UNIT 3 DEPTH OF DEATH: A PHILOSOPHICAL OVER VIEW

Contents

- 3.0 Objectives
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Understanding of Death In General
- 3.3 Death in Martin Heidegger's Thought
- 3.4 Thomas Nagel's Viewpoint of Death
- 3.5 Let Us Sum Up
- 3.5 Key Words
- 3.6 Further Readings and References

3.0 OBJECTIVES

- To initiate the students to reflect on death and see it as part of life.
- To have a general understanding of human death.
- To understand the different views of Heidegger and Nagel on death.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Death is the cessation of the connection between our mind and body. Intellectually, everyone knows that one day all will die. We are usually so reluctant to think of our death because this knowledge does not touch our hearts, and it is inauspicious even to talk about death. Death spares no one. We can affirm with certainty that we all fall prey to death sooner or later. It is inevitable and pervades everything. Everyone should face death. Truly the word *death* is frightening for many. People like to live happily and not to suffer or get pain in the universe.

The moment we are born it is sure we will die one day. In the course of our life on earth, death plays a significant role in shaping our personality. Our time on earth or our longevity in this world is very limited; we may live at the most a hundred years. According to me death should not be threatening or fearsome to us, because it is completely natural. We need not be indifferent to death; instead we need to face death with courage, because being indifferent to something is not a solution to that problem or difficulty. The way we live decides, the way we die. Similarly the way we die announces boldly and clearly the way we lived. Instead of worrying about death that will happen in the future, living happily and facing death authentically could shape our lives meaningfully. Many people's fear of death is tied into their religious beliefs. Particularly they think about what will happen after death, but worrying about death is futile.

Philosopher Martin Heidegger (1889 –1976) states that as soon as I am born, I enter into the flow of time spanning from birth to death. Death is the final condition, the end of my being-thrown. Death is my way of being-in-the-world. Also death is unique and singular to everyone. Death is a part of my life. Death is what is the most authentic in my life. So whether we like it or not we know

that we are headed toward death. He clearly advises us that against a fear of death because it is a future event, and in the attempt to escape this fear is a cowardly action. So the authentic attitude to death involves accepting it as a present possibility, awaiting it as something certain possible at any moment. Authentic human living implies facing up to the reality of what death means in our lives. It means accepting the possibility of coming to the end of life at any instant as Heidegger suggests. We must face the fact of death, as Heidegger offers us several positive potentialities.

One of the famous living American philosophers Thomas Negal's notions of death is not easily acceptable for Christians. For Nagel, death is bad for us. In one sense this may be true, because it deprives us of an extended life. Most people are of the view that life is good even though they experience pain and suffering in their lives. Sometimes tragedy can also be a very positive state. Nagel goes further to point out some important observations about the value of life. A person may wish to do or fulfil his/her desires. But unfortunately he/she may face death at the age of twenty five or thirty. As a result death negates all our desires and wishes. Death controls our freedom by removing our longings. Looking now at what is bad about death instead of what is good about life, Nagel presents some thought-provoking insights regarding this point. Life is good because we have the conscious ability to experience and appreciate all that life has to offer. So death could be called bad because it deprives us of these experiences, and not because the actual state of death is bad for us.

3.2 UNDERSTANDING OF DEATH IN GENERAL

Here we shall see some general view and impression of death by different philosophers.

a) The Epicureans

Death is nothing to Epicureans. According to them, we fear death because of the belief that death is painful and that the soul may have to suffer in an afterlife. But both of these beliefs are not true. Death is not painful. It is a painless loss of consciousness. It is just like falling asleep and therefore nothing to be feared. "Death is nothing to us... It does not concern either the living or the dead, since for the former it is not and the latter are no more"- Epicurus (*in Letter to Menoeceus*). The principal criticism against this view is that the Epicureans have falsely diagnosed the cause of humankind's fear of death. Death terrorizes us, not because we fear it as painful, but because we are unwilling to lose consciousness permanently. For some anti- Epicureans, death is bad for a person, primarily because it deprives him/her of certain goods. Life would be unbearable, death is taken to be a misfortune for the one who dies, and we feel that he/she has suffered a great misfortune.

b) The Stoics

The stoics, especially Seneca, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius offered a more complicated and elusive view of death. Seneca (4BCE-65CE), a Roman adherent of Stoicism with a particular interest in ethics said that to overcome the fear of death, we must think of it constantly. They felt that there is no need to fear death. In order to overcome this fear, we should think of it in the proper manner. It reminds ourselves that we are part of nature and we must accept this truth.

c) Spinoza (1632-1677)

The Dutch Jewish philosopher Benedict de Spinoza wrote "A fearful man thinks of nothing less than of death, and his wisdom is not a meditation upon death but upon life (Ethics, Prop. LXVII)". It is interpreted to mean that man can and should allay the fear of death, simply by diverting his attention from it, and some persons have argued that by his/her nature he/she tends to follow this advice. The criticism consists in pointing out that the fear of death is frequently an involuntary sentiment that cannot be conquered by a merely conscious decision or a bare act of will. It is not enough to tell people not to think of death, one must explain how they can avoid thinking of it.

d) Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519)

He observes that when a day is spent well one can fall asleep happily. Similarly if one can spend one's life well, one will have a happy death. A happy person would not be seriously worried about death. But the question is: can one attain full happiness on Earth? Moreover if one wants to achieve happiness in life, one must conquer the fear of death.

e) Schopenhauer and other Existentialists

Full happiness is not possible. Therefore embrace the tragedy of the human condition with a complete awareness of all evils, including death. According to Schopenhauer there is no life after death and death is totally meaningless and it is absurd. We are destined to live a life in suffering and pain. For Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) the 'super man' will not permit death to seek him out in ambush to strike him down unawares. The superior man will live constantly in the awareness of death joyfully and proudly assuming death as the natural and proper terminus of life (Seelan 2010).

Check Your Progress I		
Note: Use the space provided for your answers.		
1) What is Spinoza's attitude to death?		
2) "Death is part of life." Comment.		

3.3 DEATH IN MARTIN HEIDEGGER'S THOUGHT

So far, we have just introduced the general understanding of death in the above section. Here we want to go little deeper to discuss my subject based on two prominent contemporary philosophers: Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) and Thomas Nagel (1937).

Martin Heidegger (1889-1976)

The most representative figure of existentialism in Germany is Martin Heidegger (1889-1976). He has also the widest influence of any of the existentialists. Heidegger brings to his personal reflection a solid erudition in the whole range of the history of the philosophy. His most famous work is *Sein Und Zeit* (Being and Time) published in 1972. He urges us to cultivate the awareness of death chiefly to our sense of life. He makes the additional claim that the awareness of death confers upon humans a sense of his/her own individuality. Dying he says is one thing no one can do for you; each of us must die alone. To shut out the consciousness of death is therefore to refuse one's individuality, and to live inauthentically. Heidegger often makes his case in dramatic language that is difficult to convey in summary form. He argues that mortality is our defining moment that we are thrown into the limited world of sense shaped by our being-toward-death. In this part, I would enumerate about death in the light of Heidegger in a detailed manner.

a) The meaning of the word 'Dasein'

The word Dasein has been used by several philosophers before Heidegger, most notably Ludwig Feuerbach, with the meaning of human "existence" or "presence". It is derived from da-sein, which literally means being-there/there-being, though Heidegger was adamant that this was an inappropriate translation of Dasein. In German, Dasein is the German vernacular term for existence, as in I am pleased with my existence (ich bin mit meinem Dasein zufrieden). According to Heidegger, however, it must not be mistaken for a subject that is something definable in terms of consciousness or a self. Heidegger was adamant about this distinction, which carried on Nietzsche's critique of the subject. Dasein, as a human being that is constituted by its temporality, illuminates and interprets the meaning of Being in Time. Heidegger chose this term as a synonym for "human entity" in order to emphasize the critical importance "being" has for our understanding and interpretation of the world. Some scholars have been confused on this issue, arguing that for Heidegger "Dasein" denoted some sort of structured awareness or an institutional way of life but the textual evidence for this claim is not strong.

Heidegger used the concept of Dasein to uncover the primal nature of "Being" (Sein) which Descartes and Kant left unexplored. Like Nietzsche, Heidegger criticized the notion of substance, arguing that Dasein is always a being engaged in the world. The fundamental mode of Being is not that of a subject or of the objective but of the coherence of Being-in-the-world. This is the ontological basis of Heidegger's work.

Heidegger attempted to maintain the definition of Dasein as we all are in our average everydayness. Dasein does not spring into existence upon philosophical exploration of itself. Heidegger intended Dasein as a concept, in order to provide

a stepping stone in the questioning of what it means to be. When Dasein contemplates this, what seems circular in ontic terms, is recursive in an ontological sense, because it brings the necessary appearance of time to the center of attention (Dasein 2010).

The word is *da* has many meanings.. It means 'there' (there they go) and 'here' (here they come) as well as 'then', 'since'. Prefixed to *sein*, 'to be' it forms *Dasein*, 'to be there' 'present' 'available, 'to exist'. In the seventeenth century the infinitive was nominalised as *(das) Dasein* originally in the sense of 'presence'. In the eighteenth century *Dasein* came to be used by philosophers as an alternative to the Latinate *Existenz* ('the existence of God') and poets used it in the sense of 'life'. In the Being and Time, Heidegger uses *Dasein* for, 1). the being of human, and 2). the entity or person who has this being. In lectures he often speaks of *das menschliche Dasein* 'human *Dasein*', and this too can mean either the being of human or the human being (Inwood 1999).

b) Death in Heidegger

For Martin Heidegger (1889–1976), who revives the Pre-Socratic tradition, the human person is "being-towards-death." Death does not lie at the end of life; it pervades the entire life. As soon as I am born, I enter into the flow of time spanning from birth to death. Death is the final condition, the end of my being-thrown. Death is my way of being-in-the-world. This is the finitude that characterizes all human experience. However, death is unique and singular to everyone. If there is something that is not shared, it is my death; it is my own, but it remains non-representable. It always escapes me even when I will be dead, I do not possess it. Death is a part of my everything, which escapes me.

But in reality, we do not think of death; we just shy away from it as if it happens only to others. We take refuge in our everydayness that brushes aside or even buries the thought of death. Yet death is at the very heart of my being-in-theworld. So for Heidegger death is to be thought of in order to bring out my being-towards-death. This is the very condition of my freedom as well, for by evading the thought of death, I escape from the authentic "my-self" to hide in the inauthentic "they-self." By my being-thrown into the world, I am originally thrown into the "they-self," which makes me evade the question of death and of nothingness thus distracting and alienating me from "my-self." Death is what is the most authentic in my life. However *Dasein* wants to flee from death because of its anxiety before nothingness. This nothingness has its origin in the being-towards-death. This nothingness is the ontological origin even of the dialectical negation. Care is the way out of anxiety and consciousness is an appeal for care, which allows Dasein to get out of the anxiety of its originary being-towards-death.

Also Being-there (Dasein) is Heidegger's term for human existence, as opposed to that of things and animals. It is Heidegger who says, that I shall die. It is uncertain when I shall die. I may die at any moment. I cannot do anything after my death. No one can die for me. I shall die alone. This is not to deny the soldierly comradeship induced by imminent death. Every individual human must die for him/herself which reduces each individual to his/her own uttermost individuality (Inwood 1999).

c) Being-toward-death in Heidegger

Heidegger describes the human person as a "Being-toward-death in Heidegger" (Heideggger 1962). It is simply not possible for humans to live only for the moment as animals does. Whether we like it or not we know that we are headed toward death. Heidegger describes two possible attitudes that we can adopt. On the one hand we can refuse to face the full implications of the human condition by objectifying death as something that 'happens' to others and will 'happen' to each of us at some future date, but not something that affects us now in our living. This is an 'inauthentic' attitude. So, one is not enable to escape the reality of death. It results in fear of death as a future event, and in the attempt to escape this fear as 'something cowardly'. On the other hand the authentic attitude to death involves accepting it as a present possibility, awaiting it as something certain possible at any moment and at the same time indefinite and accepting the anguish or anxiety of the possibility of death. This authentic attitude sets one free to choose among the various possibilities that may be realized before the ultimate possibility of death is fulfilled. Choices will be made in the face of the fact that life may come to an end at my instant. Authentic human living implies facing up to the reality of what death means in our lives. It means accepting the possibility of coming to the end of life at any instant as Heidegger suggests. We must face the fact of death, as Heidegger gives positive potentialities.

d) Heidegger's Death: The Mortals and the Immortals

The conception of death as an existential appears in the designation of human as "the mortal"; Heidegger's favourite expression for mankind is "The Mortals" (Demske 1970). Nobody can take one's death away from one, or die in one's place. So as soon as one comes to life, he/she is at once old enough to die. Death is inevitable. All humans are mortal. Heidegger understands it as a statement about the self-revelation of being. The character of death as an existential is confirmed, in the term "the mortals". It signifies mortality as the proper and essential mode of human being. Here, what may be called being-mortal is the same existential determination which was encountered as being unto death. The immortals and mortals belong equally to the holy. Neither the one nor the other can relate directly to the holy. Humans require the gods and the heavenly one require the mortals in order to accomplish this. In this reciprocal relation, the heavenly ones mediate between the holy and the mortals. They convey the greeting of the holy to human. So "it is the death that touches the mortals in their essence and so sets them on the way to the other side of life and thus the whole of the pure net work (of being)" (Demske 1970).

Heidegger, the *Dasein* is being-unto death. For Heidegger, Death does not happen after life but happens already while living, in the experience of sickness and aging. Heidegger denies that death is external to life or another event after life. It makes the very experience of living a dying. Heidegger does this because his mode of philosophizing is contemplation of Being. There is nothing to know after death since we go back to nothingness so he has no choice but to interpret death in terms of existence, while still living. *Dasein* (there being) is Heidegger's notion of the universal human person in every individual person that has openness to Being or truth. The human being is the venue where truth appears. The positive aspects of being-unto-death are that the person already anticipates the idea of

death while living and comes to reflect on the origin of things which is Being (truth). The individual person dies but the *Dasein* does not die. The individual is tasked to deliver truth to his/her fullest capacity because this affects the *Dasein*. This is the form of immortality. For Heidegger, this is not in the event of death after life, but within life. Heidegger's *Dasein* sponsors an obsession of humans to live forever. Heidegger is not interested in the discussion of God but his concept of being-unto-death sponsors the idea of faith in God as the giver of eternal life which depends upon the conduct of our life. We work hard to earn immortality.

e) Heidegger's Authentic Attitude to Death

Death brings human existence to an end and so completes it, but no can experience his/her own death. For Heidegger death is "that possibility is one's own most, which is non-relation and which is not be outstripped" (Heidegger 1962). Death is *Dasein's* own most possibility in that it most intensifies the fineness of existence. Death is a non-relational possibility because no one else can substitute for me with respect to my death. It impends as something that strips away all relations to others. We mostly relate to our own most, non-relational possibility by feeling in the face of it by living out inauthentic modes of Being—towards death. We tend to think of it as something that will happen but not yet. No one dissents from the proposition that everyone will die. This is seen as a well established empirical fact. Mainly each of has our own, and own our own death to die. Ordinary, each of us want to avoid the fact that we have our own, and only our own life to live (Heidegger 1962).

This is the core insight of what Heidegger understands to be an authentic attitude to death. Authenticity does not demand the actualization of the relevant possibility. Suicide is not even a mode of Being–towards death. Authenticity demands that we live expecting death to come at the very next moment. Death would overwhelm rather than provide the background to our existential choices.

Check Your Progress I		
Note: Use the space provided for your answers.		
1) Give a brief explanation of "Being-unto-death"?		
2) How should human being respond to death authentically?		

3.4 THOMAS NAGEL'S VIEWPOINT OF DEATH

Nagel was born of a Jewish family on July 4, 1937, in Belgrade, Yugoslavia (now Serbia). After his studies at Oxford in 1960, he pursued his PhD from Harvard University in 1963 under the supervision of John Rawls. Before settling in New York, Nagel taught briefly at the University of California, Berkeley (from 1963 to 1966) and at Princeton University (from 1966 to 1980)...

Nagel is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and his *Mortal Questions* (1979) gained wide notice for its examination of a number of the central themes of human existence, including death, sexuality, and socio-political issues. Nagel's quest for 'a philosophical method that aims at personal as well as theoretical understanding' was fulfilled by the book's success in combining analytical rigor with a breadth of appeal to common experience. The humane orientation of his work was sustained in *The View from Nowhere* (1986), a compellingly lucid analysis of the tensions between the subjective and objective aspects of intellection and identity; the quasi-instinctual desire to achieve objectivity is seen as fundamental to the central preoccupations of philosophy in the course of the wide-ranging development towards a concluding treatment of major ethical problems. Other works by Nagel include *What Does It All Mean* (1987), a stimulating survey of nine essential topics for beginners in philosophy, and *Equality and Partiality* (1991), in which he discusses questions of justice.

a) Thomas Nagel's Viewpoint of Death

Thomas Nagel begins his collection of essays with a most intriguing discussion about death. Death being one of the most obviously important subjects of contemplation, Nagel takes an interesting approach to define the truth as to whether death is, or is not, harmful for that individual. Nagel does a brilliant job in attacking this issue from all sides and viewpoints, and it only makes sense that he does it this way in order to make his own observations more credible. He begins by looking at the very common views of death that are held by most people in the world, and tells us that he will talk of death as the permanent end to our existence.

The first view that Nagel decides to discuss is the view that death is bad for us because it deprives us of more life. Most people are of the view that life is good even though they experience bad events in their lives. Sometimes tragic is also a very positive state. Nagel goes further to point out some important observations about the value of life. Nagel gives the example of death and being in a coma before dying. Both of these situations would be equally bad situations.

Looking now at what is bad about death instead of what is good about life, Nagel presents some obvious thoughts regarding this point. Life is good because we have the conscious ability to experience and appreciate all that life has to offer. So death is bad because it deprives us of these experiences, not because the actual state of death is bad for us. The next point that Nagel makes is that there are certain indications that show how people do not object to death simply because it "involves long periods of nonexistence" (Nagel 1979). We do not look at the state being before we are born as a misfortune, or deprivation of life, because that life has not yet begun and, he refutes the possible argument that the person could have been born earlier and had more life, with the fact that if that person

was born substantially earlier, he would cease to be that person, but instead someone else entirely.

b) Three Problems about Death

Nagel discusses next three problems. The first is a view that there are no evils that are not rooted in a person consciously "minding" those evils. Nagel puts this view in to easier terms by saying that this is the same as saying "what you don't know can't hurt you". There are several examples that can illustrate this theory. People who think this way would say that it is not harmful for a person, if he/she doesn't know about it. If he/she doesn't experience evil, it is not bad for him/her. In the view point of Nagel, if we do not experience death, it will not hurt us. But I feel that death always, in one way or other way, hurts people, though we do not experience it.

The second problem is that there are special difficulties, in the case of death, about how the supposed misfortune is to be assigned to a subject at all. Harm can be experienced by a person before death; nothing can be experienced after death. So, when is death itself experienced as harm? When does he/she undergo it? So as long as a person exists, he/she can not experience death and once he/she has died, he no longer exists.

The third problem deals with posthumous and prenatal existence (Nagel 1979). Contemplating the good or bad aspects of death, Nagel observes that we must look at the possible circumstances surrounding a death, and the pertinent history of the person who dies. This is important because we miss a lot that is important to the argument if what we take into consideration is exclusively the state of the person at the moment of death. Nagel gives an example of a very intelligent man sustaining an injury that causes him to regress to the mental capacity of an infant. His needs can be fulfilled like those of an infant and he kept happy as long as simple needs are met. His family and friends would look at this as a terrible misfortune, even though the man himself is not aware of his loss. This situation is unfortunate because of the deprivation of what might have been had he not been injured in this way. He could have gone on to accomplish great things for the world and his family, and live out his life through old age as an accomplished and acclaimed individual. This would have led him to great happiness, but it can be observed that this same man in a state of mental capacity to match that of a child is also happy, but Nagel agrees that what happened to this man is a tragedy because of the terrible loss of the life the intelligent man could have led. This situation can relate to death in this way of thinking about deprivation. Death is bad because it robs you of what could have been.

After making these observations, Nagel states that there are endless circumstances and happenings going on that affect a person's fortune or misfortune. Many of these never coincide directly to the person's life. We must consider that there is no way to pinpoint the exact position of a misfortune in a person's life, nor a way to define the origin. People have dreams and goals in life that may or may not be fulfilled. There is no way to find all of the circumstances and possibilities that go into whether or not these hopes and dreams are eventually fulfilled, but Nagel tells us that we must simply accept that "if death is an evil, it must be accounted for in these terms, and the impossibility of locating it within life should not trouble us."

There are some who view the time before birth and the time after death as the same. We exist in neither, though Nagel argues that there is a difference. This whole essay has expressed exactly his view that though we do not exist in either case, death deprives us of time that we could have been living our lives. Nagel makes an interesting observation about whether we can assign as a misfortune an event or aspect of life which is normal to all humans in general. We all know that we all will die and that the maximum amount of life is somewhere around 100 years. So is it still plausible to say this is a misfortune? We are brought into this world and brought up with aspects of our lives that we appreciate. The deprivation of these things that we learn to appreciate is a misfortune, because we have learned to live with these privileges. It is unfathomable for a human being to grasp the concept of a finite life, in the truest meaning of understanding. We do not think of our lives right now as a set out plan or a finite sequence of events. We do not live day to day thinking of what we should do according to how much time we have left. Our lives are essentially an open-ended sequence of good and bad circumstances and possibilities. Death is the abrupt interruption of this sequence that we cannot help but be in the mindset will never end. This is how death is a deprivation, and ultimately, a bad thing for a person.

In conclusion, Nagel offers a good argument in his essay on "death" - death itself is harm. Whether a person believes in the immortal life or not, it must still be considered that dying deprives us of the goods and experiences of life. This view seems unavoidable (Crawford 2010). There is obvious disagreement about the fact of death. Some people may think that death is dreadful; others may not have objection to death. Thomas Nagel wants to ask whether death is in itself an evil; and how great an evil, and of what kind it might be. The question should be of interest even to those who believe in some form of immortality, for one's attitude towards immortality must depend in part on one's attitude toward death.

c) Death is an Evil

If death is an evil, it cannot be positive features, because it deprives us what we have. Thomas Nagel tries to deal with the difficulties surrounding the natural view that death is an evil because it brings to an end all the goods that life contains (Nagel 1979). Especially death deprives humans' desire, activity, goal, and so on. A person who dies at age 92 has lived a full life to the best of his ability and has experienced more than someone who dies at age 32. The person dying at age 32 had many things that he/she wished to accomplish and experience in his/her life, and since the event of death has taken away all possibility of any of these goals coming to pass, and undermines all the work that he/she has put forth up to that point in pursuit of his/her goals, death is a terrible tragedy for him/her.

First, the value of life and its contents does not attach to mere organic survival; almost everyone would be indifferent between immediate death and immediate coma followed by death twenty years later without reawakening. And second, like most goods, this can be multiplied by time: more is better than less. There are two other indications that we do not object to death merely because it involves long periods on nonexistence (Nagel 1979). First, as Nagel has been mentioned, most of us would not regard the temporary suspension of life. I think that it may be true, because our earthly life is not permanent or eternal. As soon as one is born he/she starts to count the final day of his/her life. It is undeniable. Second,

none of us existed before we were born (or conceived), but few regard that as a misfortune. The point that death is not regarded as an unfortunate state enables us to refute a curious but very common suggestion about the origin of the fear of death. It is often said that those who object to death have made the mistake of trying to imagine what it is like to be dead.

The first type of objection is expressed in general form by the common remark that what you don't know can't hurt you. It means that even if a man is betrayed by his friends, ridiculed behind his back, and despised by people who treat him politely to his face, none of it can be counted as a misfortune for him so long as he does not suffer as a result. The death of Keats at 24 is generally regarded as tragic; that of Tolstoy at 82 is not. Although they will both be dead for ever, Keats' death deprived him of many years of life which were allowed to Tolstoy; so in a clear sense Keats' loss was greater. However, this does not prove that Tolstoy's loss was insignificant. The fact that it is worse to die at 24 than at 82 does not imply that it is not a terrible thing to die at 82. The question is whether we can regard as a misfortune any limitations, like mortality, that is normal to the species. Blindness or near-blindness is not a misfortune for a mole, nor would it be for a man, if that were the natural condition of the human race.

Check Your Progress I		
Note: Use the space provided for your answers.		
1)	What are the main insights of Nagel on death?	
2)	How do you respond to Nagel's view that death is evil?	

3.5 LET US SUM UP

Here we have seen different views of death, including that of Martin Heidegger and Thomas Nagel. Though people have divergent views and perspectives on death, everyone has to encounter death in her own life. So our challenge is to live an authentic life. Each one is invited to discover the meaning of life and death in her own lives.

3.6 KEY WORDS

Dasein: Dasein - is a German word and is sometimes translated as "being-there" or "being-here" (da combines in its meaning "here" and "there", excluding the spatial-relational distinction made by the English words; Sein is the infinitive, "to be"). It is the human person, who is aware of her existence. Mostly it is not translated at all.

Sein-zum-tode: Being-toward-death, or *Sein zum Tode*, represents the finite nature of life. This belief that death *defines* life. It is a typical Heideggerian usage.

3.7 FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Aldwinckle, Russel. *Death in the Secular City*. London: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972.

Bruno, Marie-Aurélie. "The dying human: a perspective from bio medicine", *The Study of Dying*, ed. Allen Kellehear, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Crawford, Emily (2010) "Thomas Nagel And His Article On Death" Ezine Article, http://EzineArticles.com/453075

Cyborg. Wikipedia: *The Free Encyclopedia*. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cyborg accessed on November 24, 2010.

"Dasein" (2010) Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dasein accessed on 18.9.2010.

Demske, James. *Being, Man & Death*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1970.

Feifel, Herman. New Meaning of Death. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977.

Heidegger. Being and Time. New York: Hoper and Row, 1962.

Immortality. Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immortality accessed on November 23, 2010.

Inwood, Michael. A Heidegger Dictionary. London: Blackwell Publisher, 1999.

Kramer, Kenneth. The Sacred Art of Dying. New York: Paulist Press, 1988.

Leslie, John. *The End of the World: The Ethics and Science of Human Extinction*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Mind uploading. Wikipedia: *The Free Encyclopedia*. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mind_uploading accessed on November 24, 2010.

Morris, Doug. "Why should you want physical immortality now, what is it, and how can you live it?" http://www.physical-immortality-now.com/ accessed on 23.11.2010.

Nagel, Thomas. Mortal Questions. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Nagel, Thomas. "And His Article on Death" http://ezinearticles.com/?Thomas-Nagel-And-His-Article-On-Death&id=453075 accessed on November 21, 2010.

Nagel, Thomas. Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas_Nagel accessed on November 21, 2010.

Pandikattu, Kuruvilla. "The last moments lead us back to life" *Asian Journal of Religious Studies* Vol 55 Nr 6 (November 2010): 1-49.

Pandikattu, Kuruvilla. (2003) "Collective Extension or Extinction: The Prospects of Being Human Today" (2003). http://knol.google.com/k/collective-extension-or-cosmic-extinction# (JDV Pune, India.)

Seelan, Robin. *Complementary notes for Philosophy of Human Person*. Pune: JDV, 2010.