towns in which he spent so much time. And, here, some comparison of this hut to Thoreau’s cabin at Walden or Kerouac’s and Snyder’s fire lookouts could be very instructive.

Finally, Japanese, East Asian, or world history instructors will find much delight in these two poets. Rengetsu’s life, in particular, provides a rare and exciting connection between the world of the pleasure quarters, samurai culture, Buddhist monasticism, and the arts of the old imperial capital at Kyoto. As a bonus, her poems even refer to the arrival of Commodore Perry and the lead-up to the Meiji Restoration. A teaser in closing: Open to page 106 to find out what a samurai-trained nun has to say about the pre-Meiji Restoration fighting that broke out in 1860s Japan. Intrigued? You should be.

NOTES
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In *Lost Colony*, Tonio Andrade offers a highly readable account of the Sino-Dutch War of 1661–62 that resulted in the loss of the Dutch colony on Taiwan, which will be of great use for educators, their students, and general readers. Andrade treats the war as a case study to test competing explanations for the “rise of the West” to dominance in Asia, one of the largest and most controversial questions in world history literature. Andrade lays out the contending positions on this question between “revisionists,” who argue that the difference in technological, political, economic, and social development between the West and Asians was minimal before the Industrial Revolution; and the traditional explanation and its “counter-revisionist” defenders who hold that the rise of the West is attributable to the long historical development of unique and superior aspects of Western civilization. Andrade also tests a more specific explanation, the “military revolution theory” which holds that Westerners, even if not bearers of a superior civilization, enjoyed an advantage in military technology, organization, and discipline over other peoples.

Andrade, who is explicit about beginning in the revisionist camp, arrives at a compromise position. The Dutch in the seventeenth century did indeed enjoy superiority in certain military technologies, specifically in ship construction and in the construction of fortifications (what Andrade calls the “renaissance fortress”). These advantages, however, turned out to be marginal. In other areas, such as artillery, military organization, strategy, tactics, and discipline, Chinese forces were the equal of Dutch forces. Even in those areas that the Dutch enjoyed a technological advantage, the gap was not so great that these advantages could not be neutralized through adoption or strategic adaptation. Thus, Andrade’s account reveals neither an insurmountable Western technological or cultural superiority nor a kind of equality that omits historical distinctiveness but rather small differences that become more pronounced over time.

The counter-revisionists are correct that the Dutch had a technological advantage over the Chinese in warfare, but the revisionists are right that it was a slight one, easily made up . . . Perhaps we have not a sudden Great Divergence occurring around 1800 but rather a small and accelerating divergence beginning in the sixteenth century. (15)

This position is unlikely to satisfy partisans of either camp but is encouraging to those of us who, with Andrade, find ourselves in class “walking a tightrope” between Eurocentrism and “Europhobia” (to borrow from David Landes) (17). As one case study, Andrade’s work won’t settle the problem of how to account for the rise of the West, but perhaps it will
Andrade’s basic argument should generate plenty of discussion, and his narrative presents enough evidence to test his argument.