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Abstract
This paper reviews news coverage of organ transplantation as it appears in newspapers in the U.S. and Japan. There is a great difference in such coverage between the two nations with regard to Japan's first organ transplant and transplantations performed thereafter in this country.

With regard to Japan's first organ transplantation, the local press gives extensive details of the transplantation itself, while in America the focus is on the fact that in Japan the event was nothing less than epoch-making.

In the news coverage of organ transplants performed in 2000, one year after the first organ transplant in Japan, the Japanese press discusses such matters as 'cases of organ transplants from brain-dead donors,' 'the patient's progress after organ transplants from brain-dead donors,' 'cases of other organ transplants,' 'organs donated by brain-dead children,' 'incidents,' 'measures to improve organ transplants,' 'malpractice' and so. On the other hand, American papers report on 'politics,' 'cases of organ transplants performed on celebrities,' 'unusual cases,' 'research cases,' 'the lack of organs,' 'medicine,' 'organ transplant networks,' 'ethics,' 'incidents' and so on.

This difference demonstrates that while brain-dead organ transplantation has just begun in Japan it has already taken root in American society and now presents the problem of a lack of organs. The discrepancy lies in differences in Japanese and American views of life and death, religion, culture, medical ethics, politics, economics and so on.
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1. Introduction
The Organ Transplant Law was enforced in Japan on Oct. 16, 1997. One year and four months later, on Feb. 28, 1999, the first organ transplant from a brain-dead donor was performed, since which time there have been only 21 brain-dead donors (as of Oct. 31st, 2002). At this turning point in Japan's history, I wanted to study the present state of organ transplants in this country and the U.S., a veritable organ transplant powerhouse, and compare the two countries, with a view to examining the future state of organ transplantation in Japan.

Though a great number of researchers from various fields have studied organ transplantation, few have investigated how the mass media have reported on the subject. First, I compare articles from newspapers in the U.S. and Japan that reported on the first case of organ transplantation performed in Japan. Secondly, I look at articles reporting thereafter in both countries and examine the differences between the two. I then attempt to explore the differences between the state of organ transplantation and the background to such transplantation in the two nations.

2. Reports of the first legal organ transplant in Japan from a brain-dead patient on the basis of the Organ Transplant Law

The headlines of Japanese newspapers read, 'Brain-dead organ transplantation begins: heart and liver, Osaka University and Shinshu University, the first case in Japan' (Mainichi, Feb. 28, 1999); 'The first brain-dead transplantation, Kochi, Brain death was determined' (Sankei, Feb. 28, 1999); and 'The first legal judgment is brain death' (Asahi, Feb. 2, 1999). These headlines
provided concrete details. Meanwhile, the American media ran articles on the first case in Japan on Mar. 1. The headline of The Washington Post was, 'Japan Enters New Organ-Transplant Era.' The New York Times reported the event with the headline, 'Death Taboo Weakening. Japan Sees 1st Transplant.' The headlines of the Boston Globe and the Chicago Tribune were similar.

In the body of the articles in Japanese newspapers, further details were provided such as the fact that an inpatient of Kochi Red Cross Hospital was determined brain-dead, the patient's history, the procedure for diagnosing brain-death, the patient's donor card, the Japan Organ Transplant Network's organ transplant selection process, that the heart was transplanted to a patient in Osaka University, the liver to one in Shinshu University, the kidneys to patients in the National Nagasaki Central Hospital and Tohoku University, and the lungs to one in Osaka University. Details of the doctors' press conference were also given. In addition to all this information, the basis of brain-death diagnosis, the number of organ transplants in the world, an organ transplant performed by Prof. Wada 31 years ago, and so on were referred to in passing. The significance of organ transplants, however, was not mentioned in the reports of the first legal organ transplant in the Japanese newspapers.

Meanwhile, in the American media, details of the first organ transplant in Japan received little attention; rather, the fact that Japan had reached an epoch-making moment was the main focus. The key words used repeatedly were 'milestone,' 'debate,' 'taboo' and 'mistrust'. The papers also said that before arriving at this 'milestone,' the Japanese had had a 'fiery debate' or 'years of debate' and that behind all this lay the fact that organ transplants from brain-dead donors had been regarded as 'taboo' and doctors had also given rise to public 'mistrust' in Japan. They further said that such 'taboo' was based on the Japanese view of life and death -- that as the Japanese have long regarded heart death as 'death', there has been a great deal of resistance to organ transplantation from brain dead donors, and many Japanese have traditionally believed that the donor's spirit is also transplanted with an organ. Thus, it has taken the Japanese a long time to come round to the idea of performing organ transplants from brain dead donors. This type of reporting in America, which delves into the Japanese view of life and death, is interestingly quite different from the kind of details the Japanese press gave of the first transplant.

Doctors tonight performed the first legal organ transplants in Japan from a brain-dead patient, a milestone for Japanese medicine and an event that has transfixed the nation. (washingtonpost.com, 1999, March 1) (Author’s underlining here and below).

The operation was an ethical and emotional milestone in a country that has long believed that death comes only after the heart stops beating and the body turns cold. (nytimes.com, 1999, March 1)

Nearly two years ago, Japan was locked in a fiery debate over transplants and pondering the definition of death. Many Japanese feel uneasy about defining brain death as the end of life. (nytimes.com, 1999, March 1)

The 1997 organ transplant law, passed after years of debate on the subject of brain death and organs transplants...(latimes.com, 1999, February 28)

For the first time in Japan, doctors performed a legal heart transplant today, a striking at a taboo on taking organs from patients whom Japanese traditionally do not
consider dead. (nytimes. com, 1999, March 1)

Japan welcomed the success today of four, weekend organ transplants, heralding a new era in medicine in a nation where a deep mistrust of doctors has for decades kept such operations unavailable. (boston. com/globe/1999, March 2)

3. Reports on organ transplants in the U.S. and Japan in 2000

I will now review news coverage of organ transplants reported in both the U.S. and Japan in the year 2000, one year after the first organ transplant in this country. I will compare Japanese news coverage of organ transplants as it appeared in The Mainichi Shimbun and American news coverage appearing in The New York Times and The Washington Post, and examine the circumstances surrounding organ transplants and ways of reporting on the subject in both countries. I entered the key words ‘organ transplant,’ searched the archives of each newspaper and selected and reviewed all such articles. Though I searched only one Japanese and two American papers, I found about the same number of articles: Japan-58, U.S.-57.

3.1 News Coverage in Japan

The fifth to the tenth case of organ transplantation in Japan were reported one after another.

Table 1 Mainichi Shimbun (Jan. ~ Dec. 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject matter</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases of organ transplant from a brain-dead donor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient’s progress after organ transplant from a brain-dead donor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases of other organ transplants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ donation by a brain-dead child donor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to improve organ transplant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This represents the largest number of reports, amounting to some 43% of the total. They provide details of each case just as in the first case. Additionally, the patients’ progress after brain-dead organ transplantation and cases of other organ transplants were also reported. The total percentage of cases of organ transplant amounts to 57%, the largest percentage of all. The issue of organ donation by brain-dead infant donors was also raised, as organ transplant law only allows persons older than 15 years of age to donate their organs and a revision in the law is necessary. Under the heading ‘incident,’ the press reported on Japanese tourists assaulted by local natives in the Republic of Guatemala. This came about as the locals were under the false assumption that Japanese tourists kidnapped native children for the purpose of organ transplants.

Measures to improve organ transplants include the need to increase the number of institutions to perform organ transplantation, the inauguration of the Japan Transplant Recipients Organization and the Support Center for Recipients’ Families, and the expansion of insurance coverage for organ transplant and donor cards.

As seen above, articles on cases of organ transplants account for 57% of the total, and together with problems of infant child organ transplantation and measures for future organ transplantation, constitute the majority of articles on organ transplants in Japan. This fact demonstrates that Japan is at the dawn of brain-dead organ
transplants.

3.2 News Coverage in the U.S.

As seen in Table 2 below, in the U.S. the political aspects of organ transplantation accounts for 25% of the total number of articles, while 'cases of organ transplant performed on celebrities,' 'unusual cases,' 'research cases,' and 'lack of organs' follow 'politics.' Organ transplantations are performed on a daily basis in the U.S. In the year 2000, 22,854 cases were performed, with the number of liver and heart transplantations from brain dead donors standing at 4,934 and 2,197, respectively, which means that fourteen cases of liver transplantation and six cases of heart transplantation are performed every day somewhere in the U.S. Organ transplantation per se is too common in the U.S. to make the news (Sato, 1999) and this is fundamentally different from Japan, where we are now witnessing the dawn of organ transplantation.

3. 2. 1) Political aspects

The leading articles in the U.S. in the year 2000 were 'political'. When organs are offered for transplant, the problem is how to distribute them. The number of patients who are currently waiting for organ transplantation in the U.S. is about 79,000, but some 5,000 people die without a chance to receive transplants. Under such severe circumstances, it is crucial to decide how donor organs should be distributed. (Craven, 1992)

The whole nation was divided into 62 areas, and in each area a private nonprofit organization, the United Network for Organ Sharing, has been responsible for distributing organs. This means that there are two points at issue. The first point is whether organs should be distributed locally as before, or nationally. The second is whether organs should be distributed by the private sector as before or the federal government.

At issue are whether donated organs, when they become available, should be distributed locally or nationally and whether decisions about these scarce resources should be made primarily by the private sector or the federal government. (nytimes.com, April 13, 2000)

The House passed a bill to allow organs to be distributed locally, maintaining the status quo.

Last week, by nearly 2 to 1, the House passed a bill that would have the effect of maintaining this system and preventing national distribution. (nytimes.com, April 13, 2000)

The Senate shared the idea that organs should be distributed nationally, with the sickest patients across the nation given priority.

The administration has been arguing for years that organs should be shared broadly throughout the country, with the sickest patients generally given priority. The Senate bill would make that possible. (nytimes.com,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject matter</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political aspects of organ transplantation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases of organ transplants performed on celebrities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual cases</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research cases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of organs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

April 13, 2000)

The gap between the House and the Senate is expressed in an interesting way.

We (the members of the House and of the Senate) are still on opposite sides of the Grand Canyon on this. (nytimes.com, April 13, 2000), (parentheses added by this author).

The reason why there is a difference of opinion between the House and the Senate is that many Representatives are elected by local people. As mentioned above, organ transplantation in the U.S. is performed on a daily basis, and such surgery, which can be done only in leading hospitals in Japan, can be performed even in relatively small hospitals in the U.S. The Representatives try to protect small hospitals in their own constituencies and maintain a system in which organs are distributed locally.

As for the second point, the government decided, as a compromise, to allow the United Network for Organ Sharing to continue to be involved in the distribution of organs, but concluded a contract with another organization, the University Renal Research and Education Association of Ann Arbor, to look for a better way of doing so.

But federal health officials selected another organization, the University Renal Research and Education Association of Ann Arbor, Mich., to run the scientific registry that examines how transplant patients fare and how changes in organ distribution policy affect them. (nytimes.com, September 29, 2000)

To demonstrate how large the number of articles on the political aspects of organ transplants is, I searched all the articles with Word Smith Ver. 3, which is a very effective tool in corpus research. I found that 73,412 words are used in
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the 57 American articles, with a number of words being used repeatedly, and that 8,811 terms are used, one term being used 8 times on average. However, 'Gore' is used 118 times, 'president' 55 times, 'government' 41 times, 'vote' 41 times, 'guidelines' 35 times, 'contract' 34 times, 'Clinton' 32 times, 'Congress' 32 times, 'legislation' 17 times and so on. Thus, such political terms are used extensively and demonstrates that the issue of organ transplantations is closely related to politics in the U.S. Political terms in Japanese news coverage, on the other hand, are rarely seen.

Within this news of a more political nature, we can find a variety of issues related to economics. In the U.S., where no less than 22,000 cases of organ transplantation are performed a year, the issue of distributing organs is an economic as well as a political one.

The debate was not only political but also economic. Small transplant centers feared that the new rules would put them out of business by steering organs to larger, big-city hospitals. (nytimes.com, September 29, 2000)

After fierce debate, both in the House and the Senate, the government concluded a contract with The United Network for Organ Sharing and signed a $100 million deal for 5 years.

The United Network for Organ Sharing of Richmond won what could become a five-year, $100 million contract from the Health and Human Services Department to administer the national system for organ matching and distribution. (washingtonpost.com, October 9, 2000)

A large sum of money is consumed by the network alone. Organ transplantation has been referred to as 'lucrative transplant work.' and is big business in the U.S.
Regional networks feared losing lucrative transplant work to out-of-town centers such as the University of Pittsburgh. (washingtonpost.com, April 5, 2000)

3.2.2) Organ transplant performed on celebrities

The second largest number of reports on organ transplants in the U.S. press concerns those performed on celebrities, including the case of a professional basketball player returning after a kidney transplant, and the case of a governor receiving a rare heart and liver transplant.

Medically, it's not a miracle that Elliott is back playing for the San Antonio Spurs seven months after having a kidney transplant. But it's unique. No other athlete in any major professional sport has played again after an organ transplant. (washingtonpost.com, March 18, 2000)

Mr. Casey helped to draw national attention to organ donations after his life was saved by a rare heart and liver transplant in 1993, when he was still governor. (nytimes.com, May 31, 2000)

3.2.3) Unusual cases of organ transplants

Though organ transplants may not be a very hot topic in the U.S. press, very unusual cases are played up: a spouse-to-spouse transplant, an Arab-American Muslim deciding to be a donor - a courageous decision as Muslims are forbidden from becoming donors for organ transplants, and the daughter of a cardiologist receiving a heart transplant.

Dr. Wayne C. Waltzer removed one of Mrs. O'Neill's kidneys and transplanted it into her husband. "Spouse-to-spouse transplants are becoming increasingly common," Dr. Waltzer explained. (nytimes.com, January 16, 2000)

Mrs. Bazzy's declaration is controversial. As an Arab-American Muslim, she is part of a community that ardently believes it is forbidden for Muslims to donate organs, even to a relative. To see Heaven, they say, their bodies must return to God in one piece. (nytimes.com, May 20, 2000)

A local cardiologist discovers that "the worst heart of anyone I'd ever seen" belonged to his 14-year-old daughter...Sarah's illness seemed to him incurable. His dual role-as a physician who understood the condition and its implications only too well and as the father of the patient - weighed heavily. (washingtonpost.com, June 20, 2000)

3.2.4) Research cases

The fourth most frequent type of case, the 'research case,' has a great impact on a large number of people as they are articles run not in medical journals but in newspapers read by the general public. Research to create genetically altered pigs whose organs can be transplanted into humans, research to save diabetic patients by transplanting cells from the pancreas, research to cure a heart by creating new muscle and blood vessels fashioned from cells scavenged from the patient's own body. These stories are all good news for thousands of people.

The goal, PPL said, is to use the technology to create genetically altered pigs whose organs can be transplanted into humans without being rejected by the human immune system. (nytimes.com, March 15, 2000)

The transplanted cells, isolated from the pancreas, were harvested from deceased organ donors. The goal of the treatment is to provide an easier and safer alternative to transplanting the entire pancreas. (nytimes.com, May 27, 2000)
Doctors may soon be able to rejuvenate weakly pumping hearts by creating brand-new muscle and blood vessels fashioned from cells scavenged elsewhere in patients' bodies, new research suggests. (nytimes.com, November 14, 2000)

3.2.5) Lack of organs

The lack of organs is a serious problem in the U.S. (McCullagh, 1993) Though this is mentioned in many articles that are not specifically about a lack of organs, such articles include the lack of African American donors, an author who published a book on his sister's organ transplantation to increase the number of donors, a gospel festival to increase the number of donors for minorities, and so on.

Clive O. Callender said that when it comes to organ donation, among African Americans, the needs are especially great and the donors are few. (washingtonpost.com, February 23,2000)

The story is told in Mr. Marx's new book, "It Gets Dark Sometimes: My Sister's Fight to Live and Save Lives" (JAM Publishing)... Most donated organs come as a result of traffic accidents....Mr. Marx testified before the United States Senate about organ donor awareness....(nytimes.com. March 19, 2000)

More than 1,000 people will participate today in an outdoor gospel festival at First Seventh-day Adventist Church in the District that is intended to boost a bone marrow and organ donation drive for minorities. (washingtonpost.com. July 22,2000)

4. Background to the coverage on organ transplantation

Up to this point I have reviewed the coverage on organ transplantation in the U.S. and Japan. I would now like to turn to the background to such coverage. The articles from Japan demonstrate that this country is at the dawn of organ transplantation. The American coverage include politics, organ transplants of celebrities, unusual cases, research cases, the lack of organs, and so on, and this comes from a background in which organ transplants have taken root in American society, and in which there is a serious problem caused by the lack of organs. These two points illustrate the contrast between the two countries. I would like to discuss these two points in more detail.

4.1 Japan at the dawn of organ transplantation vs. the U.S., where organ transplantation has already taken root in society

Organ transplantation began in 1963 in the U.S., and in 1964, just one year later, in Japan. Thus, the two countries began organ transplantation almost at the same time. The world's first heart transplantation was performed in 1967. (Fuse, 1992) The first heart transplantation in Japan was performed one year later. In Japan, however, heart and liver transplantations have not been performed since then. Then, for the first time in 30 years, a heart transplantation was performed in 1999. In the meantime, such transplantations have been performed continuously in the U.S., and the number of heart and liver transplantations has increased dramatically since the widespread use of the immunosuppressive drug, Cyclosporine. (Trzepacz, 2000)

What created this hiatus of 30 years? When the first heart transplant was performed in Japan in 1968, the patient died following the surgery, and suspicions about decisions concerning the donor's point of brain death and acceptance of the organ by the recipient were pointed out. Prof. Wada, who performed the heart transplant, was sued for murder. Though the doctor was exempted from prosecution, the case invited a sense
of distrust in medical care, and raised suspicions in Japan about organ transplants, especially organ transplants dependent on the point of brain death. These factors resulted in a delay in organ transplantation. Furthermore, the Japanese people hold the belief that the deceased's body should remain intact after death, and that organ transplantation also means spiritual transplantation, as reported in *The New York Times*. The Japanese cannot believe that a man is dead when his heart is still beating. They believe a brain-dead person can still come to life again if his or her heart is functioning. It is because of this view of life and death and their religious beliefs that the Japanese find it difficult to achieve a consensus on brain death and organ transplantation.

On the other hand, Americans do not keep "holding on" to a dead person's body. According to Christian faith, the spirit goes to heaven and the corpse is merely an empty object without a soul. There is no problem in removing anything from a lifeless body. Moreover, American people think about what they can do at the time of death. Americans generally think highly of positive action, so they value donating organs to save others people's lives. Many Americans believe in Christianity, which tells them to 'love thy neighbor,' which maybe another important factor. (Fox, 1992)

In the U.S., organ donation is called 'the gift of life,' which demonstrates the concept of 'sharing with others,' which is also an important teaching of Christianity. Many donors in the U.S. are highly educated, intelligent Christians, who have been brought up in a good domestic environment, which proves the factor. (Hosaka, 1992) This 'sharing' is seen in the name of the network, the United Network for Organ Sharing (UNOS), while the Japanese network is simply called the 'Japan Organ Transplant Network.' The word 'gift' is repeatedly used in *The New York Times*, and *The Washington Post*. Such views on religion and life and death in the U.S., together with its culture, contribute to the widespread of organ transplantation.

That report affirmed the good sense of sharing organs across wider regions and the need for active federal oversight of the sort the House has now voted to remove. (nytimes.com, April 6, 2000)

It was a memorial service and celebration for deceased organ donors, their families and those who received the gifts of new lives. (washingtonpost.com, April 3, 2000)

4.2. Lack of organs in the U.S., and the present state of organ transplants in Japan

As organ transplantation has developed in American society, it has resulted in the problem of a lack of organs, which is caused by an imbalance in the supply and demand of transplantable organs. As a result, organs have become a kind of 'social resource' in the U.S. In *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, the expression 'scarce resources' is repeatedly used.

The House voted yesterday to overturn new federal rules aimed at making sure that the sickest patients get the first chance to use donated organs, as lawmakers debated how best to share the scarce resources and save the most lives. (washingtonpost.com, April 5, 2000)

The idea of identifying organs as resources demonstrates that Americans regard organs as mere objects. In the Japanese media, the word 'resources' cannot be found, as the Japanese think their soul is in their organs. Moreover, highly paid white males may have more chances to obtain organs as resources, hard-to-find organs, than either females, minority groups or those in the lower income bracket. The issue of
race and the huge discrepancy between rich and poor in the U.S. lies beneath the issue of organ transplants.

The number of patients who are waiting to receive organs is about 13,000 (as of Sept, 2002) in Japan. There is the problem of the scarcity of organs in Japan, too, though it is more severe in the U.S. due to the sheer demand in that country. In the Japanese media, however, there are no articles on the scarcity of organs. This may indicate that such articles are not of great significance in the present situation where brain-dead organ transplantations are progressing at a snail’s pace. In Japan, there is still a great deal of resistance to organ transplantation, and it remains a controversial matter, so the Japanese are not concerned with following news coverage relating to the scarcity of organs. This will be an issue for the future, after greater discussion of organ transplantation itself.

5. Conclusion

I have reviewed news coverage on organ transplantation appearing in newspapers in the U.S. and Japan. There was a great difference in such coverage between the two countries regarding the first organ transplant and organ transplantations thereafter in this country. This difference demonstrates that brain-dead organ transplantation has just begun in Japan, while it has become well established in American society where the greatest concern is the problem of a lack of organs. The difference lies in the different views of life and death, religion, culture, medical ethics, politics, economics and so on. As the issue of organ transplantation is a very delicate one related to human death, extensive studies covering a variety of fields will be indispensable. This paper has reviewed the present circumstances of organ transplantations in the U.S. and Japan by examining articles in newspapers. I hope also to research information on disclosure or the privacy of donors and recipients, (Asano, 1999) reviewing not only newspapers but also magazines, television, the Internet and so on. The Japanese must have a thorough debate on organ transplantation, learning from both the significant advantages of such surgery and the problems found in the U.S.

Notes

1) This paper is based on an oral presentation 'A study of news coverage of organ transplantation in the U.S. and Japan' at the 43rd annual convention of the Japan Association for Current English Studies held at Tokoha Gakuen University on Oct. 14th, 2001.

2) These figures are cited from UNOS [http://www.unos.org].
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アメリカと日本における臓器移植報道の比較研究

川越栄子
神戸市看護大学

要 旨

日米の新聞が臓器移植についてどのように報じているかを概観した。日本（1999年）の報道について、日本の新聞は、患者の病状、脳死判定の手続き、ドナーの事情、等と事実を細かく報道していた。一方、アメリカのメディアは、臓器移植の実事は最小限に抑えられ、視点は、日本が画期的に新しい時代に突入したことにおかれていた。

その後1年を経過した2000年の臓器移植報道は、日本ではその後の「脳死移植例」が5例目から10例目まで順に報道され、43%であった。「脳死移植後の経過を報じたもの」、「脳死以外の移植を扱った記事」も含めて移植例が圧倒的に多く、57%を占めていた。その他「小児の臓器移植」「臓器移植を充実させるための方策」などがあり、日本では脳死臓器移植の黎明期である事を証明していた。

一方アメリカでは「政策」に関する記事が25%を占め、「著名人の臓器移植」「特殊例」「研究例」「臓器不足」と続いた。

日本初の脳死臓器移植においてもその後の臓器移植報道においても日本と報道では大きな相違点があった。それは日本が脳死臓器移植の黎明期であるのに対して、アメリカでは定着期に入りその結果臓器不足という問題は生じており集約される。この相違の背景には日本での死生観、宗教観、文化、医療倫理、政治、経済等多岐にわたる違いがある。臓器移植の問題は人間の「死」に触れる問題で、多くの分野からの研究が必要であるが、今回新聞記事の分析を試みたことで、日米における現在の臓器移植の表層部分を観察し、マスコミの報道姿勢の相違点を明らかにできた。

キーワード：臓器移植 ニュース報道 新聞 アメリカ 日本