
Reviews of Books

Alexander Waugh, *The House of Wittgenstein: A Family at War*. London, Bloomsbury Publishing, 2008 366p. ISBN 9780747591856.

Readers selecting this book by its title might assume it is a further contribution to the scholarship on Ludwig Wittgenstein. It is not. The subtitle redirects the assumption, but it is ambiguous. Both title and subtitle then invite number of interpretations. Anyone who knows about Wittgenstein's life will know the reference to his house. This because the man often regarded as the greatest philosopher of the 20th century at one time helped design a house (in 1926-28) in Vienna for his sister, Gretl Stoneborough, and her husband Jerome. In fact there are some scholarly architectural texts about the house and his contribution to it. It still stands just to the east of the city centre in Kundmangasse and is startling for its Bauhaus-like austerity¹. The book is not about that house although the address is frequently mentioned in the book in reference to his sister's life. Ludwig's contribution to its design is diminished in the book however and one wonders if the author got his slant on the matter from the memoirs of a feuding member of the family. Other biographers give Ludwig much greater recognition for it, even though the principal architect was Paul Engelmann.

The next apparent interpretation could be that it is a reference to St Augustine's builders. Wittgenstein in the *Philosophical Investigations* talks about Augustine's theory of the means by which one learns a language. He says that words learnt are like bricks that are put together to build a house. The point he is making is that language is learnt ostensibly. The analogy is with a builder who says "brick" and is handed the object that corresponds to the word. The book is not about this, even though it is a debatable theory about which several scholarly articles have been written².

The subtitle is also probably deliberately ambiguous. Is the reference to the Great War of 1914-1918? Possibly. The three brothers alive at the time all fought in WW1. The Wittgenstein family suffered immeasurably from both world wars. More likely it refers to imputed animosity within the family. If this is the main allusion, the author is guilty of exaggeration.

In fact, the topic of Waugh's book is the family to which Ludwig belonged. "House" is used in the same referential sense as would be understood in the term trading house. In this sense it refers to the engineering company built by Ludwig's father, Karl and hence the house also stands as a metaphor for the family itself. It also connotes the house Karl built for his family in Vienna, the Wittgenstein Palais, as it was called, an enormous mansion that seemed often to function as a womb for the children. The title is not satisfactory on any account though because the book is mainly about just three of the nine children of Karl, and provides little about the man himself. Its principal biographical focus is on Paul Wittgenstein, the one-armed concert pianist and to a lesser extent on Ludwig. This is not surprising though as the author's trade is music journalism.

¹ The obsessively curious may view the house on Google Earth at lat. 48. 12. 12. 15 N. & long. 12. 23. 39. 23E.

² The best known of these is Rush Rhees' article *Wittgenstein's Builders*.

Of Karl we learn of little more than of his domineering temperament. He had disagreed with his parents, (they being the first of the line to accumulate great wealth, though much of it married into) and left for America in his late teenage years. He returned in his twenties and independently and almost single-handedly founded his company. His success began in 1875 with a contract to build rails for a railway the Russians were building into the Balkans to prosecute the war against the Ottoman Turks on behalf of Serbia. After just twenty five years, he had amassed an enormous fortune which was wisely invested outside of the Austro-Hungarian empire, mainly in Switzerland (in gold), New York (in stocks) and Amsterdam (currency)³. This move saved the family's fortune in the early twenties following the collapse of the German and Austrian currency and again later when Hitler reclaimed his country of birth. Karl retired from active business in 1897, just 9 years after his last child, Ludwig, was born. He died in 1913 at the age of sixty-six.

His house, the Wittgenstein Palais, hosted one of the great salons of the city attended by most of the prominent artists, musicians and composers of the Wiener Secession, including Richard Strauss and Mahler. Ludwig as a small child had heard Brahms playing in their musiksalle⁴. The house was large enough to have had separate apartments for all of the children and other guests, and it contained seven grand pianos. The family was certainly one of the richest in the empire, yet it had not ascended the social scale to the level of the imperial court, in greater part perhaps because of their assumed Jewish ancestry, though perhaps also because they may have been seen as nouveaux riches. This detail is found in the first section of the book. The bulk of the story from then on mostly deals with the lives of Paul, Gretl and Ludwig. Karl's domineering *geist* is always in the background and it seems that few of the children ever felt they satisfied their father's ambitions or met his high standards. Perhaps as a result, two of the elder boys, Johannes and Rudolph, committed suicide as young men (one having disappeared and so presumed to have). Paul and Ludwig had at times considered suicide also. Konrad, the fourth boy shot himself in the last days of WW 1, but was assumed by the family to have done so in order to avoid the supposed disgrace of capture by the Italians.

The family's fortune did not save them from misfortune, particularly that of the two world wars. Paul and Ludwig were also soldiers in WW1, and also captured. Paul was wounded and had his right arm amputated in a field hospital. This was over-run by the Russian army during his recovery and he was taken to Siberia as a POW. Though treatment was generally humane, the conditions under which prisoners were held were appalling and Paul suffered greatly from his unhealed wound. Ludwig was also taken prisoner later, but fortunately by the Italians and not the Russians. We have learnt from other biographers that he was a brave and exemplary soldier and that typically he did not seek promotion.

Once the background is established, the book proceeds in chronological order, following sporadically the lives of Paul, Ludwig and Gretl (Margaretha). Little information is given of Ludwig's pre-war years in England, where he had gone initially to fulfill his father's wish that he become an engineer. *He had later returned to Cambridge but had fallen out somewhat with Russell and George Moore, two men much his seniors, but awed by his personality and intellectual brilliance (as was J. M. Keynes and others of the Bloomsbury group), and had gone to Norway to seek the social isolation he felt was necessary for writing, but was back in Vienna when the war broke out. This prevented his plan to return to Norway and he volunteered instead for civilian duties, overcome by feelings of intense patriotism, which we know from Rus-

³ The value of all assets was at least 200 million kronen, estimated as having been equivalent to about 200 million dollars after WW2. Some researchers have claimed that it was one of the largest fortunes in Europe.

⁴ Ludwig tells of pointing out that Brahms had played a wrong note. Brahms acknowledged it gracefully, to the immense relief of Ludwig's parents.

* He studied in Manchester briefly but defying his fathers wish, gravitated to Cambridge to study under Bertrand Russell.

sell's biography, was incomprehensible to the latter, who was to be jailed for his resistance to the war. His civil duties did not suit his morbid desire for a test of character, so he enlisted and fought for three years, first in the east and then in the Austrian occupied territories of Italy⁵. This, despite his firm belief that the English would certainly win the war because of what he believed to be their superior character. He was captured in the last days of the conflict and held by the Italians for more than a year, during which time he was writing the *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*.

We learn little new about Ludwig from Waugh. It might be difficult indeed to improve on the numerous existing biographies and memoirs, especially those of his students and close acquaintances. The philosopher's younger years are superbly and sensitively documented in a balanced way in Brian McGuiness's 1988 book. Another recent biography by William Bartley (1978) is generally thought to be inaccurate and unfair to the memory of Ludwig. Waugh's portrayal of the man as fundamentally gloomy to the point of desperation also cannot stand up against the earlier biographies, and is possibly tinged by his reliance on certain other sources from the family. Norman Malcolm's personal memoir shows a different side of Ludwig's character. Malcolm recounts meeting Ludwig in New York⁶ on his only trip to North America and as they travelled by train to Ithaca, Ludwig whistled one of Beethoven's symphonies, as he claimed, in its entirety. He is said to have liked cowboy films and had jokingly agreed to visit Malcolm on the condition that he be introduced to Betty Grable.

I believe Waugh's only significant contribution to the understanding of Ludwig's character to be his revelation of the extent to which he was influenced by the German translation of Tolstoy's *The Gospels in Brief*, which he discovered in a bookstore during the war. This work is more a statement of Tolstoy's own beliefs about self-abnegation than it is about the life of Jesus, though the latter presumably served as Tolstoy's model for such a life. Waugh points out the striking similarity of structure and tone between the opening lines of Tolstoy and of the *Tractatus*. The aphoristic style of the *Tractatus* has usually been seen as influenced by that of Karl Kraus. Waugh's claim deserves much closer examination therefore. It is fairly certain that Tolstoy's influence on Ludwig was great, though it probably only strengthened already-held inclinations to simplicity and austerity. Like the Russian count, Ludwig gave away his inheritance in the twenties, in this case a large fortune disbursed amongst his family and about fifteen of his contemporaries in the Viennese cultural world.

Overall it must be said that if one's only knowledge of Ludwig comes from Waugh's account it will lead to a fundamental misunderstanding of his character. Waugh's portrayal focuses too sharply on the depressive side of his personality rather than on Ludwig's high moral concerns and consequent feelings of moral inadequacy (themes found strongly in McGuiness's book), or on that part of his character that so clearly endeared him to Cambridge. I believe he overlooks the effect on Ludwig of the war's horror and carnage. It is conceivable that Ludwig found the strain of life amongst his family almost as difficult to bear. They scarcely understood the awe in which his Cambridge friends and students held him⁷. How much more puzzling to them would have been his decision to become a school teacher in a small mountain village following WW1? By this time Wittgenstein is thought to have felt that he had solved all philosophical problems (in the *Tractatus*) and should therefore find another occupation.

As mentioned already, the main focus of the book is its revelations about the life of Paul Wittgenstein. Here Waugh covers himself in some glory with a sympathetic biographical sketch of the brother closest to

⁵ During WW2 he undertook civil duties also as a hospital orderly in England.

⁶ Malcolm was one of his former students in Cambridge. Ludwig's visit to New York will perhaps be remembered in future mainly by the silk screen prints of the Scottish pop artist Eduardo Paolozzi: "Wittgenstein in New York" and "Wittgenstein at the Cinema admires Betty Grable"

⁷ Keynes wrote to a friend about Wittgenstein's return: "Well, God has arrived. I met him on the 5.15 train."

Ludwig. As a young man Paul had shown a well above average ability as a keyboard performer, having given regular concerts in Vienna and other cities prior to the war. His family's capacity to buy banks of tickets may have helped initially however. At the front line a bullet shattered his right elbow. In conditions of war it seemed that the only safe treatment was amputation. This was followed by his capture and the imprisonment already mentioned. His family was eventually able to secure his release by the Russians as part of a prisoner exchange. Despite the immense hardship he endured in prison, he became determined to resume his musical career as a left-handed performer. In the many Siberian prisons in which he suffered, he had marked out keyboards on a plank of wood and spent most of his time practicing the fingering necessary to span notes with one hand. Once freed he astounded his family by announcing that he intended to continue his career as a performer. Aside from the technical difficulties he faced, there was little in the way of compositions for the left hand only, especially in the genre of solo works. Not deterred by this he began commissioning concerti from prominent contemporary composers⁸, paying enormous amounts for them from his inheritance. The best known of these and a work available in current discography is Ravel's Concerto in D for the left hand⁹. Waugh notes that Paul was able to develop incredible facility with the left hand when accompanied by deft use of the *sostenuto* pedal, which sustained notes no longer in play while the music swept on. The technique can be clearly heard in the Ravel work as it dominates the music. Paul created something of a sensation and played in concerts in the major music venues in Europe in the twenties and thirties though reviews ranged from raving to mildly damning. Most though were complimentary. Other music scholars have commented on the gradual decline of his talent so it was perhaps in the later part of his career that the less favourable reviews appeared. His audiences apparently appreciated his musicianship, not just out of sympathy for the problems he had overcome. Waugh surprisingly does not refer to Paul's important three-volume book on piano technique, "School for the Left Hand" which according to a contemporary musicologist "is a work of genius with many exercises that even pianist with two well-functioning hands ought to study". Paul, whose natural inclination was towards music of the 19th century repertoire, almost certainly felt estranged by the dissonance of the 20th. His main disagreement with Prokofiev was based on his claim to not understand the concerto composed for him.

A major part of the book tells of the beginning of the families' decline as a result of incipient Austrian Nazism and the eventual German take-over (the Anschluss of 1938). It is portrayed as an event generally warmly welcomed by the population, with an enthusiasm for Hitlerist fascism that might have exceeded that of the Germans themselves. The Wittgensteins then suddenly found themselves in a difficult position as a result of their Jewish background. For two generations they had considered themselves Catholics, Karl's father having been baptized as Hermann Christian. Under the initial classification of Jewishness they might have been excluded from close examination. A subsequent classification put them under direct investigation as Jews (by virtue of having four Jewish grand-parents) and subject to harsh sanctions at least and deportation at worst. The Reich's knowledge of the vast Wittgenstein holdings in Switzerland and their anxiousness to take over that part of it decreed by law as their entitlement from Jews (two-thirds of it at least and up to 90 percent for one emigrating) led to some accommodation with the Nazis. The funds could only be withdrawn and repatriated if agreed to by all five surviving children. The problem was that Ludwig was in England and had taken British citizenship, Paul was in America¹⁰ and Gretl was married to an American citizen. The brothers were encouraged to return to Austria by their sib-

⁸ Amongst them Korngold, Richard Strauss, Hindemith, Prokofiev and Britten.

⁹ At least two recordings of the concerto with Wittgenstein playing are still available, one of them conducted by Ravel. On piano roll there is also a pre-war recording of Paul playing the Brahms piano transcription of Bach's Chaconne from the D-major Partita for solo violin, from which his early talent may be judged. It is said to be flawless.

¹⁰ Paul's share of the fortune was in any case tied up by deeds of the trust, which forbade his accessing it until 1947.

lings and the Nazis, but understandably would not. Gretl was able to move in and out of the Reich as an American passport holder (America was yet to declare its support for either side in the emerging crisis in Europe and its sympathies were open to bidders from both sides). As a prelude to an accommodation, the claim by the family that Herman Christian Wittgenstein was the illegitimate child of German nobleman and a Christian girl was accepted by the Reich. Their claim was not without merit. It conformed to rumours alive in the family and to the fact that no Jewish records had noted his birth. This rendered the children as *mischlings* (of mixed race) and not purely Jewish. By then the Palais had been plundered of its art works, oriental antiques and complete original autograph musical scores of Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert and others. The funds outside could not be retrieved however because of non-compliance on the part of the brothers. The three sisters, who found themselves by choice (Gretl) or birth (Hermine and Helen) residents in Vienna, at least survived and were left alone by the Nazis after all tangible assets had been taken from them. Their under-estimation of the Nazi threat and over-estimation of their status in society had reinforced the belief that they were in no great danger, an oft-made assumption at that time. Gretl became estranged from Paul for the rest of her life after his refusal to treat with the Reich over the family fortune abroad. She had apparently been prepared to hand over the fortune. She died in 1958, three years before Paul's death.

Waugh describes Paul's life after the war as not happy. His ability had waned and he had feelings of despair upon learning that many of the works composed for him had been re-scored for two hands and some were being performed by other left-handed artists¹¹. The former complaint is justified when one listens to the Ravel played with two hands. There is always the suspicion that it might sound better performed by a dedicated left-hander. Paul had not seen or been in contact with Ludwig, his closest sibling, since 1939, but when the latter visited New York in 1949, he attempted to visit Paul at his residence on Long Island¹². No one but the maid was home. Sixty years later we cannot read about this without some feelings of sadness. The brothers never met again. Paul's later life is not covered in much detail. After the war he had married at last and brought to the USA one of his pupils from 1934, with whom he had produced two children, the boy being the only male heir of a line with five males in his father's generation. Ludwig's last visit to Vienna was in 1950, to see Hermine (the eldest child of Karl) on her death-bed. He died less than a year later. Shortly after Hermine's death, the Palais Wittgenstein, the house of the family built by Karl, was demolished to make way for workers' flats, this symbolic of the politics of past WW2.

Alexander Waugh's book has the voyeuristic interest of a good biography. Readers may be a little discouraged by the way in which the narrative shifts back and forth in time, but this is perhaps unavoidable in a book that attempts to cover the lives of five or six principals and many others. His shallow treatment of Ludwig can be excused because even though one might have been attracted by false expectations, one learns much about the psychopathology of family life that must obviously have had such an affect on the children's personality and aspirations. This, to the extent that Ludwig's life could be summed up as a denial of the wealth and opportunities held out to him. His closest leaning towards it is in his acknowledgement of the enormous influence of music in the life of the family. Other than this Waugh gives little attention to the intellectual and artistic world of secessionist Vienna and its influence on Ludwig, a topic covered well by Toulmin & Janik's book *Wittgenstein's Vienna*. We might wonder if there is anywhere in the contemporary world a family of such wealth, culture, erudition and modest pretensions. Today the grand piano has been replaced by the Bentley, the Klimt by a Damian Hirst cow in formaldehyde, and the book

¹¹ One in particular shock was in learning that a concerto composed for him by Prokofiev was plundered from the latter's estate and premiered by another left handed amputee, Siegfried Rapp, in Berlin. Paul had had many disputes with Prokofiev as with others too because he maintained the prerogative of suggesting liberal changes whenever he thought the orchestra assumed too much of the role.

¹² Paul's family lived there, but he resided most of the time in Manhattan where he taught piano.

by the diamond-encrusted mobile phone.

Michael Herriman

Reviews of Books

Øystein Tunsjø (2008) *US Taiwan Policy: Constructing the triangle*. Oxon: Routledge. 194 p. ISBN 978-0-415-45202-1.

The bilateral relationship between the United States and China is arguably now the most critical of all other twenty-first century international relations. To a certain extent, US Taiwan policy is the most sensitive issue in, and the key to, US-China relations. It is an ironical footnote of US-China policy in general, and an exceptional case in any bilateral relations between two powers. Transition of Taiwan's role from an unsinkable military base of the United States to an American model of democracy in East Asia hasn't changed the fact that the US-China bilateral relationship always appears as a US-China-Taiwan trilateral relationship. Due to the US role as the world hegemon, and the domination of western ideology, US-Taiwan policy was rarely analyzed or questioned by scholars from western institutes, whereas China has always considered US-Taiwan policy as the US interfering in the domestic matters of China. From whichever perspective, the US-Taiwan policy is one of the main obstacles to a friendly Sino-American relationship in its true meaning.

Many studies, supplemented with more contemporary analyses, provide useful insights into US-China relations, but they do not draw extensively on archival material. While most scholars have focused their studies on particular crises, few have examined historically the shifting foundations for Taiwan's independence and the adherence of the US to the one-China principle. Based on extensive original and detailed archival research, *US Taiwan Policy: Constructing the triangle* written by Øystein Tunsjø, is one of a series of books devoted to the security issues affecting the region, that includes detailed empirical studies, theoretically oriented case studies and policy-relevant analyses as well as more general works. Tunsjø's book offers an historical, original, and critical constructivist analysis of US-Taiwan policy.

The methodology of the book applies a constructivist approach that challenges other mainstream approaches. It is not a study of the type that is primarily directed at geopolitical, ideological, or economical explanations, nor in strategic calculations related to the balance of power logic of international relations theories. According to the author, the traditional and rationalist accounts are preoccupied with a form of casual explanation, and emphasize "why" questions. An analysis inspired by constructivism moves from "why" to "how-possible" questions, and opens up the possibility of new kinds of questions and answers, so as "to construct and sustain particular representations of China, the US, Taiwan and the relations between these countries." The constructive explanation of the book was thus not deduced from any international relations theories, but induced from archival materials such as documents, speeches, and books written by politicians.

In answering "how-possible" questions related to US Taiwan policy, the book offers a historical analysis of the emergence and development of different discourses that have been central in constituting US identity, and have framed the possibilities of available action for US-Taiwan policy. It identifies this policy as the constructive results of four discursive representations under the consideration of the US role in international politics as follows: Taiwan as representing all of China (the "red menace" discourse), the status of

Taiwan as “undetermined”, Taiwan as “independent”, and the status of Taiwan as “determined” (one-China, and Taiwan as part of China). On the one hand, the book traces the origins of Taiwan’s “undetermined” status with the US. On the other hand, it discusses the roots of the contemporary US one-China policy from the Truman and Nixon administrations’ position that Taiwan was part of China. The “red menace” discourse emphasizes the pivotal struggle against Communist expansion. The US considered itself as the leader of the free world, and the Chinese Communist government as “a tool of Russian imperialism in China”. Therefore, US-Taiwan policy was developed with the Cold War against the Soviet Union as the background, and in which American national security was at stake. The “red menace” was defined as an opposition to Communist aggression. According to the author, there are two significant alternative representations to the “red menace” discourse; the “determined” and the “undetermined” discourses, and they both had a significant impact on US-Taiwan policy in 1949-50. The author interprets both “determined” and “undetermined” as in line with the US-Taiwan policy of “impartial neutralization”. It was the PRC’s involvement in the Korean War that led to the US policy towards Taiwan to be “undetermined”. Then the author justifies the US “undetermined” discourse of “neutralization” of the Taiwan Strait as a reasonable, appropriate, and intelligible response to the outbreak of the Korean War. The rationale of this conclusion is based on the typical US standpoint of considering itself as the leader in the battle against Communism, and the champion of promoting democracy and freedom worldwide. The Cold War mentality dominates the author’s judgments on US “neutralization” and his view of the Korean War. With this explanation, even if the US had chosen “determined” as the discourse of its Taiwan policy, the subject of determination would be the ROC, not the PRC. Readers are left wondering whether US “neutralization” is impartial or partial, and whether criteria of “neutralization” are principles of current international relations or a hangover ideology of the Cold War.

The book offers an original analysis of US Taiwan policy. It highlights how the ongoing process of constituting an American identity constructs a particular US-Taiwan policy, and how the practices of this policy produce and reproduce US identity. The author considers the ambiguity of the so-called “undetermined” discourse as the central aspect of US Taiwan policy, and explains what and who determines Taiwan’s status, and “how-possible” questions. The last paragraph of the book concludes that the various discourses on US-Taiwan policy overlap and interrelate with each other. For example, the “undetermined” and the “red menace” are the predominant discourses that guided US Taiwan policy after the Korea War, while the “determined” and the “undetermined” discourses were most prominent in US-Taiwan policy during the Nixon administration. Contemporary US-Taiwan policy can be located in the opposition between the “independent” and the “determined” courses. However, the book does not explore whether the US should adopt a different policy from both sides of this bilateral relationship, not just from US national interests and security. Readers on the PRC side will simply argue that the “independent” is only a contemporary “red menace”, and “undetermined” is but a term of strategic camouflage. The fundamental reason of the discussion in US Taiwan policy is that, when dealing with China, the US never considered itself as an equal part in a normal bilateral relationship, but as the world leader against Communism protecting democracy. When Taiwan is “undetermined”, the US can have any kind of relationship with Taiwan, ignoring the PRC. If Taiwan is part of China, who represents China would no longer depend on US strategic considerations.

On the issue of US arms sale to Taiwan, which is a critical part of US-Taiwan policy, the book offers a new and distinct critical constructive analysis. Borrowing heavily from the words of US politicians, the book holds that US arms sales to Taiwan are more important to the US than to Taiwan. As the book quotes speeches from members of the US executive branch and Congress, the Bush administration was “increasingly concerned that Taiwan [was] not adequately investing in its own defense”, and urged “Taiwan’s political leaders to implement plans to bolster defensive capabilities”. This, according to the author, became one of the explanations for the reduced congressional and executive backing of Taiwan’s government. As a

reaction to US complains, Taiwan's parliament passed T\$9.9 billion in funds to buy weapons from the US as the first step in soothing relations with Washington. These accounts falsify the US claimed "China Threat" as the main concern of US arms sales to Taiwan. However, within the context and with the voice of the US House Representatives, the author justifies US arms sales to Taiwan by arguing that "the primary focus of American foreign policy should always be the promotion of democracy", and that "Taiwan's evolution into a true multi-party democracy over the past decade is proof of the importance of America's commitment to Taiwan's defense." Meanwhile, the book contradicts the above statement with other archival material to show: first, there is something more important than democracy to the US, namely the importance of the PRC to the US economic interests, as well as in anti-terrorism cooperation; second, Taiwan's democracy has to be controlled when Taiwan's emerging impulses are towards independence. "The foundations of US Taiwan policy are never stable, fixed, or complete, but are constantly evolving and always in the process of becoming", as the author concludes at the end of Chapter 4.

In discussing international relations, arguments should not only be drawn from one side. A thorough research of US-Taiwan policy has to be based on historical and archival materials from both sides. Using critical constructivism as its central conceptual framework, the book claims its originality in its attempt to connect the Taiwan issue with US identity, and American representations of China and Taiwan. For example, when the book emphasizes the US perception of itself as the leader in the battle against Communism and the champion of human rights and democracy in the post-Cold War period, and considers Beijing as an authoritarian regime and Taiwan as a flourishing democracy, it leaves little room for further discussion. The evolving process of US-Taiwan policy has to account for the ongoing development of the Beijing authoritarian political system and its relationship with Taiwan. It is difficult to have an impartial evaluation on US-Taiwan policy without examining archival material from China side. The discourses surrounding US-Taiwan policy would obviously be enriched if China's perspectives were also included and US-Taiwan policy would truly be bilateral.

With a constructive approach, the author only explores "how-possible" questions. However, as the book abounds with archival material, readers can reach different conclusions based on these firsthand documents, and their own research that might incorporate different methodologies. After all, foreign policy discussion in the field of international relations is indeed more an inductive form of research than deductive.

PingPing Zhu Lincoln

