offers three essays in a row which are more about Nihonron (Japanese writings about being Japanese) than about internationalization (though Befu succeeds in relating the two issues, arguing that Nihonron represents the flip-side of Japan’s quest for internationalization). Davis’ and Mouer and Sugimoto’s essays on Nihonron are examples of the sort of strident, self-satisfied Japan-bashing which seems recently to be so much in vogue among Western intellectuals (see Miller’s Japan’s Modern Myth). Mouer and Sugimoto go so far as to compare the insidious effects of Nihonron to the Soviet Union’s treatment of dissidents (the logic of their argument is too complex to be explained in a mere book review).

After ridiculing and lambasting Nihonron as being unscientific, subjective, foolish, fascistic, ethnocentric and dangerous to the world, the authors of these anti-Nihonron papers declare that Japan cannot be considered truly international, despite its economic success as long as it clings to its backwards belief in its uniqueness and remains at heart xenophobic.

But are the Japanese really more self-absorbed, xenophobic, and ethnocentric (and thus less international) than most other people of the world? Do the Japanese, for example, have more of an irrational affection for their language than the people of France do for French? Is it not the rule rather than the exception for people to think of themselves as the best and even as the most truly human of people? (In many languages the word for person is the same as the name of the tribe.)

If many other people in many other cultures have myths about themselves similar to Nihonron what then is all this attention from the outside really about? I believe the argument is that because the Japanese are so active and successful in international trade, they should act less like scions of yamato damashii [Japanese spirit] and more like true citizens of the world (they should speak better English, accept more refugees, buy more foreign goods, be less ridiculous as tourists, and talk less about what it means to be Japanese.) But this suggestion itself is based on several culture-bound, ethnocentric assumptions including the notion that internationalization is incompatible with nationalism and with a popular culture tradition of writing about one’s specialness as a people. I would suggest that the Japanese are not necessarily more clanish and ethnocentric and less international than Americans (or Australians, or Hmong tribesmen) so much as that they tend to express their ethnocentrism and cultural identity in a highly accessible public forum (Nihonron), rather than keeping it under the rug. This would be a better book if there were a little less attention given to criticizing Japan for not being properly international and more attention given to developing less culture-bound notions of internationalism and to exploring the various ways in which people in Japan are struggling to find a balance between internationalism and traditional Japanese values in their personal identities, life styles, and social institutions.
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Although the last great ocean to be explored, the Pacific became the first large region beyond Europe to be observed and described by the new language of science. Because of the publicity surrounding Cook’s three voyages, the peoples of the Pacific

became better known to Europeans than the inhabitants of less distant lands. This point, made by Bernard Smith in his recently reissued European Vision and the South Pacific, is an extremely crucial one. While many scholars persist in limiting their understanding of the Pacific to the negative disruptive effects caused by Western contact, Smith demonstrates convincingly that Europe too was affected and changed in considerable ways by its contact with the Pacific. "For in the hundred years after 1768," writes the University of Melbourne scholar, "the Pacific Ocean became one of the finest schools for scientists in the world and stimulated European thought concerning man and nature in both art and science" (p. 7). The opening of the Pacific eventually shattered Europe's belief in creation theory and the simple Linnean order of things, and contributed significantly to the triumph of science and Romanticism in the nineteenth century.

Classical antiquity and Christian thought had combined to produce a neo-classical synthesis through which Europeans perceived the life about them. In the latter half of the eighteenth century, however, science emerged as a new paradigm that now began to shape Europe's understanding of the larger world. As the sponsoring institution for Cook's first voyage, the Royal Society advocated an approach to knowledge based upon empirical observation and experimentation that existed in marked contrast to the Royal Academy's commitment to the idealism and perfect form of the neo-classical tradition. This new emphasis on scientific methodology showed itself quite clearly in the requirements placed upon those artists and draughtsmen who sailed with Cook. On Cook's first voyage, Joseph Banks actively worked to insure the graphic representation of those physical traits that both distinguished and gave unity to a particular geographical environment; a principle that, according to Smith, ultimately came to define the genre of typical landscape painting.

One of the earliest, most influential advocates of scientific representation, Banks nonetheless possessed a keen appreciation of his more traditional audience. The expectations of men of taste back in England anxiously awaiting the reports of a grand neo-classical tourist tempered at times Bank's endorsement of the scientific approach. The artists themselves were affected thusly. Sydney Parkinson's work, with its emphasis on topographical reality but tinged with elements of the exotic, visually demonstrated the tension. William Hodges, on Cook's second Pacific voyage, attempted to reconcile traditional forms with a more empirical representation of climate in his landscapes. And John Webber's efforts on the third Cook voyage evidenced a blending of botanical detail with elements of the picturesque. Engravers, sensitive to the neo-classical traditions of their day, further diluted the attempted realism of the original drawings from Cook's three voyages. Despite these forced compromises, visual depiction of the Pacific, argues Smith, edged decidedly toward a more realistic approach.

At the same time that artists were beginning to engage in a more scientific rendering of the Pacific, European attitudes toward the people inhabiting the terrain being painted also changed. Neo-classical thought had long held a fascination for the noble savage. The neo-classical tradition recognized two types of primitivism. The Maoris of the land that came to be known as New Zealand and the Aborigines of Australia typified the hard primitivism of simple peoples living in rugged environments. Hard primitivism remained an admired but never desired state of existence. Society Islanders, on the other hand, dwelled in a rich, verdant, near-idyllic land; their soft primitivism held an initially strong attraction for many back in Europe. Extended exposure to Pacific peoples, however, soon undermined the appeal of the classical noble savage in European intellectual circles. The descriptions of Tahiti offered by