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“In his essay, ‘Perpetual Peace,’ Immanuel Kant, argued that peace would eventually come to the world in one of two ways, by human insight or by conflicts and catastrophes of a magnitude that left humanity no other choice. Today we met at such a juncture.” - Henry Kissinger, Former Secretary of State

The existential threat of the Soviet Union engrossed most geopolitical pundits in the West in the latter years of the 1960s. But while most attention was concentrated elsewhere, a small group of ingenious diplomats began to turn their sights south of the Soviet Union, imagining the unbounded potential of a rising China. They saw in China both a potential counter-balance to America’s Cold War rival and a malleable nation with mutual interests, one that perhaps could be induced to liberalize and join the international community. But anti-communist sentiment still raged within the US, and the idea of an American president stepping foot in China would have been utterly preposterous at the time. Understanding the delicacy of the situation, American and Chinese special envoys worked in secret to formalize diplomatic ties and pave the way for official channels, eventually culminating in President Richard Nixon’s one-week trip to China in 1972. What resulted was one of the greatest triumphs of diplomacy and bilateral debate in modern history. Starting largely in 1971, the consequences of this diplomatic effort transformed not only the path of the Cold War but also the two respective nations themselves. Undaunted by the considerable ideological and political barriers, Sino-American diplomats worked together to counter the Soviets and ushered in decades of coevolution and coexistence between the United States and China.
The true brazenness of this diplomacy from the American perspective must be understood in the political context of the time. Still very much in a cold war mindset, the American people, broadly speaking, detested and feared the specter of communism. But Nixon had long established himself as a vehement anti-communist, thanks in large part to his aggressive campaign ads for the presidency. In one such ad, when asked how he planned to negotiate with Soviet leader Khrushchev, Nixon famously declared “The only answer to communism is a massive offensive for freedom.”¹ Thus, while nearly any other politician seen shaking hands with a communist leader would most certainly have been labeled a communist sympathizer by his domestic rivals, Nixon was immune to this attack.² However, the explanation of why Nixon was open to such a diplomatic move goes deeper than his “anti-red” resume. Nixon had experience and expertise in foreign affairs and saw himself as a grand strategic thinker with long-term plans. He laid out his projection for Asian policy publicly in 1967, writing in Foreign Affairs Magazine that America must deal with China sooner rather than later.³ Nixon understood his transcendent position in the domestic debates over working with communists and used this advantage to seize a diplomatic opportunity few politicians could, or would, have done.⁴

Undoubtedly, Nixon’s decisions were not solely of his own formulation. The great mastermind and orchestrator of these negotiations was his Secretary of State and long-term advisor, Dr. Henry Kissinger.⁵ Kissinger, like Nixon, saw the geo-political world like a

---

² Daly, Robert. Personal Interview. 28 Jan. 2022.
chessboard and he had his own vision as to how to create a new global order. In his book “Diplomacy,” Kissinger argued that the configuration of power most likely to produce such order was ideally a balance between three superpowers. An astute student of history, Kissinger argued that since the 17th century only two global configurations had produced notable stability: the Concert of Europe, created after the Congress of Vienna in 1815; and the liberal order that followed the aftermath of World War II. But neither, he explained, was ideal and both failed to last because they lacked the proper balance. The former involved too many powerful nations, and the latter involved only two. Only in a new three-way balance, Kissinger deduced, could power be checked. In America, China, and Russia, Kissinger saw the three chess pieces he needed. This theory, and assurances from Kissinger to Nixon that the international community would eventually back this move, proved enough to convince the American president that diplomacy could be the path forward.

The Chinese Landscape

In China, the domestic political scene was less convoluted than that in America because, for all intents and purposes, the political scene was dominated by one man. Chairman of the Communist Party, Mao Zedong, had an iron grip over the party and the party had an iron grip over the country. Despite his near dominance, Mao still had many complex factors to consider.

At the time of American outreach in the early 1970s, China was in the midst of a cultural revolution. Formally known as the “Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution,” domestic life for many was upended. There was little sense of normality in the public sphere, and Mao understood the underlying vulnerability caused by this turmoil. Even though he largely benefited from this revolutionary fervor, Mao was keenly aware of its danger. A society mobilized against itself in class warfare would be unable to mobilize against an existential threat, like the Soviet Union. And Mao, perhaps even as much as the US, feared Soviet aggression. Indeed, Mao so feared Soviet aggression that he ordered the construction of underground bomb shelters across China. This development was of particular interest to the CIA, and internal documents reveal the agency believed that perhaps “A new period of open hostility between the two powers has arrived.” Similar to the US, Mao saw the need for a bilateral counterbalance to the Soviets. Hence, as their mutual interests became evident, openness to diplomacy became a viable option.

Kissinger’s Gamble

With an understanding of the possibilities before him, Kissinger found his first opportunity to launch dialogues with China in 1969, after the Sino-Soviet border conflict on the Ussuri river. The crisis was precipitated by the Soviet military, who appeared to have been building up forces along the border, suggesting serious conflict was imminent. Via secret hand-delivered letters, using the American embassy in Pakistan as a middle man, Kissinger and his Chinese counterpart, Foreign Minister Zhou Enlai, began communications. In these letters,
both parties expressed their willingness to talk in person. Even more, the Chinese delegation wrote that they saw in-person meetings as a prerequisite to any real diplomatic success. This was articulated to the US in Zhou Enlai's letter to Kissinger asserting “However, if the relations between China and the U.S. are to be fundamentally restored, a solution can be found only through direct discussions between high-level persons of our two countries.” In delivering this letter to Nixon, Kissinger called it the “most important communication that has come to an American president since the end of World War II.” With this aspiration, Kissinger secretly made his way to Beijing on July 9th, 1971, where he met face to face with Premier Enlai. As written in the American transcript of the meeting, the two began discussions over three main points of concern. The first topic was their mutual understanding and alliance over the issue of the Soviet Union. Kissinger went as far as to say that the US would “make no moves affecting your [China’s] interests without informing you first.” The second point was the issue of Taiwan. Regarding this concern, the two sides were at clear odds. Nonetheless, they agreed to disagree. While they differed on the issue, they understood each other’s positions, and in an effort to keep the talks alive, they chose to shelve the issue for another time. Such a decision demonstrated not only remarkable tolerance and openness but also reflected the optimism the two sides felt toward a peaceful discourse over the issue in the future. The third, and perhaps most groundbreaking, resolution was a verbal agreement on President Nixon making a trip to Beijing to meet with Chairman Mao. The details of this visit were mapped out on Kissinger’s second secret visit on
August 6, 1971, where Enlai again expressed a general sentiment of optimism


about the visit and its potential. As for Kissinger, in describing the ordeal he wrote emphatically “My visit to Peking resulted in the most searching, sweeping and significant discussions I have ever had in government.”

Nixon’s Visit: The Week That Changed the World

Nixon’s ensuing arrival in Beijing in February 1972 formalized all that Kissinger had dreamed and covertly worked to realize: the end of the bipolar division of the world. During the visit, symbolic gestures between Nixon and Mao were celebrated by both American and Chinese media. Spectacular banquets, a visit to the Great Wall, and press conferences with Mao left images that quickly became iconic. The image of President Nixon shaking hands with Chairman Mao was splashed on the front page of newspapers across the western world. (See appendix A)

During this visit, diplomats on both sides meticulously focused on the litany of issues on which the two powers could compromise. Nixon’s personal meetings, as with most of the high-level meetings, focused largely on the global balance of power and creating a new international order.

This groundbreaking diplomacy came to its denouement in the Shanghai Communiqué. Much of the wording of the Shanghai Communiqué itself is brilliantly ambiguous. While that description may seem oxymoronic, given the staunchly differing opinions of the two sides on
specific issues, this was the only way any mutually agreeable document could have been produced. A good illustration of this is the document’s handling of Taiwan. The compromise was that the two sides agreed to merely acknowledge, but not agree with, the other side's position. Chinese diplomats insisted on the “One-China principle” stating that Taiwan was a part of China and nothing more than a runaway province, whereas American diplomats pushed for the recognition of Taiwanese sovereignty. By acknowledging each other's stance, without conceding their own, they were able to keep a working relationship alive in the name of pursuing a greater common interest.

**Conclusion**

The consequences of this frenzy of diplomacy transformed the world stage. Patiently building mutual trust over the course of six years, the US formally agreed to recognize the People’s Republic and established official diplomatic relations under President Jimmy Carter on December 15, 1978. Soon after, at China’s behest, the US and its allies slowly began to surrender Taiwan to China’s sphere of influence, and the US broke off diplomatic relations with Taiwan and withdrew any official US military presence from the island. On the other hand, just as Kissinger had envisioned, economic liberalization occurred in China following political opening. While the Russian economy stagnated and the Soviet Union broke apart, China experienced unprecedented growth. China joined the World Bank and the International
Monetary Fund in 1980, a decade before Russia did.\textsuperscript{21} China transformed into an export-led economy, making products that became a crucial part of consumption in the US and across the larger western world. Since 1978, China’s GDP growth has averaged almost 10 percent a year (See Appendix B), and more than 800 million people have been lifted out of poverty.\textsuperscript{22} This economic development in China must be viewed not just as of benefit to China, but also as a fundamental humanitarian victory for the world. Chinese economic development meant better standards of living for millions of its people, and that in itself is an achievement worthy of recognition.

There is also the success of negotiations, in a geopolitical sense, to consider. In this regard, diplomacy was objectively successful. Sino-American war was avoided, and the Soviet Union was toppled without the Americans or Chinese having to fire a single shot. These two fundamental goals of the original Shanghai Communiqué were met unequivocally. This detente set in motion by Kissinger and Enlai facilitated coexistence, coevolution, and economic integration, all of which could have only occurred in the context of peace.

With the benefit of hindsight, some have questioned if the opening of China was a miscalculation based on myopic interests. The source of this discontent is understandable as, since 2012, China has grown openly hostile towards the US under Xi Jinping. China began to close itself off from the world, reverse liberalization, and Xi Jinping has consolidated progressively more totalitarian power.\textsuperscript{23} While this is a truly tragic development, most so for the Chinese people, it is not a
development that either was, or could have been, anticipated in the era of Nixon and Kissinger. It is an unfair historical standard to question how politicians of decades past did not predict every possible development and transformation emanating from the modern era. Critics also point to economic predictions of Chinese economic power soon eclipsing that of the US as a discredit to the Nixon-Kissinger mission, though this too is misconstrued. True, it is a statistical reality that China has grown at a faster rate in terms of GDP than America, but China

also started at a lower point and thus had far more room to grow. In 1971, China’s GDP was 99.8 billion, nearly a fraction of America’s GDP of 1.165 trillion that same year. Global prosperity and human economic success are not zero-sum games. Furthermore, lifting a large swath of humanity out of poverty is a self-justifying goal. China today accounts for one-fifth of the world's population. Therefore, the economic growth this nation experienced after its opening, which benefited one-fifth of mankind, is a success of epic scope and scale.

Learning from this history may even give insight into today’s debates over policy with China. Some pundits argue the chances for diplomatic success with China today are unlikely. Yet such a pessimistic outlook ignores the lessons of the past. America and China have always been ideological rivals, but diplomacy and bilateral exchange have made it so they do not have to be incompatible. Moreover, their interests do not have to be mutually exclusive. Today, the two nations, as a direct result of prior diplomacy, have shared economic interests and integrated industries. Perhaps the most meaningful common interest, though, is the avoidance of a mutually destructive war. While tensions are high and both sides are skeptical of, have grievances against, and do not full-heartedly trust the other, the diplomacy of the past teaches that these barriers can
be transcended in the pursuit of mutual interest. Thus, once again, the world is at a juncture. On one path, today’s leaders can approach the other in the spirit and promise of diplomacy, where they allow economic integration to foster prosperity in both countries, as it has done so far. Conversely, the leaders can shun diplomacy, further dividing the countries and damming each other to the turbulent fate of what could become a new Cold War. A shining lesson for the leaders of today, the opening of China speaks to the power and promise of debate, diplomacy, and the resulting mutually beneficial coexistence of two adversarial nations.

Appendix B

This graph, made by the World Bank, puts into visual representation the boom China’s economy experienced since opening up economically in 1978. Specifically, it depicts China’s annual GDP percent growth from 1978 to 2020.
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