “soldiers” to action), he shouted out three times: “Long Live His Majesty the Emperor.” Then, after retreating inside the building, in the midst the jeers of the young Self-Defense Force volunteers below, Mishima carried out a samurai-style *seppuku* suicide, slitting his bare abdomen with a razor-sharp short sword, and then literally disemboweling himself with a vertical cross stroke.¹ Morita Masakatsu, close follower of Mishima and member of his militaristic Shield Society, tried to serve as Mishima’s “second” by beheading the bleeding author with a long sword, but failed. Another Society member Koga Hiroyasu successfully completed that beheading, and then cut off Morita’s head as well after the latter’s botched attempt to follow Mishima in ritual suicide.

Mishima’s suicide struck many Japanese observers as anachronistic nonsense. Arguably just as reflective of popular Japanese attitudes toward the self-destruction samurai-style emulated by Mishima is the movie “Seppuku” (1962, directed by Kobayashi Masaki). This film brutally emphasized the cruelty and barbarism of the *seppuku* custom, as a desperate young samurai in the early 17th Century is forced to carry out the ritual act with a bamboo sword, having pawned his real sword due to poverty.

Westerners, and sometimes the Japanese themselves, tend to exaggerate the tendency toward self-murder in Japanese culture.² For instance, Emile Durkheim remarked: “The readiness of the Japanese to disembowel themselves for the slightest reason is well known.”³ Durkheim’s careless comment may indicate a different understanding of suicide in Japanese culture and in the West. What he

¹The Chinese characters for *seppuku* may also be read (in reverse order) as *hara-kiri*, literally “belly-cutting.”

²For the use of the term “voluntary death,” see Maurice Pinguet. *Voluntary Death in Japan* (Polity Press, 1993).

³Emile Durkheim, *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. The Free Press, 1951, 222.

considers “the slightest reason” was, after all, more important than even human life itself to those who killed themselves in this manner.

Actually, though, the suicide rate of Japan in both premodern and modern times may not be significantly higher than in the rest of the world. Modern Japanese suicide rates are only slightly higher than the average of other developed countries (and given the attitudes toward voluntary death we consider here, there may be less reason for those who take their lives to hide their suicide in Japan). Recent data show that impoverished former Soviet countries like Lithuania and Belarus have higher rates of suicide than Japan. But so do France and Austria.

Yet as Mishima’s death confirms, at least some Japanese still have a traditional tolerance, or even a respect and admiration for those who take their own lives. How are we to explain the persistence of these very “traditional” values in a postmodern context? The historical cultural heritage of samurai seeking “death before dishonor” is surely pertinent. Other cultural influences include non-Christian concepts of reincarnation coming from the imported Indian religion of Buddhism, and a preference for “groupism” over individualism, which may translate into less emphasis on the sanctity of individual lives. As the method of Mishima’s suicide suggests, one key to understanding the culture of suicide in Japan lies in the past, in the traditional values embedded in its long history.

Samurai and Death

“The Way of the Samurai is found in death.”⁴ The opening line of Yamamoto Tsunetomo’s *Hagakure* seems to confirm that the “Way of the Warrior” (*Bushidô*) is in fact a cult of death. Yet Yamamoto penned these lines in 1616, a year after the last significant samurai battle for more than two centuries. In other words, this “classic” of *Bushidô* was a product of an age of peace, not warfare.

Not only are some of the most-cited versions of the “Way of the Warrior” (*bushidô*) a later construct. Further complication emerges from a study of the centuries of battle from which samurai practices of self-murder actually emerged. For it turns out that voluntary death among warring samurai was actually quite rare. Earlier versions of *Bushidô* are more aptly called the “Way of the Bow and Arrow” (*kyusen no michi*) or the Way of the Bow and Horse. Even Tsunetomo’s famous opening lines about the way of the samurai being death can be read not so much as an endorsement of suicide as advise to be prepared to die and to not cling to life. It is, in short, a call to bravery, not a celebration of suicide.

⁴ Yamamoto Tsunetomo, *Hagakure: The Book of the Samurai*, trans. William S. Wilson (NY: Kodansha International, Ltd., 1979), 17.

Certainly death itself was no stranger to the warring samurai of medieval Japan. The 11th Century *Konjaku Monogatari* recounts some of these early battles, which resulted in the display of the severed heads of defeated enemies. But many other battles were individual confrontations between two warriors, with much lower casualty rates. Mass slaughter on Japanese battlefields came only with the arrival of Western muskets in the late 16th Century.

Yet if many samurai even during ages of warfare died of old age, the practice of ritual suicide by samurai warriors (*seppuku*) occupies a prominent place in most considerations of suicide in Japan. The first probable case of *seppuku* was by Minamoto Tametomo, scion of a warrior family facing defeat by the Taira clan in 1170. Gradually the self-murder by samurai sword became a ritual, with a “second” (*kaishakunin*) to lop off the dying man’s head, ideally after he has carried out the excruciating second “crosswise” cut (*jumonji*; literally “in the shape of [the Chinese character for] ten”) to fully disembowel himself. By the Tokugawa age (1600-1868), *seppuku* had become a Shintô-influenced ritual with ceremonial cleansing and white cloth aplenty.

In addition to the original motive for *seppuku*, to prevent capture by an enemy, there were other causes. Suicide for remonstrance (*kanshi*) was a way to subtly influence one’s superior, who you would not dream of directly criticizing. In 1553, for instance, Hirate Nakatsukasa Kiyohide apparently took his life to encourage the young general Oda Nobunaga to alter his behavior. One can consider Mishima Yukio’s death to fit at least loosely in this category as well, since he hoped to change the course of Japanese history with his act. Another type of *seppuku* was to make amends for one’s own wrongdoing (*sokotsu-shi*). Not a particularly common cause of death, it evinced a popular response in the premodern media. One famous case was of the Warring States general Yamamoto Haruyuku who launched a suicidal attack against the enemy to compensate for his own actions which endangered his lord in 1561. Wounded, he retreated from the fray to take his own life.

Fact and Fiction: Gauging Medieval Attitudes

The fact that Yamamoto wrote his *Hagakure* in the Tokugawa period is full of insight to that peculiar and yet formative age for traditional Japanese culture and attitudes toward death. Following more than a century of war, the Tokugawa *shôgun* initiated policies designed to keep the country at peace. These policies were so successful that some samurai (and indeed, as we shall see, some non-samurai as well) looked back longingly to a golden age when warriors actually “lived by the sword.”

Most historical cases of *seppuku* were a product of the Warring States period (1467-1600) preceding the “*pax Tokugawa*,” proving a warrior’s loyalty and

bravery in the face of death, as well as, on a practical level, offering an alternative to the disgrace of capture by one's enemy. During the two-and-a-half ensuing centuries of Tokugawa peace, instances of *seppuku* were few and far between. But another type of suicide attracted great attention during the Tokugawa era—the suicide of lovers. The poignant emotional tragedy of lovers who saw no way other than to die together also became the topic of popular puppet plays and Kabuki dramas, often based on real-life incidents.

Chikamatsu Monzaemon (1653-1725) wrote two of the undeniable masterpieces of Japanese drama dealing with the actual suicides of ill-fated lovers: “Love Suicides at Sonezaki” (*Sonezaki Shinjû*, 1703) and “Love Suicides at Amijima” (*Shinjû ten no Amijima*, 1721)⁵ These poignant tear-jerkers, popular with theatre audiences from Chikamatsu's time on, are dramatic largely because of the irresolvable dilemmas between duty and passion, chronicling the inevitable tragedy of impoverished lovers who find no way to remain together other than death.

In a sense, the actual love suicides upon which Chikamatsu's plays were based, as well as the plays themselves, constituted “texts” that represented a tacit protest against the overarching power of the state. The Tokugawa *bakufu* repeatedly banned these plays because of their potentially subversive message, even though they were always set in a fictional ancient setting.

Yet another form of self-immolation in traditional Japan was “following one's lord” in death (*junshi*). Generally this was a desperate act by samurai whose lord had fallen in battle. Rather than become “masterless samurai” (*rônin*), and in deference to their leader, they chose to die.

Junshi was not a common cause of death. Most samurai preferred to live on as *rônin* rather than die in this manner. But in the mid-17th Century, as Japan became a country at peace, the incidence of *junshi* was on the rise. Furthermore, these were cases of samurai who willingly died after the death of their *daimyô* from illness. Following a case in which twenty-six followers of Nabeshima Katsushige in 1657, the Bakufu formally prohibited *junshi*.⁶

Traditional Death in Modern Times

After the Meiji Restoration of 1868 Japan's leaders issued order after order to destroy the immediate past and build Japan into a modern nation. Yet old ideas and attitudes persisted. The 20th Century was only a few years old when the Japanese public was shocked by a suicide. In 1903 a promising higher school

⁵Steven Heine. “Tragedy and Salvation in the Floating World: Chikamatsu's Double Suicide Drama as Millenarian Discourse.” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 53, no. 2 (May 1994): 367-393.

⁶Ikegami Eiko, *The Taming of the Samurai: Honorific Individualism and the Making of Modern Japan* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1995), 219.

student named Fujimura Misao had leapt to his death from Kegon Falls. As a wave of copycat suicides took place, pundits feared the social consequences of these “anguished youth.”

Many observers, at the time and since, attributed the suicide of Fujimura and other “anguished youth” to their social isolation and loneliness, portraying their anguish as the inevitable product of their pursuit of individualism. In this view, by breaking with convention and setting out to fulfill their individual potential, these young people inevitably became anguished as they abandoned traditional values and destroyed their relationship with their families and society. What actually motivated Fujimura to take his young life is debatable. His cryptic suicide note, carved on the tree above the falls where he plunged to his death, makes no mention of loneliness or isolation, but rather refers to his personal engagement with deep philosophical problems and the meaning of life. Indeed, what was so shocking about Fujimura’s case for many Japanese was that he was dying not for the sake of country or emperor but for his own individual reasons.

Fujimura’s disenchantment with the power of ideas to explain existence had led him to a personal dilemma. His attempt to escape this intellectual dilemma through suicide terrified many Japanese, but inspired many others. For those who scorned him, his willingness to die for what they saw as trivial personal reasons suggested the need to inculcate traditional values more thoroughly among an increasingly individualistic younger generation. For those who admired him, Fujimura stood as a rejection of the call for young people to dedicate their lives to making themselves and the nation strong and rich. He was seeking deeper truths. Founder of the Iwanami publishing house Iwanami Shigeo recalls that many young people in those days were moved to tears by Fujimura’s anguish, which they saw not as the result of loneliness or isolation but as proof of his commitment to the search for answers to the questions they were all asking: “Where did I come from? Where am I going?”⁷ (Note that both Fujimura’s detractors and his supporters stressed the individual motivation for his death, rather than the act of suicide itself, reflecting the fairly tolerant attitude toward suicide in Japanese culture.)

Twenty years after Fujimura’s death, we encounter the death of an unusual intellectual and writer. Arishima Takeo (1878-1923) was a popular Japanese novelist and a founding member of the White Birch Society, an influential literary group advocating humanism and individualism. The last few years of Arishima’s life, and the manner in which he died, has provoked as much interest and controversy as any of his fictional works. The events leading up to his death seem to form a tragic teleology. From around 1920 he produced few works of fiction, suffering, literary critics argue, from an insoluble writer’s block. Then, in 1922,

⁷ Sumiya Mikio, *Dai Nihon Teikoku no shiren*, 196.

Arishima published “One Declaration,” an essay that predicts the collapse of the bourgeoisie of which he was a member, and denies the possibility of any productive involvement of people like himself in the working-class movements that were about to transform Japanese society. Many observers at the time and since have read this essay as a confession of Arishima’s social irrelevance due to his inability to participate in social change. The dramatic denouement of Arishima’s life came in 1922-1923, when he gave away his inherited land in Hokkaido, and then committed suicide with a married journalist.

Yet my own research convinces me that, far from the desperate act of a tortured soul, Arishima’s suicide was actually the culmination of years of earnest pursuit of individual self-fulfillment. And the particular character of Arishima’s self-fulfillment through suicide reflects the powerful influence of traditional Japanese culture on what was in most respects a thoroughly modern man.

On 9 June 1923 Arishima and Hatano Akiko, a journalist for the *Fujin Kôron*, hung themselves in the Arishima family house in the resort town of Karuizawa. The best explanation of their death is found in “Love the Plunderer,” a 1920 essay that strongly endorses the view that even in death Arishima was seeking to fulfill his project of self-realization. This essay serves as an indispensable corrective to the view that Arishima died to escape feelings of doubt and anguish.

The connection between Arishima’s complex and unorthodox view of love and his death with Hatano Akiko in Karuizawa emerges in the following passage from “Love the Plunderer,” dealing with the ultimate realization of love in the impulsive life:

Love takes as much as possible from the outside world, leading to the growth and freedom of one’s individuality. Beginning close at hand, love carries back its booty from every which way. The stronger a person’s individuality, the more striking is love’s action. If I take all of the person I love, and in turn, all of me is also taken, at that time, we two become one. Thereupon, nothing remains for me to take, and nothing remains to be taken from me.

Therefore, at such a time, my love’s death is my death. Following one’s lord to the grave or love suicide in this way is extremely natural. Even if the love between two people does not take from each other completely, if my love can intensively do its work, my individual growth will broaden more and more. In this manner, a certain world—a world unbound by time and space—will be firmly formed within my individuality. The ceaseless expansivity of this world will break my hitherto existing habits, change my life, and finally, destroy my weak and short-lived body. Thereby, my body will explode.

In the final analysis, what does this sort of “self-destruction” indicate for those who attack my view? Simply the loss of one’s physical body, and nothing more? We are human. Eventually humans must die. Eventually our bodies will decay. No matter what we do, we cannot avoid this. But if I were to die on behalf of love, these people would be wrong to think that therefore the growth and freedom of my individuality were lost as well. My physical loss is not my individuality’s loss. The ruination of my body goes hand in hand with the expansion of the growth and freedom of my individuality. (p. 345)

A serious reading of this passage in light of Arishima’s steadfast sincerity and lifelong pursuit of consistency between thought and action makes it hard to see Arishima’s suicide together with his lover was nihilistic or the product of anguish and doubt.⁸ Indeed, in this essay Arishima pities those who were so afraid of death that they dared not truly love.

In a short poem published two months before his death in his own magazine, Arishima explored the relationship between love and death. At the burning peak of love, he wrote, an embrace is insufficient. Death is what such a lover wants. So death arrives at the very moment life achieves its fullest glow in love. “What a contradiction!” Arishima concluded.⁹ This poem shows how Arishima privileged emotion above rationality. He was well aware that in terms of rational thinking it was contradictory or even foolish to seek to realize oneself in death, yet he believed that death was the highest culmination of love in the emotional impulsive life.

Virtually every aspect of Arishima and Hatano’s suicide conform to the view of love suicide found in “Love the Plunderer.” And the letters Arishima left behind in the Karuizawa house were also consistent with his philosophy of love, what he told Asume, and the letter of Akiko’s just cited. In two of these letters, one to Akiko’s husband, and the other to Arishima’s mother and three sons, he provided little explanation for why he was dying, but basically merely asks their forgiveness. He was apparently aware that to explain his death to these people was an impossible task. He told his mother and three sons that “I know that to act in this way is abnormal (*ijô*).”¹⁰ But, he continued, “it cannot be helped.” His farewell letter to his family ended with the seemingly cold: “Until it came to this decision, how much I loved you!” It seems that at the time of his death, Arishima’s love

⁸ In several emotional diary entries and letters Arishima confesses feelings of despair. In a few cases he vaguely refers to being unable to write, facing a deadlock or a terrible crisis. But he never explicitly links these personal problems with his voluntary death. Rather, all of his references to suicide are positive and strongly-worded. Furthermore, Arishima attributes most of his difficulties in writing and the frustrations in his life to the ongoing burden of his private property and how it interferes with his creativity.

⁹ Arishima Takeo, “Shi e no itsudatsu,” *Arishima Takeo zenshû*, Vol. 9, 157-158.

¹⁰ The letters discussed here are found in *Arishima Takeo zenshû*, Vol. 14, 666-669.

towards Hatano Akiko knew no bounds, even to the extent of making the love he felt for his children and mother only relative. In terms of the philosophy of “Love the Plunderer,” one would have to conclude that Arishima died a satisfied man, even as he acted in a manner sure to bring grief to his family.

In Arishima’s final three letters he is more explicit about why he and Hatano Akiko were taking their lives, probably thinking it more likely that his siblings (who were fellow artists) and friends could understand his decision to die than his mother and children. Writing at midnight on the train to Karuizawa, he told his younger siblings that since he fell in love with Akiko, he had “realized my true fate for the first time in my life.” He emphatically stated that their death together had absolutely nothing to do with any outside pressure. Rather, the two were full of freedom and joy as they faced death. He reported that even as the train arrived at Karuizawa, he and Akiko were laughing and chatting happily with each other. He asked his siblings to consider he and Hatano “apart from convention.” Likewise, in his brief note to Asume Soichi, Arishima reported that they had finally arrived at the dark Karuizawa villa, drenched from their long walk in a heavy downpour, but that far from feeling gloomy, they were as playful as two infants. Why? “Until this moment, I had not realized that death is nothing in the face of love.” (He also asked Asume to help take care of Arishima’s children, by providing them with the royalties from his writings.) The note concluded with the frank remark that their bodies would probably be rotten by the time they are discovered (indeed they were). In Arishima’s final letter, to Morimoto Kôkichi, his close friend since they were students together in Hokkaido, he requested that Morimoto keep an eye on the communal farm, and once again insisted, for the last time: “We are dying together at the peak of our love. We are not dying because someone is threatening us.”

Further insight into Arishima’s death emerges in his Master’s thesis, a review of the entire course of Japanese civilization from its origins to the 19th century, written (in English) at Haverford College.¹¹ In the same way he had pondered what had motivated Fujimura Misao to kill himself, in his thesis Arishima is fascinated by the highly emotional motives that led characters in Tokugawa-era drama to commit love suicide. He reveals the degree to which he treasures the emotional side of life. He deplures how the feudal Tokugawa regime used the imported philosophy of Confucianism to stifle the free expression of the Japanese people’s native sensitivity and sentiment, which he saw as an excellent cultural trait of the Japanese, and probably the only means they could make “some

¹¹ Arishima Takeo, “Development of Japanese Civilization From the Mythical Age to the Times of Decline of Shogunal Power.” Masters Thesis, Haverford College, 1904. Thanks to Ms. D.F. Peterson of the Haverford Library staff for arranging access to the thesis. (I later found that it is also reprinted, albeit without Arishima’s excellent penmanship, in *Arishima Takeo zenshû*, Vol. 1, along with a complete Japanese translation.)

important contribution to the general progress of the world.” (pp. 231-232) In the context of a Tokugawa clampdown on the free expression of feelings, the Japanese had to find some outlet for their innate emotional expressiveness. Thus, Japanese commoners (and indeed, many samurai as well) became great fans of the urban performing arts. Arishima saw this drama to have reached its peak in Chikamatsu Monzaemon, who he praised as “Japan’s Shakespeare,” and “a powerful defender of the true Japanese sentiment and character.” (pp. 243-244)

Yet another famous Japanese intellectual took his own life only a few years after Arishima and Hatano. But the death of Akutagawa Ryonusuke in 1927 was a drastically different case. As he stated in his suicide letter, “A Note to a Certain Old Friend,” Akutagawa was dying because he was “prompted by a vague sense of anxiety.” Explicitly reporting that he did not feel suicide to be a sin “as Westerners do,” Akutagawa further expanded upon his reasons:

We humans, being human animals, do have an animal fear of death. The so-called vitality is but another name for animal strength. I myself am one of these human animals. And this animal strength, it seems, has gradually drained out of my system, judging by the fact that I am left with little appetite for food and women. The world I am now in is one of diseased nerves, lucid as ice. Such voluntary death must give us peace, if not happiness.

The contrast between Arishima and Akutagawa is striking. Akutagawa died for the sorts of reasons many thought Arishima suffered from. Both Arishima and Akutagawa are products of a society that continued to tolerate and respect suicide at least in part because of its traditional culture; otherwise, their cases could hardly be more different.

Today’s World: Terrorism and Culture Redux

During World War II, Japanese units suffered casualty rates higher than fighting men in any other conflict. The defense of reinforced Pacific islands such as Iwo Jima could be called a form of “voluntary death,” as virtually the entire Japanese population of the island was eliminated rather than surrendering. Likewise, the one-way pilots of suicide torpedoes, bombs, and the notorious Kamikaze pilots also seem to be in the tradition of suicidal behavior. But I consider these to be a separate case, since the coercion of fascist Japan during the “Fifteen Year War” from 1931 to 1945 made these decisions far from voluntary. (Sometimes this was literally true; one survivor of the supposedly all-volunteer Kamikaze corps reported that he was “ordered to volunteer.”) Instead of that gruesome history, let us conclude with two more recent stories, horrible enough in their own right.

In January 1985 a 33-year-old Japanese housewife walked into the waves off Santa Monica, California. She took her 4-year-old son and infant daughter with her. Pulled from the water by two passing college students, Mrs. Kimura Fumiko survived to stand trial for the murder of her children, who drowned. She insisted that she had not intended to live, but was seeking to die and by taking them with her, to save her children from the horrors of life without a mother.

For most Americans, regardless of any extenuating factors, Kimura was clearly a murderer. Yet in Japan, it is a common defense that such cases are not simply murder, but “parent-child suicide” (*oya-ko shinjû*). This form of “suicide” is illegal in Japan, but is generally punished more lightly than murder. Kimura’s attorney did not stress this cultural explanation for her behavior at the trial, but rather argued that his client was temporarily insane. But the 20,000 signatures from Los Angeles Japanese Americans on a petition for leniency may well have swayed the judge’s sentence. The petition argued that in such cases, “the mother’s intent is to save the child from a life of suffering without her.” Indeed, Kimura herself claimed that her children were “extensions of her.”¹² For this Japanese mother, her death was really the same thing as the death of her children; she did not grant them an individual existence. Mrs. Kimura seems to confirm an ongoing distrust of individualism and borderline admiration for suicide among today’s Japanese.

The response to Kimura’s case also suggests that the emotional resonance that Arishima Takeo had for love suicide in the plays of Chikamatsu persists in the attitudes of many Japanese (and Japanese Americans). As a penultimate example of this, consider one of the leading members of a small Japanese terrorist group, the Red Army. Three members of this group carried out a gruesome attack in the arrivals terminal of Tel Aviv’s Lod Airport in May 1972. These Japanese terrorists murdered 26 travelers (mostly Puerto Rican nuns) and wounded 76 other bystanders.¹³ One of the three apparently threw himself onto his own hand grenade after he ran out of machine gun ammunition. The only surviving member of the terrorists was Okamoto Kozo, who had also tried to kill himself by throwing grenades at a plane on the runway. Only when the plane did not explode did Okamoto try to escape.

Only after the Israeli officer interrogating Okamoto, Major General Rehavam Zeevi, promised the Japanese terrorist a gun and a single bullet to commit suicide did Okamoto begin to talk.¹⁴ Interviewed in jail, Okamoto spoke of his admiration for Japanese traditions of suicide old and new: “Even though

¹²“Japanese Mom who drowned children given probation,” *Houston Chronicle*, November 22, 1985, 2.

¹³Ian Black, *Israel’s Secret Wars: A History of Israel’s Intelligence Services* (1992), 269.

¹⁴William R. Farrell, *Blood and Rage: The Story of the Japanese Red Army* (Lexington, Massachusetts and Toronto: D.C. Heath and Company, 1990), 139. Despite making his promise in writing, Zeevi did not in fact offer Okamoto a gun.

Mishima and other Japanese suicide heroes believed in anti-revolutionary or reactionary ideologies, their emotions were the same as those of revolutionaries.”¹⁵ Denied his wish death, Okamoto was freed in a prisoner exchange in 1985 with the Palestinians, and welcomed as a hero by Qaddafi in Libya. Okamoto clearly displays both a flawed revolutionary consciousness and an ongoing grudging respect for traditional forms of voluntary death. Similar sentiments linger in the innermost emotional attitudes of many Japanese to this day.

Select Bibliography

Arishima Takeo. *Arishima Takeo Zenshû*. 14 Vols. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobô, 1980-1985.

Bryant, Tamie. “Oya-ko Shinju: Death at the Center of the Heart.” *Pacific Basin Law Journal*, 8 (1).

Farrell, William R. *Blood and Rage: The Story of the Japanese Red Army*. Lexington, Massachusetts and Toronto: D.C. Heath and Company, 1990.

Headley, Lee A., ed.. *Suicide in Asia and the Near East*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Heine, Steven. “Tragedy and Salvation in the Floating World: Chikamatsu’s Double Suicide Drama as Millenarian Discourse.” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 53, no. 2 (May 1994): 367-393.

Ikegami Eiko. *The Taming of the Samurai: Honorific Individualism and the Making of Modern Japan*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Lifton, Robert Jay, Katô Shuichi, and Reich, Michael R. *Six Lives/Six Deaths: Portraits from Modern Japan*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1979.

Minamoto Ryôen. *Giri to ninjô*. [Duty and Passion] Tokyo: Chûô kôronsha, 1969.

¹⁵Robin Morgan, *The Demon Lover: The Roots of Terrorism* (2001), 172.

Morgan, Robin. *The Demon Lover: The Roots of Terrorism*. 2001.

Morris, Ivan. *The Nobility of Failure: Tragic Heroes in the History of Japan*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

Pinguet, Maurice. *Voluntary Death in Japan*. Polity Press, 1993.

Sansom, G.B. *Japan: A Short Cultural History*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1952.

Seward, Jack. *Hara-Kiri: Ritual Japanese Suicide*. Rutland, Vt., and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle, 1968.

Suwa, Haruo. *Shinjû: Sono shi to shinjitsu*. [Double Suicide: Its History and Reality] Tokyo: Mainichi shinbunsha, 1977.

Yamamoto Tsunetomo. *Hagakure: The Book of the Samurai*. Translated by William S. Wilson. NY: Kodansha International, Ltd., 1979.