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Preface

My scholarly interest in Sino-American policy and Cross-Strait issues during the Nixon era stems, in the first instance, from my personal familiarity with the significant political and social changes within the Asian Pacific region. My personal background (understanding the national language) also allows me a better comprehension of data collected concerning foreign relations between China and the United States together with its effect on Taiwan Strait issues, and Taiwan and US relationships. Nonetheless, my research rests mainly on recently declassified State Department materials, particularly foreign relations of the *United States, 1969-1976*, Vol XVII, *China, 1969-1972*. The Nixon – Kissinger détente with the Soviet Union and China led to a significant shift in the international power structure during the 1970s and has affected international affairs to the present day. The One-China policy acknowledged by the United States in the 1970s, was a strategy for the United States to form a decades-long positive relationship with the People’s Republic of China.

This thesis is essentially about the origin, course, and impact of “Sino – American” relations, under the administration of President Richard M. Nixon, with his National Security Advisor, Henry Kissinger. My argument is simple: Nixon’s policy of détente in China marked a turning point in world history, that is, the US accommodation with the People’s Republic of China provides a lesson in international diplomacy that has as much relevance today as it did during the Cold War. There is no doubt that despite several criticisms it has proven to be a most significant and successful policy.
However, while everyone focuses solely on China and US and pays little attention to Taiwan’s point of view, in this thesis I will also include the Taiwan factor in the evaluation of Nixon’s One-China Policy. The fact that the “Taiwan issue” remains indicates that it is the flaw in Nixon’s One-China Policy that many have suggested. True enough, Nixon and Kissinger should be criticised on how they handled the issue of Taiwan; however, Taiwan mustn’t be portrayed as a victim in its policy with the Chinese. Although the One-China Policy may have worked against Taiwan in many ways, it has also benefited Taiwan on several occasions. In this thesis I also aim to explain why it is in Taiwan’s best interests to work with the PRC.

Following the literature review chapter where Nixon and Kissinger’s papers, memoirs and official documents will come under review, I will spend most of the thesis discussing events in China – US relations together with a background study on China – US relations before President Nixon came to power. I will also tackle the issue of Taiwan – the One-China policy and the aftermath of the Nixon – Kissinger China policy, also known as the “China Card”. Taiwan took an enormous hit with the One-China policy which not only cost it its seat on the United Nations Security Council, but also left it feeling emotionally betrayed by their old friend and protector Richard Nixon.

I intend to take an essentially qualitative approach in conducting this research. For example, the primary source of information will be a content analysis of the recently
declassified documents on Nixon – China relations, minutes of meetings between Beijing and Washington, and official announcements. The recently declassified materials will provide a documentary update on US – China relations during the Nixon era while promoting a clearer perspective of these events. The Nixon era memoirs, speeches and similar sources will also be described and examined. Likewise, various sources from the literature about Sino-Relations will be utilised, examined, and presented to demonstrate how the policy of détente became a major factor in Sino-US relations.
Sino-American Relations and Détente: Nixon, Kissinger, Mao and the One-China Policy, with special reference to Taiwan
Chapter 1: Introduction - Understanding Nixon’s policy of détente, Nixon’s One-China policy and the issue of Taiwan

During the 1950s, the Soviet Union and China were communist allies, and the United States was alarmed by the threat of a monolithic Sino – Soviet bloc. The Cuban Missile Crisis in the 1960s lead the way for to detente between the United States and the Soviet Union, and China began to worry about a possible image of Soviet – American rapprochement. In the 1970s, Soviet leaders began to fear the strength of Sino – American relations because of the fact that the Chinese and Americans were getting along too well (Stiles, 1999).

According to Stiles (1999) there were several options for superpowers like the United States, the Soviet Union and China, in seeking security in international affairs: the first was to increase military capability to a level exceeding that of impending adversaries; the second was to declare neutrality; and the third option was to align with other countries in order to combine military strength. Both China and the United States saw that the last option was the best option in order to maintain the balance of power, because as nations seek security by forming alliances, so the international community will be composed of coalitions which will balance each other. The purpose of President Nixon’s visit to China in 1972 was not to wipe away the China – US tensions of the past, but to lessen these tensions and to put extra pressure upon the Soviet Union in order to further advance the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty and to
terminate the Vietnam War. (SALT) talks (CNN interactive n.d.).

On October 1, 1949, the People’s Republic of China (PRC) under the administration of Chairman Mao Zedong, proclaimed its unfriendly relations with the United States based on the fact that Mao Zedong was suspicious of America’s intentions, and thus ordered an anti-American campaign. For several years the United States and the People’s Republic of China considered each other as adversaries. Chairman Mao together with his colleagues continued to denounce American Imperialism and rejected discussions on any issues unless the United States put an end to its aid and protection to Taiwan (Cohen, 2006).

The internationally recognised government of all China_ including the territory controlled by the People’s Republic of China - was the Republic of China (ROC) under the administration of Chiang Kai-shek on the island of Taiwan (Wertz, 2006). According to Cohen (2006), the Sino–Soviet split and the discontent over the war with Vietnam which resulted in reduced anti-communist pressure during the mid-1960s, led to the alteration of American opinion towards relations with China. According to Wertz (2006), the catalyst for the significant change of opinion by the United States in its relations with China was the fact that during the end of 1971, the People’s Republic of China developed and tested a nuclear weapon, making China the third party to the Cold War. The United States needed a productive working relationship with the People’s Republic of China due to the fact that China was now
the third largest country and most populous nation in the world, with growing military power and nuclear weapons. The Nixon administration saw China as the key in establishing regional stability, thus giving China a major role in the post Cold War world.

In his speech accepting the Republican Party nomination for the presidency, Nixon justified his interests in creating a new relationship with the People’s Republic of China. He stated the need for a new internationalism, establishing an open world, with open minds, open cities and open skies and, mentioned the probability of negotiations with the leaders of the Communist world through alternative peaceful negotiations and extending the hand of friendship to China and Russia (Watergate Info n.d.).

During the Sino – Soviet split, academic and government leaders during the Nixon Administration aimed at a more realistic policy of accepting Mao Zedong’s regime as the legitimate government of China. President Nixon agreed with senior State Department officials’ assessment that the People’s Republic of China might play an important role in helping the United States to end the war in Vietnam and assist the United States’ efforts in opposing the growing power of the Soviet Union. In his State of the Nation Address in 1971, President Nixon reiterated the necessity of establishing a dialogue with the People’s Republic of China and called for a possible place for the government of the People’s Republic of China in the United Nations (Cohen, 2006).
Only days after the visit of the United States ping – pong team to China on the 14th of April 1971, President Nixon publicised his determination to liberalise trade and travel restrictions affecting the People’s Republic of China. President Nixon and his National Security Advisor, Henry Kissinger had already previously discussed the possible repercussions on United States relations with Chiang Kai – Shek's Republic of China on Taiwan, of establishing a new China policy (Burr, 2004).

Henry Kissinger, a proponent of “Realpolitik”, played a major role in United States foreign policy from 1969 to 1977. Under the Nixon administration, Kissinger pioneered the policy of detente that led to a significant moderation in Soviet – American tensions; he also played a critical role in establishing the 1972 talks with the Chinese premier Zhou Enlai, by making two secret trips to China and meeting with Chairman Mao, the leader of the Communist Party of China. Kissinger discussed with Zhou Enlai and Mao Zedong the normalisation of relations between the United States and the People’s Republic of China, ending 23 years of diplomatic isolation, resulting with the opening of China and the creation of a new strategic anti – Soviet, Sino – American alliance.

Upon assuming office President Nixon began indicating the need to change the United States, attitude towards establishing friendly relations with the People’s Republic of China. He had Secretary of State William Rogers publicise that the United States favoured the increase of cultural and scientific exchange with the People’s Republic

In the 1972 Shanghai Communiqué (Appendix 1) that was signed during President Nixon’s visit to China, the United States acknowledged the One-China Policy, recognising that “all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait maintain that there is only one China, and that Taiwan is part of China”. The United States welcomed and encouraged dialogue between Taipei and Beijing as a process that would contribute to the reduction of tensions between the two sides of the Taiwan Strait. The United States administration under Nixon and Kissinger believed that the differences between Taipei and Beijing could best be resolved by the people on both sides of the Taiwan Strait themselves and consistently reiterated that the United States’ interest was to establish peaceful negotiations between the two (Wertz, 2006).

The major shift of American recognition and support from Chiang Kai-Shek’s regime to that of Mao Zedong was a major obstacle, because the United States was bound by a 1954 treaty to defend Taiwan, and American businesses had multi-billion dollar
investments on the island of Taiwan. But the Nixon administration was firm on the
decision and was nonetheless prepared to annul and or abolish the defence treaty with
Taiwan, justifying it by saying that peaceful resolution could be established in the
long run. Under the Chinese – American Joint Communiqué, both the United States
and the People’s Republic of China stated the two countries’ similarities. The United
States acknowledged the People’s Republic of China’s claim that Taiwan was part of
China, but reiterated the United States’ interest in a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan
issue. President Nixon removed all American forces in Taiwan in response to Chinese
demands (Cohen 2006).

In 1970s, the United States, together with its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty
Organization (NATO) and most of the member states of the United Nations changed
their diplomatic recognition of China from the Republic of China government under
Chiang Kai – Shek on Taiwan, to the People’s Republic of China government under
Mao Zedong. In 1971, the United Nations General Assembly under resolution 2758,
ousted the ROC representatives of Chiang Kai – Shek and replaced its representatives
on the China seat on the Security Council with those of the PRC. Under resolution
2758, the representatives of the government of the People’s Republic of China, were
considered the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations, and the
UN rejected the Republic of China on Taiwan as legitimately representing the whole
of China (Wertz, 2006).
According to Jue (2006) the competing interests of both the United States and the People’s Republic of China in establishing the One-China Policy have had important implications on the balance of power and establishing world order. Given the fear of another World War or the eruption of World War III, involving the United States, the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China with the latter’s gigantic economic power, one party political system and nuclear weapons, it was the best possible strategic option at that time for the United States to conclude an agreement with the People’s Republic of China without getting directly involved in the negotiation and mediation of the Taipei – Beijing issue. Nixon and Kissinger further reassured Chinese leaders that the United States would not support independence for Taiwan and guaranteed to take further steps as requested by the People’s Republic of China (Wertz, 2006).

The normalisation of relations between the United States and the People’s Republic of China was held back by the Watergate Scandal that eventually forced Nixon to resign. But Nixon’s successors continued the normalisation process between the People’s Republic of China and the United States that was finally achieved in 1979, and even before then the secret exchange of military intelligence between the United States and the People’s Republic of China that was pioneered by the National Security Advisor Kissinger was never interrupted (Cohen, 2006).

Nixon and Henry Kissinger were noted for their diplomatic accomplishments in
foreign policy and for the policy of detente with the People’s Republic of China and the Soviet Union. Both of them were equally responsible for the dramatic change in the structure power relations between the Eastern and Western blocs in the early 1970s. During the Sino – Soviet split in the 1960s, Nixon, with the aid of Kissinger, planned a significant strategy to use the conflict between the two Communist nations – China and the Soviet Union, to shift the Cold War balance of power to the West. The deliberate improvement in friendly relations between the People’s Republic of China and the United States during the Nixon administration was purposefully established in order to gain a strategic advantage over the Soviet Union and to open possibilities of improving relations with the Soviet Union.

The China Policy brought about an immensely significant shift in the balance of power during the Cold War. The established relationship between the Washington and Beijing was directed against the clearly growing power of the Soviet Union. The Sino – American relationship relieved the People’s Republic of China’s fear of a possible Soviet attack, and the United States was able to concentrate its military power in Europe, while the Soviet Union was being confronted by adversaries from both the Eastern and Western blocs. The China Policy was, in the long run, a major turning point in world history, because it played a major role in bringing about the weakening of the Soviet Union and perhaps the end of the Cold War itself (Cohen, 2006), pushing the Taiwan issue into the future.
The relationship between the United States and the People’s Republic of China after the PRC was established in 1949 was extraordinarily complicated but today the People’s Republic of China represents a key focus of the United States foreign policy and international economic policy (Rickelson, 1999). China is now undergoing astounding economic growth of 10% per year with an economic output of $10 trillion. With China’s rapid economic expansion, United States commercial interests’ find China’s markets significantly important (Wertz, 2006).

To gain a better understanding of the importance of Nixon’s international diplomatic policy with China we must also look into China – US relations before the Nixon era.

China and U.S. Relations before Nixon

Post-revolutionary America had its first contact with the Chinese through the voyage of the trader ship *Empress of China*, which arrived in Guangzhou (Canton) in 1784. The voyage of the *Empress of China* marked the beginning of the lucrative Sino-American relations known as the Old China Trade. During this period, large quantities of spices, ginseng, and furs were exported to China, while a larger influx of tea, cotton, silk, lacquer ware, porcelain and furniture was brought to the United States. The trade was lucrative on both sides. American merchants who served as middle men between the Chinese and American traders made fortunes and became the first generation of US millionaires, while Chinese artisans capitalised on the Western consumer market by adjusting their practices and by manufacturing goods suited to
the demands of the American consumers.

In the late 19th century, France, the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, Japan, and Russia started carving out their own niche of influence in China. Perceiving this as threat to their potential market for goods, the US sent diplomatic notes to these powers and asked them to guarantee the territorial and administrative integrity of China by not interfering with the free use of treaty ports within their respective spheres of influence. Although the major powers evaded answering the US proposal, the US took this evasion of response as acceptance of the proposal which came to be known as the Open Door Policy.

While the Open Door Policy was generally respected internationally, it did cause serious setbacks for China. A war erupted between Japan and Russia because of the latter’s encroachment in Manchuria in 1904. Then in 1931, Japan invaded Manchuria and established the puppet state of “Manchukuo”. While the US and other countries condemned the Japanese invasion, they did little to stop it. However, when the second Sino-Japanese War erupted in 1937, the US sent aid to the Republic of China (ROC) which was led by Chiang Kai-Shek. The sympathy of the American public for the Chinese was further aroused by reports of Japanese brutality in China. Protestant missionaries, novelists such as Pearl Buck, and Time magazine reported the cruelties and abuses of the Japanese.
In 1941, following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour, China officially declared war against Japan. The US government sent massive amounts of aid to the Chiang administration. However, a perception grew that Chiang’s government was unable or incapable of effectively resisting the Japanese or that he preferred to focus more on defeating the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) under Mao Zedong. The two factions had been in conflict for years, and the same has been argued of the CCP. After World War II ended in 1945, the obvious hostility between the ROC and the CCP exploded into open civil war. In 1949, the Communists defeated the Nationalists. Consequently, Mao established the People’s Republic of China on the mainland driving the Nationalists to retreat to Taiwan and some other small islands around it. Hence, the ROC led by Chiang was established in Taiwan and has remained there up to the present day.

With the People's Liberation Army (PLA) completing the communist conquest of mainland China in 1949, the American embassy followed the ROC government of Chiang to Taipei. The US though, retained some of its consular officials on the Chinese mainland; however, the new communist government of China did not approve of the US presence. Mao proclaimed the PRC's unfriendly relations with the US and denounced American imperialism. Thus, by the end of 1950 all Americans were withdrawn from the PRC.

The relations between China and US worsened during the Korean War in 1950 as they
fought directly against each other until a cease-fire was agreed to in 1953. Meanwhile, the US continued to work to prevent the PRC from taking China's seat in the United Nations and encouraged its allies not to deal with the PRC. In addition, the US placed an embargo on trading with the PRC and encouraged it allies to follow suit.

For 30 years after its founding, the United States did not formally recognize the People's Republic of China. Instead, it maintained diplomatic relations with the ROC government on Taiwan, and recognized the ROC as the sole legitimate government of all China. Despite this official non-recognition and cool relations between the two countries, from 1954 until 1970 the US and the PRC conducted 136 meetings at the ambassadorial level in Geneva and in Warsaw. During this period, both sides were sending feelers to try to improve relations.

Hence, communications between China and US were established through various intermediaries including Pakistan, Romania, and American journalist Edgar Snow. Nixon, who had long been interested in Asia, pursued the negotiations through his National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger. In 1969, the US initiated measures to relax trade restrictions and other impediments to bilateral contact.

The emerging friendliness of Mao and his communist party was reciprocated by the US' positive response to conducting high-level talks. Both parties engaged in intensive yet secret communications discussing a possible meeting between the top
leaders of China and the US.

Moreover, political developments around the world became a major causal factor in the pursuance of negotiations between China and US. During that time, China was having problems with the Soviet Union while US was facing discontent with its ongoing war in Vietnam.

According to Wertz (2006), the US was in need of a productive working relationship with the PRC due to the fact that China was the world's third largest country and most populous nation, with growing military power and nuclear weapons. On the other hand, China needed the US to counteract the brewing hostilities between China and the Soviet Union. Hence, after almost 30 years of non-recognition and non-communication, China and the US started to renew their diplomatic ties.

The Policy of Détente

Détente between the United States and the Soviet Union emerged as both countries realised the importance of easing tensions for economic purposes. The Soviet leadership felt that the economic burden of the nuclear arms race was unsustainable while the American economy was also faced with financial woes as the Vietnam War drained government coffers. Moreover, both countries deemed it necessary to lessen the tensions between them as the political landscape in Western Europe and in China was slowly changing.
For the Soviets, détente with the US would enable them to establish better ties with Western Europe. In addition, with the worsening relations between the Soviet Union and the People’s Republic of China, the Soviets feared the potential of a Sino-US alliance against them; thus, it was necessary for the Soviets to improve relations with the US. On the other hand, the US, in part due to the effects of Vietnam, was not prepared to militarily confront the Soviet Union. Furthermore, the US believed that through détente the country would be able to reduce its expenses in developing new weapons and defensive systems. For the Americans, containment represented significant economic costs for the country, thus, it was necessary to adopt the policy of détente (Penna, n.d.).

Penna (n.d) argues that as there are many explanations for détente, most of which are very convincing. He explains that détente occurred between the Soviets and the Americans because the superpowers began to realize that policies that promoted constant confrontation were dangerous in a nuclear world. While in the 1950s, due to the limited nature of the kinds and numbers of nuclear weapons, leaders could somewhat realistically believe in a winnable or limited nuclear war, by the late 1960s, although there were still some adherents to that belief, most policymakers came to realise that winning a nuclear war was not realistic—there would only be losers—that is if there were any survivors at all. The foreign policy choice was not between rollback, containment and coexistence as it had been in the 1950s, but was now
between coexistence and non existence. The system had changed simply because the players realized that the technology had become so destructive that their objectives needed to be altered (Penna, n.d.).

The series of summits held between the US and the USSR and resulting treaties were indications that the superpowers had begun to recognize their destructive capability and started to establish ways to improve communications during crises. As early as the 1960s, there had been summits and treaties between the two superpowers on testing and proliferation of nuclear weapons. These earlier treaties, though, “did little to curb the superpowers' abilities, and served primarily to limit the nuclear ambitions of third parties that could endanger both superpowers”. It was during the time of Richard Nixon and his National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger that the policy of détente began in earnest. (Penna, n.d)

According to Penna (n.d), the policy of détente adopted by Nixon was basically “to create an incentive for the Soviets to cooperate with the US.” During that time, the Soviets and the Americans were considered to be the two world superpowers and thus in contention about who was more powerful. Therefore, with the policy of détente the covert competition between the two world superpowers cooled down. Penna (n.d.) explained that: “as long as the US and USSR were both powerful, yet did not cooperate, it was easy for each side to view the world in 'zero-sum' terms--a Soviet gain was a US loss and a US gain was a Soviet loss. However, if the two sides
cooperated, perhaps they could work together and find situations where the results would be profitable for both countries….Kissinger [and] Nixon believed that through a process of linkage each side could get something it wanted. For example, if the Soviets wanted to buy something from the US, such as grain, the US would allow the sale if the Soviets cooperated in some other area, such as allowing increased emigration of Soviet Jews.” (Penna, n.d.)

Among the achievements of Nixon’s policy of détente were the 1972 SALT I treaty which limits the superpowers' nuclear arsenals, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, Nixon’s 1972 visit to Moscow, and the opening of diplomatic relations with China. During the 1975 Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Helsinki Accords, consisting of a wide ranging series of agreements on economic, political, and human rights issues, were signed. Furthermore, trade relations between the US and the USSR improved during the era of détente.

However, historians such as Walter Lefeber (cited in Penna, n.d) believed that the policy of détente was a failure. Among the reasons cited was the loss of domestic support for Nixon, Kissinger, and détente itself due to the following reasons: 1) Weariness of the American public with the Vietnam war; 2) lingering distrust of the Soviets which was fed by the eventual communist victory in Vietnam and Soviet actions in Angola; 3) the Watergate scandal and, 4) the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) oil embargo which focused American attention on its
own economic vulnerability (Penna, n.d.). Such accusation is unjust.

Penna (n.d) argues that the policy of détente “succeeded partially. It succeeded in changing the rules of the game of superpower competition: the Chinese were in, the Soviets could be negotiated with directly, and there was more freedom for the US's NATO and other allies to develop their own independent relations with Communist states.” Moreover, while détente may not have ended the military expenditures of the US, it definitely reduced it. While the disengagement from the Vietnam War contributed to the reduction in total defence spending as a percentage of the US gross domestic product (GDP) during the détente era, Penna (n.d.) asserted that had the US developed an ABM system during that period, the defence spending would not have been cut. Thus, détente contributed significantly to the slashing of defence expenditure by the US. Furthermore, détente established the unwritten rule and expectation that the leaders of the two most powerful countries in the world must regularly consult each other. Also, détente resulted in the Helsinki accords which attempted to monitor human rights within the Communist countries (Penna, n.d.). Above all, the US policy of détente with the Soviet Union paved the way for the opening of a communication line between China and the US which had become at odds with each other since the communist takeover of mainland China.

Implications of the Policy of Détente on Sino-US Relations

When Richard Nixon assumed the US presidency in January 1969, his administration
simultaneously pursued three major diplomatic agendas: the withdrawal from Vietnam, the building of détente with the Soviet Union, and rapprochement with China (Soeya, n.d.). Nixon intended to build a positive relationship with the People’s Republic of China. In February 1969, only one month in office, Nixon ordered a study from the secretary of state, the secretary of defence and the director of central intelligence on US – China Relations. The order was written by Henry Kissinger on Nixon’s behalf: “The president has directed that a study be prepared on US Policy towards China, on US policies. The study should incorporate alternative views and interpretations of the issues involved. It should include summary statements of the conceptions and policy lines of the previous administration. The study should include the following: The current status of the US relations with Communist China and the Republic of China (Taiwan); The nature of the Chinese Communist threat and intentions in Asia; The interaction between US policy and the policies of other major interested countries towards China; Alternative US approaches on China and their costs and risks”. (Foreign Relations, 1969 – 1976, Volume XVII)

The growing rift between China and the Soviet Union was the crucial turning point in the US’s rapprochement with China. When China and the Soviet Union clashed along their border in March 1969, “Nixon and Kissinger did not fully appreciate its strategic implications” (Soeya, n.d.). However, “hypersensitive reactions by the Soviet Union and North Vietnam made them realise its significance” (Soeya, n.d.). Kissinger (1979) wrote in his memoirs that on March 11, the Russian ambassador to the United States
Anatoly Dobrynin "insisted passionately that China was everybody's problem," and on March 22, North Vietnam's Xuan Thuy "volunteered the surprising outburst that the United States had nothing to gain by seeking to take advantage of the divisions between the Soviet Union and China." (Kissinger, 1979: 172). According to Garthoff, the intensifying Sino-Soviet rift became an important impetus for both China and the Soviet Union to improve relations with the US over Vietnam. China needed the US to cope with the Soviet threat while the Soviet Union needed to restructure its diplomacy with the US.

Realising that China might help the US end the war in Vietnam and assist US efforts to counter growing Soviet power, Nixon started to signal American desire to improve relations with China (Cohen, n.d.). Moreover, Nixon recognised that the “changed mood of the American public, plus his own anti-communist credentials, would allow him to seek an accommodation with China” (Cohen, n.d.) Thus, in a slow, cautious manner without risking the security of the US, Nixon conveyed a message in August 1969 through Pakistani channels “to the effect that the United States would not isolate China in the intensifying Sino-Soviet confrontation” (Soeya, citing Kissinger, 1979: 180-181).

China responded through Pakistani channels that "the possibility of expansion of the Vietnam war is seen as having lessened. A war between China and the US is seen now as a very remote possibility" (Kissinger, 1979: 689). Kissinger interpreted this
message as China’s positive response to the US message: “Zhou En-lai had understood us. He had even grasped by early 1970 what so many domestic critics had failed to acknowledge: that we were on the way out of Vietnam. And he coupled this with an unmistakable hint that China had no intention of entering the Vietnam War, or, for that matter, of attacking any other vital American interest”. (cited from Soeya, n.d.)

By early December 1970, the Chinese government, through Pakistani President Yahya Khan, conveyed a message to Kissinger welcoming Nixon's special envoy to China. Kissinger replied by indicating US readiness to hold high level talks in Beijing (Kissinger, 1979: 701-702 cited in Soeya, n.d.). In late April, the Chinese reply reaffirmed the country’s "willingness to receive publicly in Beijing a special envoy of the President of the US (for instance, Mr. Kissinger) or the US Secy. of State or even the President of the US himself for a direct meeting and discussions” (Kissinger, 1979: 713-714 qtd. in Soeya, n.d.).

In July of 1971 Henry Kissinger, while on a trip to Pakistan, was announced to the media to be ill and he did not appear in public for a day. Actually, Kissinger was secretly visiting China and was finalizing an arrangement for Nixon to visit China (Soeya, n.d.; “1972 Nixon visit to China”, 2006; Cohen, n.d.). On July 15, Nixon disclosed Kissinger's secret trip to China and announced that he would visit the country before May 1972. When the Soviets heard of Nixon’s announcement of an
impending visit to China, they asked Nixon to visit Moscow before his trip to China, which Washington declined. The Soviets then requested that Nixon visit Moscow in May or June, after his planned trip to China (Soeya, n.d.).

Nixon travelled to China in February 1972 and visited Beijing, Hangzhou, and Shanghai. At the conclusion of his visit, Nixon signed the Shanghai Communiqué declaring a historic US-China rapprochement (Soeya, n.d.). “With this prospect in mind, it [the US] affirms the ultimate objective of the withdrawal of all US forces and military installations from Taiwan. In the meantime, it will progressively reduce its forces and military installations on Taiwan as the tension in the area diminishes” (qtd in Soeya, n.d.).

Thus, after three decades of mutual hostility, a new era in US-China relations was forged with the signing of the Shanghai Communiqué which also “marked the end of US policies of hostile containment toward China and reached an initial compromise on the Taiwan issue, modifying US interference in the unfinished Chinese civil war since the Korean War” (Soeya, n.d.).

As part of Chinese and American efforts to establish formal diplomatic relations, the US and the PRC established the United States Liaison Office (USLO) in Beijing and a counterpart PRC office in Washington, DC in May 1973. However, it was only after the visits of US Presidents Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter that the two countries were
able to establish formal diplomatic relations. China and US formally established their respective embassies in Washington, D.C. and Beijing on March 1, 1979.

With the establishment of their respective embassies, China and the US were able to engage in both high-level and working-level dialogues covering a wide range of issues such as global and regional strategic problems, political-military questions, United Nations and other multilateral organisation affairs, and international narcotics matters. Both countries have also participated in joint research projects and cooperative programs under the Agreement on Cooperation in Science and Technology.

However, the expanding relationship between China and US was threatened in 1981 when the PRC expressed objections to the level of arms that the US was selling the Republic of China on Taiwan. The US acted immediately to resolve this issue. Secretary of State Alexander Haig travelled to China in June 1981 and discussed matters with the Chinese leadership. After eight months of intense negotiation, the US and PRC issued a joint communiqué where “the US stated its intention to gradually reduce the level of arms sales to the Republic of China, and the PRC described as a fundamental policy their effort to strive for a peaceful resolution to the Taiwan question” (817 Joint Communiqué; Appendix 2).

With the third China-US communiqué, the high-level exchanges continued to be a
significant means for developing US-PRC relations in the 1980s as President Ronald Reagan and Premier Zhao Ziyang made reciprocal visits in 1984. A year later, President Li Xiannian visited the US while Vice President George H. W. Bush traveled to the PRC and opened the US Consulate General in Chengdu. Between 1985 and 1989, reciprocal visits among cabinet-level officials of both countries occurred, capped by the trip by President Bush to Beijing in February 1989. Many of these diplomatic and professional exchanges continued after the suppression of the Tiananmen protests. Such exchanges gave both the American and the Chinese people opportunities to learn each other's cultural, artistic, and educational achievements.

In 1996, the PRC conducted military exercises in the Taiwan Strait prior to the pending presidential elections in the ROC on Taiwan. This triggered Taiwan Strait Crisis, prompting the US to dispatch two aircraft carrier battle groups to the region. Subsequently, the tension in the Taiwan Strait diminished. With these developments, the relations between the PRC and US started to improve again, as manifested by the increased high-level exchanges and progress on numerous bilateral issues, including human rights, non proliferation, and trade. By the fall of 1997, President Jiang Zemin had visited the United States while President Bill Clinton visited the PRC in June 1998. To date, the PRC and the US continue to work closely on regional issues such as North Korea and its nuclear weapons program. Although, the countries continue to maintain good relations, there are speculations on both sides.
The issue of Taiwan remains a volatile issue between the two countries. In addition, the PRC passed an anti-secession law (Appendix 3) stating that the PRC would be prepared to resort to non-peaceful means if Taiwan declared formal independence. While the US officially observes the One-China policy and acknowledges that Taiwan is part of China, Americans believe the US has to defend Taiwan against military aggression by the PRC because it is a democratic government.

Clearly, there is ambiguity with regards to the stand of US regarding the unification of mainland China and Taiwan. While the US does not officially recognise Taiwan as independent from mainland China, it supports the membership of Taiwan in international organisations as an independent government. Furthermore, as the US continues to supply arms to Taiwan on the pretext that Taiwan’s defence needs are aimed at preventing the forced unification efforts by the PRC, the prospect of the People's Republic of China applying a military solution to unite China and Taiwan remains high. As Liu (2002) explained “From China's perspective, building up China's military potential to retake Taiwan by force is a purely defensive measure, the logic being that Taiwan is an inalienable part of China, a fact the US officially acknowledges.” Hence, there is a risk that China may view US support of Taiwan as an act of war against China (Liu, 2002). Other issues between China and the US are the military expenditures of the Chinese government which were perceived by most Americans as going at a fast rate, and the human rights violations allegedly committed by the communist government.
Despite these issues China and US are able to maintain good economic relations. A 2005 Report (Bunton) showed that the two-way trade between China and the US has grown from $33 billion in 1992 to over $230 billion in 2004, and that more than a hundred US-based multinational corporations have projects in China. The cumulative US investment in China is estimated at $48 billion.

The establishment of Nixon’s foreign policy with China was undoubtedly successful and brought peace between the US and China. However, the Taiwan issue still remains unresolved to this very day.

The Republic of China (Taiwan) and the People’s Republic of China

For over 30 years, Taiwan has been facing an identity crisis. Whether Taiwan should be a part of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) or be its own independent nation has always been an extremely difficult and delicate topic that lies close to Taiwanese hearts. The impact of Taiwan’s stance on global politics could very well be devastating.

There have been numerous debates on this subject, and there is evidence supporting each of the debaters’ standpoints. Most importantly, it isn’t a question that is entirely up to Taiwan to answer. Depending on what the Chinese government is willing to allow, it might not be taken lightly by them.
Ever since the Taiwanese government’s 1987 announcement of its policy allowing people to visit their relatives in China, business trading agreements, investment, the tourist industry and cultural exchanges between the two countries have reached a new record high. Ma (2003) points out that, in 2002, trade between Taiwan and China reached a value of US $40 billion dollars, seeing over half a million Taiwanese people working or studying in China. More than four million people travel across the Taiwan Strait each year. The relationship between Taiwan and the PRC has not only been remarkable, but an historic event as well. However, when comparing the rapid growth in business with the political progress between the two countries, you can immediately identify the dawdler. Business growth travels at jet speed, while political relations with the Chinese are still awaiting clearance for takeoff. One could say that there has never been a positive advance in political relations between the leaders of both sides; in fact, the situation could be said to have gotten worse.

The Chinese government feels strongly that Taiwan is a part of China and persists with its One-China Policy, i.e. there should be only one China in the world. This policy does not have the support of the Taiwanese people, who have always been opposed to such an idea. However, countries such as the United States and many others are all for the proposal. This, in turn, places an enormous amount of pressure on Taiwan to follow and leaves very little space for it to stand alone as an independent nation. Therefore, activities such as an independence movement in Taiwan are
considered by some to be a threat to world peace.

There have been several occasions when Taiwan has been pushed to extremes and security has become a real concern. These included the official visit to the United States of America of the former Taiwanese president Lee Teng-hui (President, 1988 – 2000) in 1995. The visit caused China to stage war games along China’s east coast, only a few hundred kilometres from Taiwan (Wang 2005). Also, in March of 1996, the PRC held war games and missile testing once again in the strait between Fujian province and Taiwan (Wang 2005). These war games were held in response to Taiwan’s actions in attempting to declare itself a nation independent of China.

Any announcement from Beijing can easily affect Taiwanese society and its economy. For example, in July 1999, Taiwan’s first democratically elected president, Lee Teng-hui, made a speech on a German radio station suggesting that talks between the People’s Republic of China and Taiwan should be “state to state, nation to nation talks” (Wang 2005). He stated that “Taiwan was an independent country and should be treated as one by the PRC.” The speech that he gave on the radio station immediately placed Taiwan in a red alert situation. Chinese officials were furious and made some threats to Taiwan’s safety. On the same day, the Taiwanese share market went down, as investors were concerned about Taiwan’s safety. Even today, there have been many official claims by Chen Shui Bian (the Taiwanese president since 2000) that suggest movement towards independence. Chinese officials have
responded to these claims with condemnation and fury. These responses have also had a heavy impact on Taiwan’s economy.

It has been mentioned more than once by the Beijing government that the People’s Republic of China will not give up the option of using military force to secure reunification with Taiwan. Beijing officials made their point even clearer by announcing an Anti-Secession Law in 2005 to remind the Taiwanese people of the PRC’s solid stance on this issue. However, despite possible action that might be taken by Beijing, Chen Shui Bien was re-elected in the presidential election of March 2004. This raised the tension between Taiwan and the PRC even higher. The success of Chen Shui Bian (leader of the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP)) showed that he had strong support from the Taiwanese people in leading the country towards independence. However, considering the vast improvements made to business, why would Taiwanese people be willing to give up their stable lives and strong economy to claim independence and face the possible consequence of war with the PRC?

What is the motivation behind all the dangerous independence remarks being made by the vast and growing numbers of independence supporters in Taiwan? There can only be one answer: that these people wish to become independent. People in Taiwan see China as a third world country but also as a powerful country that continues to threaten Taiwan and prevent it from claiming world recognition as an independent nation. However, China has a strong economy and a high living standard in all its
major cities. Almost every international industrial giant regards China as one of the major market players. Still, most Taiwanese people, whose information is obtained from a misleading media and the government, regard Chinese people as lower class citizens.

On the issue of Taiwan, this research paper neither sides with Taiwan’s independence claim nor supports China’s policy on immediate reunification. However, one thing that is certain is that good relations between the two are absolutely essential. Are Taiwanese people too “rational” in their treatment of China or are they being too emotional and patriotic in their feelings about the mainland Chinese?

In the later Chapter I will identify the mentality of Taiwanese people in relation to the issue of Taiwanese and Chinese relations; and how they see Nixon’s One-China Policy. I raise several questions throughout this thesis and will address each with a clear and independent point of view. The foundation of this Taiwan crisis is based purely on issues of identity and social status.

Analysis and Recommendation

Nixon’s policy of détente with the Soviet Union marked a turning point in world history. It shows how the US utilised its foreign relations strengths to position itself between one superpower and another, emerging superpower. According to Penna (n.d.), the diplomatic relations with China initiated by Nixon and Kissinger achieved
three significant results:

First, other countries were ahead of the US in opening relations with China and therefore, their economies stood to profit while US businesses were forced to skip trading with China. Second, the US at last recognised the serious split between China and the Soviet Union--Communists were not all the same. China and the Soviet Union had had sporadic border clashes. The US recognized that China was a potential ally in any conflict with the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union was a potential ally in any conflict with China. Third, if the rationale for hostility toward China had originally been that Beijing Communists were controlled by Moscow, then détente with Moscow removed the rationale for hostility toward Beijing. The US accepted China as part of the UN and agreed that China's seat on the Security Council and its veto power should belong to Beijing, rather than to Taipei (Penna, n.d.).

Thus, the détente policy became a diplomatic weapon for the US to advocate its interests without risking the nation's security. It had adopted the policy of détente to ensure that when the rift between China and the Soviet escalates, the US will be on the winning side. Liu (2002) argued that the US policy of détente “has been motivated solely by the US need for leverage against the USSR”. He further argued that the geopolitical strategy of Nixon: “sought to perpetuate a central role for the US in world affairs by forging new relations not just with China, but also with the USSR, both being prime adversaries of the US in the post-World War II world. Yet the USSR was
the main target, and China was a card in US-Soviet detente. The central theme of this strategy of triangular diplomacy involved a new determination at the height of the Cold War that world communism was not politically monolithic and that the Trotsky notion of world revolution did not survive any reality check. Thus, US ‘détente’ with the USSR and a ‘linked strategy’ involving nuclear arms control and economic relationships would be important tools for containing superpower bilateral nuclear confrontation, with minimum political risk to the US and potentially high profits for US business.” (Liu, 2002)

Furthermore, it can be said that both Nixon and Kissinger used China to exert pressure upon North Vietnam toward a war settlement (Liu, 2002), at the expense of the Soviet Union. Unclassified government documents indicated that Kissinger may have revealed intelligence information on Soviet military dispositions while negotiating for the visit of Nixon to China. (Liu, 2002)

Months before Nixon’s visit but only a few weeks after Henry Kissinger’s secret trip to Beijing in July 1971, the Soviet ambassador asked Kissinger on 17 August 1971 whether he had provided the Chinese with intelligence information on Soviet military dispositions. Kissinger denied that he had, but various secondary accounts (e.g., Raymond Garthoff, *Detente and Confrontation*, 1994, p. 262) suggest, however, that he soon provided intelligence data to the Chinese as early as his October 1971 visit to Beijing. The relevant documents from October 1971 remain classified but new
evidence shows that Kissinger was more than willing to provide sensitive intelligence information to the Chinese. The transcript of a meeting on 13 December, during the Indian-Pakistan war, shows Kissinger offering Ambassador to the UN Huang Hua highly sensitive information, derived from satellite reconnaissance photography, on Soviet military deployments. Whenever Kissinger made his first offer of intelligence information, this was an important step in the Nixon administration’s extraordinary effort to tilt US policy toward Beijing. (The Kissinger Transcripts, n.d.).

Kissinger defended the diplomatic conduct of Nixon as a way of upholding the “firm belief in national interests as the fundamental guiding principle of diplomacy and as a central organizing principle of major power relations” (Soeya, n.d.). Kissinger (1994) stated that Nixon sought to navigate according to a concept of America's national interest... If the major powers, including the United States, pursued their self-interests rationally and predictably, Nixon believed--in the spirit of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment--then equilibrium would emerge from the clash of competing interests (Kissinger, 1994, p. 705).

Therefore, given the heightened tensions between China and the Soviet Union prior to the period of détente, good relations between the US and China provided the US with a swing position where it could enjoy both rapprochement with China and détente with the Soviet Union, consequently, acquiring diplomatic leverage over both China and the USSR (Liu, 2002).
With China emerging as a possible contender for superpower status in the 21st century with its bustling economy, traditional dealings with the global powers such as the US, the UK and Russia, and its high level of international interests (Dellios, 1999), it is imperative that relations between China and the US must be periodically examined and evaluated based on mutual interest and benefits to avoid any misunderstanding that could escalate to military aggression by both countries towards each other. As Weber (2005) states “the Sino-American relationship is now central to the health of the global political economy, but it is not a healthy relationship. Stories about globalization and economic interdependence are important. But the notion that the Sino-American relationship is market-driven is illusory and misleading. This is a political relationship through and through. It’s about power and control as much as it is about wealth.”
Chapter 2 Literature Review

When talking about the One-China Policy, the first book to look into would have to be the *Memoirs of Richard Nixon*. This book was written to retell his life from the time he was born till the time he gave his last speech when he resigned from the position of the President of the United States in 1974. As a biographical account of his life, his recollections were supplemented with “contemporary” resources such as memos, correspondence, public papers and tape transcripts. He divided the chapters of his book according to the significant periods of his political life. In each period of his political life, his accomplishments, his struggles and his stands were recalled with significant enlightening and enlightened insights about his decisions. On the issue of the One-China Policy, he recounted every incident he could think of that may be related to the creation of the One-China Policy.

These incidents happened prior to the journey of President Nixon to China: His recollections begin from the time he wrote his inaugural speech in 1967 where he spoke indirectly about his goal of promoting better diplomatic relations with China. He said “We seek an open world . . . a world in which no people great or small will live in angry isolation”. He also wrote Kissinger a memorandum urging the government to improve its attitude towards exploration of the possibility of rapprochement with the Chinese government.
There were several publicly-known meetings in Warsaw, Poland, with envoys from both camps. US Ambassador to Poland Walter Stoessel was the US representative while Lei Yang, the Chinese charges d’ affaires was the Chinese envoy to these talks. The subject of the talks was about changing the venue of their talks to Beijing.

However, it almost fell through when the Cambodian operation erupted. For few weeks, communications between two teams were cancelled. According to Nixon, he almost felt that the Chinese government would not continue with their talks. A few months later, the Chinese government signalled that they were willing to resume talks with the American government and continue their seemingly “strengthening but fragile ties”.

In July 1970, Catholic Bishop James Edwards Walsh, who was arrested in 1958, was released after 12 years of imprisonment. This somehow signalled subtly to the international community the intentions of the Chinese government to continue with what they had been doing for the past several years.

After this action from the Chinese government, Nixon continued discussing his intention of having diplomatic ties with China with different Heads of different countries at various different political functions, and the Yahya Channel was established; “Yahya” being President Yahya of Pakistan who became a mediator between China and the US. Polo I was the first secret journey of Dr. Henry Kissinger
to Beijing to explain and gather information for the policy their country was creating regarding their relationship with China. Polo II was the second secret journey of Dr. Henry Kissinger to Beijing. The announcement that shocked the whole world was when President Nixon announced in late spring of 1972 that he would go to China for talks about their governments and the strengthening of ties between them. The meeting between Mao and Nixon finally took place in China, in the year 1972.

This book written by former President Nixon was done very eloquently. It is thoroughly expressed and supplemented by accounts from the diary he kept as the President of the United States. Such eloquence paved the way for an easy understanding of the incidents leading to the creation of the One-China Policy. With the author of the book being President Nixon himself, the veracity of the incidents leading to the creation of the policy became unquestionable. This is because of the fact that he himself was one of the two persons in this world who truly knew what happened in the meeting between the leaders of China and the United States.

The parts about China are specifically mentioned in the book. Unlike other books, it concentrates on the relations between China and the US during the talks leading to the Communiqué in 1972. Although there were of significant events that almost stopped both governments from pursuing better diplomatic relations, such as the wars in Cambodia and Vietnam, it did not dwell too much on them. It made it comprehensible for its readers because unnecessary information is minimized. In his accounts and
recollections, it is impressive to note that the author acknowledged the roles of other members of the group in the creation of the policy. He neither trivialized nor overestimated the roles of these said individuals. He however reinforced that fact that even the United States, a country considered as a superpower, experienced difficulties forging diplomatic ties with China. It made him appear very human to his readers. He also pointed out in this book the subtleties the governments had to take to achieve their goals.

The words used by President Nixon to express his thoughts on the One-China Policy were simple. However, it was written with such level of honesty and eloquence that increased its depth. It was direct and to the point, but the added comments of the author about the characters of the people involved made it more interesting for its audience. Although the intention of the President was to write a narration of what took place between “China and America” 1970 - 1972, the fact that he analyses the incidents in between this period clarified questions about the decisions to pursue the moves he did. During this time and even now, when one attempts to read about them in the archived articles, confusion and more confusion comes about. However, because the President did analyse them, the issues become clearer.

The Nixon-Kissinger China Policy is one of the most controversial and discussed issues in the second half of twentieth-century. Richard Nixon led a colourful political career and Henry Kissinger was one of the most admired, feared, and criticised
secretaries of state during the years when the United States beginning to wield its considerable international influence, not only in the western world, but also into the far east. Henry Kissinger became Secretary of State on the 22nd of September in 1973 and held that position until the 20th of January 1977. He also held the position of Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. At present, he is the chairman of an international consulting firm. As a diplomat who has travelled the world, Kissinger often writes down his strong opinions of various international relations issues that the United States has to deal with.

One of his most recent books was published in 2001 and asked the question: “Does America need a foreign policy?” In this book Kissinger did not seek to answer the question because the answer is obviously affirmative. But Kissinger outlined the kind of foreign policy that the United States must have. Kissinger’s thoughts in this book reflect his China experience. In this book, Kissinger (2001) first described the present foreign policies of the United States. He called them the “four international systems” which have characteristics that are supposed to impel the United States to modify and redefine its foreign policies.

These international systems are: (a) the relationship of United States with Western Europe; (b) the relationship of United States with the Middle East, specifically regarding the mediator role of the US in the Middle East Conflict; (c) the relationship of the United States with the countries on the continent of Africa, which is also
ravaged with several conflicts; and finally, the one aligned with the topic of this study, (d) the relationship of United States with countries in Asia, particularly with the Peoples Republic of China.

Kissinger succinctly describes Asia in this manner:

The great powers of Asia -- larger in size and far more populous than the nations of nineteenth-century Europe -- treat one another as strategic rivals. India, China, Japan, Russia -- with Korea and the states of Southeast Asia not lagging far behind -- consider that some of the others, and certainly a combination of them, are indeed capable of threatening their national security. Wars among these powers are not imminent, but they are not inconceivable either. Asian military expenditures are rising, and they are designed principally as protection against other Asian nations (though some of China's military effort includes as well the contingency of a war with the United States over Taiwan). As in nineteenth-century Europe, a long period of peace is possible -- even likely -- but a balance of power will necessarily play a key role in preserving it (Kissinger, 2001: 26).

Based on his writings, one may draw a diagram that categorises the different nations in Asia, and one will find that at the centre of the diagram, there will be three circles representing the three most powerful and influential countries, which are China with its extremely large population and an increasing military power, Japan with its rapid technological advances and formidable economic power, and India whose strengths are neither supreme nor outstanding but nevertheless place the country in a powerful position.

Kissinger (2001) contends that never has there been a moment more timely than the present decade to have the United States review its current foreign policy, especially with China. This is because, according to his observation, the country is enjoying a
form of pre-eminence in terms of military power, economic power, and even cultural influences, which can be likened to an empire. And, perhaps, this American empire can be considered even greater than the ancient Roman Empire. The United States, Kissinger insisted, must have a foreign policy which has a long-range approach and is supported by subtle ideology.

Kissinger laments that the current foreign policy is too reminiscent of the Cold War and no longer relevant to the changing climate of today’s politics. Beyond containment, the major thrust of American Cold War diplomatic foreign policy was to return the defeated enemies, Germany and Japan, to the emerging international system as full-fledged members. This task, unprecedented in respect to nations on which unconditional surrender had been imposed less than five years earlier, made sense to a generation of American leaders whose formative experience had been overcoming the Great Depression of the 1930s. The generation that organized resistance to the Soviet Union had experienced Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal, which had restored political stability by closing the gap between American expectations and economic reality. The same generation had prevailed in World War II, fought in the name of democracy (Kissinger, 2001: 28).

The position taken by the United States is usually a benevolent power over the nations that it has defeated during the wars. The First World War brought about an unprecedented rise in its economy and the occurrence of the Great Depression was
unexpected, although some economists contend that the Great Depression was inevitable during those years. The psychological makeup of the American leaders was then influenced by the experience of the Great Depression and along with this is the strong desire for stability. Stability, however, is often synonymous with a desire to not change any system that is currently working. It was a stability that led to the lack of dynamism of many US leaders which caught the American nation flat-footed in the face of global changes. The foreign policies that the United States has today, including the China policy that was established in the 1970s may no longer be relevant. Kissinger explains that: “It was Vietnam that broke the fusion of ideology and strategy that characterized the thinking of what is now termed "the greatest generation." Though the principles of American exceptionalism continue to be affirmed by all participants in the domestic discussions of foreign policy, their application to concrete cases became subject to a profound and continuing dispute” (Kissinger, 2001: 28).

Kissinger, however, does not exactly outline what the new foreign policy should be. And the new foreign policy that is being touted by Kissinger can only be understood if one has a background on the previous policies. This is because any present characteristic of foreign policy is undoubtedly an outgrowth or perhaps a mutation of previous policy, despite any claim to the contrary. Thus, to determine where Kissinger is coming from, it would be advantageous to determine his views on one of the most interesting periods, of American politics, the transition from the Nixon presidency to
Ford’s.

Kissinger wrote his memoirs for these years and published it in a book entitled *Years of Renewal*. Published in 1999, this book again contained many of Kissinger’s brilliant analyses of the various world events that affect the American nation. He also gave detailed portraits of two Presidents, Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford. Thus, the book has three major focuses: (a) the complexity of foreign relations; (b) Nixon’s brilliant mind and sad paranoia; and (c) Ford’s confidence and lack of egotism. The title of the book refers to the years when Ford assumed the presidency.

Establishing a China policy or any other foreign policy is always a complicated matter, according to Kissinger. He explains that if diplomatic relations were as easy as academicians wanted them to be in the numerous college seminars they give, then the Middle East conflict would have been resolved many years ago. Kissinger shows a distaste for people who assume that foreign relations are simple agreements. In an episode in which Kissinger was tasked to put together an interim foreign policy for the new Ford administration, Kissinger recounts the difficulty and delicacy of putting together the representatives of three powerful nations:

“To avoid confusion abroad, it was important to establish a sense of continuity in our foreign policy, at least for an interim period until the new President could determine what changes, if any, he wished to make. To this end, I had brought along a transition plan, the essential feature of which was to put before every government around the world a personal presidential message … Since it was physically impossible to see each ambassador individually, I proposed that Ford meet them in regional groups, allotting about an hour to each. The first group would be NATO ambassadors, followed by Latin America, the Middle East,
Africa, and Southeast Asia. Since the nations of Northeast Asia did not fit any grouping, and since Japan was an indispensable ally and China a key element in our triangular diplomacy, I recommended that their diplomatic representatives be received individually. (Anatoly Dobrynin, the Soviet ambassador, was on home leave; he would be received as soon as he returned.) Finally, there would be separate meetings with the ambassadors of South Korea and South Vietnam -- two countries on behalf of which American blood had been shed. Their ultimate safety depended on making sure that their adversaries understood the new President's commitment to their security”. (Kissinger, 1999: 23-24) Kissinger was always the master of his own shuttle diplomacy.

In the second focus, intended to describe Nixon as a man, as a vice-president, and as a president, Kissinger seems to navigate towards the conventional ideas, which is quite unconventional compared with the methods that Kissinger used to present his ideas. The conventional ideas that Kissinger put forth regarding Nixon are that Nixon was blessed with a brilliant and analytical mind. There were many times that this analytical mind saved him from the clutches of his adversaries. Yet the tragic side to this is that Nixon suffered from a kind of paranoia that sometimes impeded his actions. Still, in getting a portrait of Nixon, one finds that Kissinger tends to give a romantic image.

“It is difficult to write about Richard Nixon, who combined intelligence, patriotism, and courage with self-destructive flaws as in a Greek tragedy. The hatred he evoked in his political opponents was extraordinary even by the turbulent standards of American democracy. I served as his principal adviser on foreign policy for five and a half years and, when we were both in town, often saw him several times a day. Yet, to some extent, I still remain mystified by the personality of the perhaps most complex President of the twentieth century” (Kissinger, 1999, p.43).
One may assume that indeed Nixon is similar to a Greek tragic hero whose wisdom would be almost unquestionable. This implies that the China policy that Nixon and Kissinger established would also be next to unquestionable. After all, the existence of diplomatic relations between America and China was originally considered to be impossible. But history showed that there were many loopholes in the China policy and that there were also many unresolved issues for which any resolution was not viable. For example, the United States had acknowledged the one-China policy but it also clearly admitted that it would not stop Taiwan from getting independence and establishing its own democracy.

The problem lay in ideology. The People’s Republic of China was mainly a communist country, and the United States wanted to project the image of itself as the bulwark of democracy. Thus, stopping Taiwan would be similar to destroying the very principle that the United States utilized in many of its decisions. Unfortunately, China is a power to be reckoned with and the United States has pledged to the Chinese government that it will not give any form of aid to Taiwan. Nixon, faced with this situation was unable to come up with a better solution.

The description of the other President, Ford, is not directly related to this research study but it is a focus of Kissinger’s book. Thus, a portrait of Ford will be briefly presented before the next piece of literature is presented. But first, one must be aware
that because Kissinger worked closely with Nixon many people had expected animosity between Ford and Kissinger. Surprisingly, Kissinger did not consider Ford an adversary. Kissinger’s general description of Ford goes like this:

“Gerald Rudolph Ford was an uncomplicated man tapped by destiny for some of the most complicated tasks in the nation's history. The first non-elected President, he was called to heal the nation's wounds after a decade in which the Vietnam War and Watergate had produced the most severe divisions since the Civil War. As different as possible from the driven personalities who typically propel themselves into the highest office, Gerald Ford restored calm and confidence to a nation surfeited with upheavals, overcame a series of international crises, and ushered in a period of renewal for American society” (Kissinger, 1999, p.17).

Kissinger may not regard Ford as brilliant as Nixon, but Ford possessed a certain confidence and sharp discernment that saved the United States from several crises. This comment by Kissinger about Ford came as a surprise to some reviewers of Kissinger’s book. But Kissinger’s opinion of Ford is not the focus of this research. This description of Ford only serves to demonstrate the brilliance of the tactician’s mind that was behind the China policy enforced by the United States since the 1970s.

On the study of his diplomacy, Kissinger wrote a book that was published in 1995. This book can be considered as a guide for other aspiring diplomats, but by which country it will be utilized is anyone’s guess. In fact, Kissinger did not believe that a strategy utilized in one country can be used again in another country. This book can then be an exercise of the mind that went through several international negotiations, all with other brilliant and powerful leaders.
The major message that Kissinger wanted to impart through this book is that among so many countries all over the world, only the United States has come up with several unique and admirable foreign policies. The United States is unique in its foreign policies because it was able to accomplish seemingly impossible objectives through the use of tactics that were never before employed in American history. This does sound like Kissinger is praising his own handiwork, but he did proceed to put forth many convincing arguments that support the above thesis. Kissinger also concedes that other countries are as capable of making unique foreign policies as the United States.

Of course, any analysis of the Nixon-Kissinger China policy should not just be based on the works of the creators of the said foreign policy. It would be interesting to have Nixon’s opinions but this would be impossible. Fortunately, there were other political analysts that attempted to describe Nixon and his principles that were behind the Nixon-Kissinger China Policy. Three of them are Richard Thornton, Robert Litwak and James Humes.

Thornton is a professor of American history and his general view of the Nixon-Kissinger China policy is that it was made by the Nixon administration and that it was continued by the Kissinger “shogunate”. Of course, there is no literal shogunate, for this term refers to Japanese warlords that controlled and divided historical Japan. But Kissinger’s role extended far beyond the Nixon administration and this is why
Thornton utilized the term.

Thornton’s treatment of the foreign policies, by itself, can be considered scholarly and the reader is encouraged to follow the strategic arguments he offers. But, with the subsequent dramatic description of the Watergate scandal and the colourful portrayal of the people involved, Thornton’s writing, despite the possibility that the contents are true, leans towards creative fiction. This affects the scholarly beginning of the book.

Litwak provided another perspective of the Nixon-Kissinger China policy by using several historical and conceptual contexts. Litwak (1984) contends that the Nixon-Kissinger China Policy was heavily influenced by two factors, the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union and the Nixon Doctrine that came out after the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. The Nixon Doctrine was made public on July 25, 1969 and the United States still maintains its position that it will give aid to nations who are fighting against communism. However, the United States will give limited military aid similar to that given to Vietnam, basically providing means for a nation to fight communism.

Then, the bulk of the aid will be largely economic in nature. The Nixon Doctrine also expressed the United States’ willingness to provide shelter to nations that the country considers as allies or vital to its security. The same Nixon Doctrine was applied to foreign policy towards the Persian Gulf. This was against Kissinger’s original idea of
not using the same strategy for several countries. But the use of this Doctrine in this region, according to Holt (2004) allowed the flow of military aid to US allies in this region. The subsequent Carter Doctrine became the basis for the US military involvement in the Gulf War and the Iraq War.

Humes (1997), to describe Nixon and explain the reasons behind his decisions particularly as regards China policy, enumerated and described Nixon’s ten commandments of statecraft. Humes also described how these ten commandments of statecraft were correctly or incorrectly applied in various situations that the country faced. But Humes began with the words used by Nixon in introducing these ten commandments of statecraft.

“A President needs a global view, a sense of proportion and a keen sense of the possible. He needs to know how power operates and he must have the will to use it. If I could carve ten rules into the walls of the Oval Office for my successors in the dangerous years just ahead, they would be these” (Humes citing Nixon, 1997: 13).

Based on this powerful introduction, here are concise descriptions of Nixon’s ten commandments of statecraft:

1. Always Be Prepared to Negotiate, but Never Negotiate Without Being Prepared. (Humes, 1997, p.29) – Nixon was probably obsessed with the thought of being
prepared. He was known to have immersed himself in Russian politics and culture before a meeting with the Vice President of the Soviet Union. Nixon’s goal was to achieve a détente. Nixon may approve the development of an anti-ballistic missile to repel possible missile strikes or he may establish a rapprochement with China, which is still considered by the Soviets as an adversary despite their similar ideologies. In the end, Nixon carried out both options.

2. Never Be Belligerent, but Always Be Firm (Humes, 1997: 45) – This commandment was especially applied during the Moscow summit. Before the summit, the South Vietnamese were beginning to be overwhelmed by the military power of the North Vietnamese who are backed by the Soviet Union. A retreat by the South Vietnamese would place the United States in a weakened position. To prevent this, Nixon ordered a tactical move: the mining of Haiphong Harbour. This move prevented the Soviet from supplying more military aid to North Vietnam. Thus, during the Moscow summit, Nixon was in a better position to negotiate.

Eventually, the Soviet General Secretary, Brezhnev, was aware of the tactical move and lashed Nixon in a furious manner. Throughout the episode, Nixon remained calm and kept on clarifying whether Brezhnev’s words could be considered threats. Eventually, Brezhnev’s belligerence was his own downfall because it indicated a weaker position. Nixon was said to have obtained a unilateral diplomatic victory (Humes, 1997).
3. Always Remember That Covenants Should be Openly Agreed To But Privately Negotiated (Humes, 1997: p.57) – This commandment is better explained by Vaughn (2001) in his own analysis of Nixon’s ten commandments of statecraft. According to Vaughn:

“Given the bureaucratic resentment of open relations with the People's Republic of China, the diplomatic implications of the Soviet Union's knowledge of normalized relations between the Americans and the Chinese, and the fervour of the Cultural Revolution and its purges in China, open diplomacy was not an option to Nixon and his Chinese counterparts. Instead, Nixon embarked on a Metternichian guise of diplomacy, complete with secret envoys, veiled messages passed through the media, and a network of international connections between himself and the Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai that included de Gaulle of France, Ceausescu of Romania, and Yahya Kahn of Pakistan. After a contingent of American ping-pong players were invited to China and Henry Kissinger took a secret flight to a Chinese military airport, an official invitation was extended to President Nixon from Beijing to visit the People's Republic of China; Nixon quickly accepted. A few months later the historic normalization agreement was signed between the two nations” (Vaughn, 2001: 46)

4. Never Seek Publicity That Would Destroy the Ability to Get Results (Humes, 1997, p.75) – This commandment of statecraft can be applied to the Chinese relationship, but it was earlier applied by Nixon when he was still vice president. Six months before the elections, Nixon and his President, Eisenhower, had already supplied ammunition and training to Cubans who fled Castro. A planned invasion was underway. However, during the election campaign, Nixon was being criticized by Kennedy for the government's weak stance against Castro.

Nixon could have defended himself and created a better image by disclosing the planned Cuban invasion, but by doing so, he would have made the entire operation
public and this might make the invasion fail. Thus, Nixon opted to keep his silence.

“That would have been utterly irresponsible: it would have disclosed a secret operation and would have completely destroyed its effectiveness” (Humes quoting Nixon, 1997, p. 79). These words of Nixon have gained the approval of Humes and Vaughn.


The United States had been planning for many years to establish diplomatic relations with China. But many pessimistic political analysts predicted that the US would need to withdraw its support of Taiwan and pull out its troops from Vietnam to obtain those relations. The image put forth was that the United States seemed willing to bend over backwards just to open relations with China.

Surprisingly, the Nixon administration did not do all these things and Washington established a liaison office in Beijing. This is because Nixon was aware that China wanted full embassy status. Nixon kept the situation hanging until China no longer demanded a formal withdrawal of US support for Taiwan. That is, the US may still support Taiwan, even militarily, if China attacks the small democratic state. Eventually, two administrations later, China obtained full diplomatic status from the Carter administration.
6. Never Let Your Adversary Underestimate What You Would Do in Response to a Challenge. Never Tell Him What You Would Not Do (Humes, 1997, p. 105). – During the Cold War, the two superpowers that were head to head were the United States and the USSR, but the latter was decidedly weaker in military power and almost stagnant economically. It was able to maintain its power because of its unpredictability. When an adversary is unpredictable, it holds a sword of Damocles and puts fear into its enemies.

Nixon was aware and appreciative of this unpredictability even before he became president. Thus, when he became president, Nixon engaged in unpredictable manoeuvres that sometimes earned him the reputation of a “madman”. For example, he ordered a massive bombing campaign against North Vietnam from December 18 to December 30, with one rest day, Christmas Day. This image of unpredictability that was cultivated by Nixon instilled fear, even in his ally, the South Vietnamese leader, President Nguyen van Thieu (Vaughn, 2001). Of course, the unexpected bombing earned strong criticism from the media and human rights organizations. But Nixon’s target audience was not the media. His targets were the other leaders who are not taking friendly actions towards the United States.

7. Always Leave Your Adversary a Face-Saving Line of Retreat (Humes, 1997, p. 121) – This was applied during the crisis in the Middle East when the Arab forces were up against the Israeli Army. No political analyst has yet utilized this
commandment in the study of the Nixon-Kissinger China policy, but this does not imply that future events will not prove or disprove this idea. But on a general note, this commandment simply allows the adversary to have a way out, since one who has no way out will tend to believe that he has nothing to lose and can inflict much damage.

8. Always Carefully Distinguish Between Friends Who Provide Some Human Rights and Enemies Who Deny All Human Rights (Humes, 1997, p. 133) – This was not applied to the Chinese relations. Humes (1997) and Vaughn (2001) used the situation in Iran as an example. That is, the government of the Shah of Iran had been favoured by the United States government because it had always been fair in its dealings with oil and had granted civil rights to women despite the fact that Iran was an autocratic government.

Unfortunately, there were critics against this particular favouritism. Media pressure pushed the Carter administration to publicly question the relationship between U.S. and Iran. The seed of doubt sowed by these public statements resulted in tension in the relationship between Iran and U.S. Eventually, the Shah was replaced by the Ayatollah Khomeini and Iran became an Islamic theocracy, making it a virulent enemy of the U.S.

9. Always Do at Least as Much for Our Friends as Our Adversaries Do for Our
Enemies (Humes, 1997: 149). – To illustrate this commandment of statecraft, Humes (1997) again utilized the situation in the Middle East, citing the American support for Israel. This will not be elaborated fully since the Middle East situation has been mentioned several times already.

The reason why the Middle East situation was cited was to establish a point of comparison for the China policy. As more research is reviewed, it appears that the mediation process in Middle East conflict and the establishment of diplomatic ties with China were both complex. The nature of the complexity has similarities and differences. The similarities lay in the opposing ideologies while the differences lay in the political and cultural situation.

10. Never Lose Faith. In Just Cause Faith Can Move Mountains. Faith Without Strength Is Futile, but Strength Without Faith Is Sterile (Humes, 1997, p. 159). – This is probably the most philosophical of all Nixon's commandments. According to Humes (1997), Nixon intended this last commandment as advice for future leaders. Will this last piece of advice hold true in the Nixon-Kissinger China policy?

To better evaluate the commandments of statecraft, and eventually, the Nixon-Kissinger China policy, another perspective must be taken from another political analyst, Gordon Chang. In his book, *Friends and Enemies: The United States, China, and the Soviet Union*, Chang (1990) illustrated the difficulty of establishing
diplomatic relationships with China and a fairly peaceful relationship with the Soviet Union. None of the three countries were considered friends. In Chang’s point of view as a professor of American history, the establishment of the relationships was unexpected and the strength of these relationships was, at best, tenuous. Yet, Chang suggested that this tenuousness was probably the best characteristic of the relationships between these three countries. That is, if there is a stronger relationship between China and the US, this may destroy détente, and if there is a closer relationship between the Soviets and the Americans, China would not be open to diplomatic relations.

For a more detailed information regarding the establishment of the tenuous relations between the three countries, the work of William Burr may be consulted. Burr was once a senior analyst at the National Security Archive and he was also a director of the Archive’s Nuclear Documentation Project. His position gave him access to much sensitive information including transcripts of the top secret talks with China and the Soviet Union. These transcripts were originally classified, which implies that divulging the contents of these transcripts may present some form of danger to the security of the United States. But today’s political and social climate has radically changed. This does not imply that there is less danger in the world, but the concepts of danger, sovereignty, freedom, transparency, and political power have evolved or mutated.
Kissinger is the main protagonist in the transcripts published by Burr, but the main subject is the diplomatic talks involving three powerful countries. The other players in the transcripts were Mao Zedong, Zhou Enlai, Deng Xiaoping, Leonid Brezhnev, Andrei Gromyko, Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, and George Bush. The transcripts were made public under the Freedom of Information Act, for the study of would-be politicians and diplomats and for analysis by present diplomats and critics. In his context with the transcripts, Burr stated that the now characteristic Chinese suspicion of the term “peaceful evolution” probably stemmed from the wooing of China to the American side.

Today, in the twenty-first century, the Nixon-Kissinger China policy still has both its supporters and critics. The supporters, of course, are people who also support Nixon and Kissinger. The critics are people who are against these two.

One Nixon supporter was the journalist Cyrus Sulzberger. In a book entitled *The World and Richard Nixon*, Sulzberger wrote positively and approvingly about Nixon’s successes in foreign relations. Sulzberger (1978) attributed Nixon's success to the experiences that had prepared Nixon for statesmanship and diplomatic relations. These experiences included extensive travel and reading and according to Szulzberger made Nixon a brilliant tactician and negotiator. But, as critics of Sulzberger pointed out, the journalist studiously avoided any mention of Nixon’s performance in the nation's domestic affairs.
For example, Sulzberger made no comment, approval or criticism of the unexpected bombings that Nixon approved. There was much media clamour against the bombings and Sulzberger was part of the media. Of course, one may not have sweeping expectations regarding any group, particularly the media. At the same time, Sulzberger may have been privy to Nixon’s reasons for the bombing but chose not to publish them. This book, after all, appeared in 1978, which was several years before the enactment of the Freedom of Information Act and the publishing of some contents from the National Security Archive. This was also before the release of Nixon’s Ten Commandments of Statecraft that explained the bombing as part of Nixon’s “madman” strategy in order to project an image of unpredictability.

Another supporter of the Nixon-Kissinger China policy is Roger Morris, who served on the National Security Council. Morris served during two administrations, those of Johnson and Nixon. Thus, from his experience, one may assume that Morris has some credibility. Morris, however, did not write about Nixon. He focused on Kissinger. Morris (1977), in his book, has ambivalent feelings towards Kissinger. On one hand, he has reservations regarding the unexpected actions and oftentimes too smooth dealings of Kissinger. Yet, Morris applauded Kissinger’s performance as a co-creator of various American foreign policies, especially the China policy. Establishing diplomatic relations with a country of an opposing ideology and which has a history of maintaining co-operative relations with countries that the United States does not
consider as allies was perhaps the most difficult and challenging tasks that a diplomat will ever face. According to Morris the accomplishment of this task, is evidence of the diplomat’s greatness. Morris, of course, was referring to Kissinger.

Another political analyst who wrote about Kissinger was Robert Schulzinger. This analyst’s work, entitled *Henry Kissinger: Doctor of Diplomacy*, was published in 1989 and can be considered a work that has more modern views. Unlike the previous books about Kissinger and Nixon, which were published a few years after the Nixon administration, Shulzinger allowed the passage of time to filter through the numerous events of the recent past before putting forth his analysis of the Nixon-Kissinger China policy. Similar to Morris, Shulzinger focused on Kissinger.

According to Shulzinger (1989), there were three major accomplishments that Kissinger, as a diplomat, was able to accomplish. The first one was the attainment of détente with the USSR, which today seems no longer relevant because the Cold War is over and this once-superpower is now divided into several countries which are intent on establishing their own sovereignty and identity. The second major accomplishment was the establishment of an American presence in the Middle East. This region of the world cannot be viewed as the friendliest to the United States, yet, through the diplomatic efforts of Kissinger, the American government is now a major player in the various events in this region. And the third major accomplishment was, of course, the establishment of diplomatic relations with the People’s Republic of
China. The Nixon-Kissinger China policy is the result of Kissinger’s diplomatic efforts and brilliant mind.

However, Shulzinger (1989) also pointed out that Kissinger was far from the perfect diplomat. There are many areas that Shulzinger called “gaps” in the performance of Kissinger. Shulzinger is inclined to believe that although Kissinger may have achieved a coup in getting opening diplomatic and trade relations with China, the relations with other countries operated with less finesse. The bombing of North Vietnam and the invasion of Cambodia were not evidence of a sterling performance. Thus, similar to Morris, Shulzinger has ambivalent views regarding Kissinger’s diplomacy.

There were, however, strong critics of Kissinger and the various foreign policies that he authored, during both the Nixon and the Ford administrations. One of these strong critics was Tad Szulc. Szule is an investigative reporter who worked for the Associated Press and then for the New York Times. Szule’s work, however, does not have the benefit of the Freedom of Information Act from which he could have obtained more information. But then again, Szule’s work has always questioned the sincerity of the government’s efforts to be transparent and this doubt implies that Szule would have been one of the media people who would be critical of the contents released by the National Security Council archives.
The thesis of Szulc’s book is the establishment of an illusion of peace during the Nixon administration. That is, the Nixon administration may have opened diplomatic ties with China and may have attained détente with the Soviet Union, but the relationships with these two communist countries did not bring actual and complete peace within their regions. Szulc (1978) contends that the so-called success with China was marred by the many acts of violence that the United States committed against other nations in Asia, such as North Korea and Cambodia. Perhaps, from the point of view of Szule, no reason would be sufficient to justify the bombings on North Vietnam and the waste of innocent lives. Thus, the theme of Szulc’s book is the fake morality and the assumed cloak of immortality that many American leaders wear today. This fake morality and arrogantly assumed immortality cannot be strong foundations for the creation of foreign policies. However, Szulc's treatment of the historic events that he described and cited can also be described as unbalanced. He did not consider the points of view and the actions of the foreign leaders, such as the Soviet General Secretary, the President of North Vietnam, the President of Cambodia, and the President of Korea.

Another critic of Nixon and Kissinger was William Bundy. Similar to all the other literature, Bundy's book, which came out in 1998, was about three significant foreign diplomacy events during the Nixon administration. But first, one must be aware that Bundy served three other Presidents besides Nixon. Bundy (1998) explains that Nixon’s experience in foreign policy was based on his many years of experience in
political life. Nixon was not limited simply to domestic policy. For twenty years before Nixon became president, he travelled the world and was part of the meetings of the National Security Council. In describing this, Bundy immediately established that Nixon, before becoming president, could be assumed to be well-prepared in making foreign policies. The flipside of this is that Nixon may already have had strong opinions about certain world leaders. Bundy explains that such is shown when Nixon displayed a sympathetic attitude towards the Pakistani generals.

In his analysis of the Nixon-Kissinger China policy, Bundy proposes that the greatest influence was the so-called “pactomania” invented by Dulles, which was all about having mutual defence treaties along a geographic line from Turkey to Japan. With the intention of having these treaties and the significance of the geographic locations, Nixon realized the importance of establishing a strong presence in Asia: the ideal option was to have diplomatic relations with the biggest country in this region, which is China.

Thus, according to Bundy, Nixon proceeded to established foreign policies based on ideas that he had even before his presidency. Nixon found an ally in Kissinger, who became the National Security Adviser. Bundy (1998) commented that Nixon should have consulted the Secretary of State, William Rogers, but Nixon ignored this protocol and authored foreign policies together with Kissinger. Bundy, who was the assistant secretary of state, obviously did not approve of Nixon’s actions. Bundy
resigned on the grounds that the policy making was not being made through appropriate offices, which should be the State Department. From these early statements by Bundy, the reader must then be alerted to the possibility that Bundy’s examination of the Nixon-Kissinger China policy may be biased, or worse, lacked information. Still, Bundy tackles major foreign policy issues and examines them against the policies that Nixon and Kissinger formulated. In this research paper, Bundy’s examination of the China foreign policy will be elaborated, although the reader is informed that other foreign policies were also discussed in the book.

The Nixon-Kissinger China policy has been regarded by many political analysts as a major feat in U.S. diplomatic relations. Bundy disagrees by stating that China only capitulated in agreeing to open diplomatic relations with the United States because the Chinese government was not friendly to the Soviets. That is, the Soviets, by supplying the North Vietnamese with military aid, were causing many problems for China. The pressure that the Soviets brought within the locality of China, according to Bundy (1998), forced the Chinese government to sign the diplomatic agreement with United States. China was dealing with a Soviet threat and was not so much enamoured by the diplomatic abilities of Kissinger. Bundy claims that the Chinese intelligence had learned of Soviet plans to bomb nuclear plants in China. The United States government was simply acting at the right time and at the right place. Bundy proposes that even without Nixon and Kissinger, China may have sought such diplomatic relations because the Chinese leadership had its own compelling motives.
Nixon and Kissinger, as described by Bundy (1998), were not the geniuses behind the opening of relations with China. They were just the men who were available at the time. And to prove the inadequacies of Nixon and Kissinger in establishing admirable foreign policies, Bundy proceeded to describe the actions of the United States against Vietnam and Cambodia. Nixon seemed to have the mistaken idea that the United States could protect South Vietnam using the strength of the United States Air Force. Bundy sees the bombing of Cambodia as the worst error that the Nixon’s administration ever made, perhaps as scandalous as the Watergate scandal that forced Nixon to resign. Bundy recounted the bombing of the border area of Cambodia in 1970 and then in 1973. Bundy insists that Cambodia was not a war in the view of the American people. It was simply Nixon’s war. This comment of Bundy reflects a similar sentiment today with the ongoing situation in Iraq. That is, the war in Iraq is not that of the American people. The war in Iraq is simply Bush’s war. But of course, the pros and cons of this statement will demand another compilation of varying views.

In conclusion, Bundy (1998) makes three very strong accusations against Nixon and Kissinger. First, the formulation of the foreign policies was never within the accepted norms especially because the State Department and the Secretary of State were largely ignored. This could be the origin of Bundy’s contention, but there are other reasons as well. Second, Nixon and Kissinger did not utilize professionalism in creating the foreign policies. Bundy described them as two men who were just “steered by
examples and stereotypes drawn from their own experiences” (Bundy, 1998: 515). And the third strong accusation is that Nixon and Kissinger operated under the theme of deception.

Given the views of political analysts, journalists and former employees of the White House, there is yet another source that can shed light, perhaps on another facet of the foreign policies, particularly the China policy. This source is Nixon's speech writer, William Safire. In his book, “Before the Fall: An Inside View of the Pre-Watergate White House”, Safire provided an interesting portrait of Nixon, along with other political personalities, especially Kissinger. Safire’s focus may not have been the China policy, but his work provides insights about the most controversial American president of all time. The use of Safire’s work would be in lieu of any literature that would have come from Nixon himself.

The first memorable part of Safire’s description of Nixon is the presence of dualism in the president. Safire used the old “Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde” to present this duality of Nixon’s personality. Kissinger only described a certain form of paranoia about the president, but Safire’s description is more radical and may even have invited psychologists into the fray of analysing Nixon’s political career. The use of these famous gothic characters is tantamount to suggesting the existence of schizophrenia. Safire (1975), in a daring move, describes that the Dr. Jekyll in Nixon is constantly attempting to suppress the Mr. Hyde, while the rest of the other time, the Dr. Jekyll is
engaged in activities that are meant to hide the Mr. Hyde from public view.

Despite this description of Nixon, Safire did not show any animosity against his former boss and his examination of the foreign policies was middle of the road. For example, Safire simply described Nixon’s trip to China in a manner which is detached but full of details. Safire did not condemn the bombing of Cambodia but simply narrated the events that led to the president's decision. Finally, he dwelt on describing the tricks that some of the people at the White House made that pulled the United States into the whirling vortex of the Vietnam War. Safire did not approve of this particular war.

All the previous literature, except for one book written by Kissinger, was created during the last part of the twentieth century. What do political analysts in the earlier years of the twenty-first century have to say regarding the Nixon-Kissinger China policy? Robert Ross and Jiang Changbin compiled several views, not only of the Nixon-Kissinger China policy, but of the US-China diplomatic relationship.

According to Kirby (2005), before any US-China relationship, and before the moves by Nixon and Kissinger to open diplomatic relations with China, and even before the Cold War, there was already an existing Sino-American conflict. This was right on the heels of the Second World War. The Chinese were allied against the countries that the United States supported during this war. Thus, during the late 1940s and
throughout the 1950s, all activities involving China and the United States were strained with mutual fear.

Then, the Chinese Nationalist army fled to Taiwan. Without the presence of the United States in Asia, China may have summarily dealt with the Nationalists on Taiwan. But, with the American presence, Mao Zedong goal's was modified. According to Preussen, Accinelli and Li, the original goal of crushing the Nationalists was changed into attempting to discourage and disband the Nationalist Army on Taiwan without provoking the United States into declaring war against China.

Obviously, the United States did not welcome a war against the biggest country in Asia and this is why then president, Dwight Eisenhower, and his Secretary of State, John F. Dulles, also utilized measures to avoid provoking the PRC. Bernstein described that the American policy as mirroring the Chinese policy: “One sees that each power was frustrated by its inability to shape the other's foreign policies and international behaviour. Hostility reached a high point during the Taiwan Straits crises where both sides glared at each other but purposely avoided an armed confrontation” (Bernstein, 2005: para. 6)

The US certainly approved of the democratic state that the Nationalists planned to build at the time, but providing too much and too obvious support for Taiwan would place the US in an untenable position with China. There were also ambassadorial talks
that Eisenhower initiated, but historically these were insignificant since no significant agreements were made. Yet these ambassadorial talks established the road of communication for Nixon and Kissinger.

This literature review first presented the need for a foreign policy, as described by Kissinger. But the United States already had several foreign policies, one of which was the China policy. This China policy is sometimes considered the hallmark of the greatest diplomatic skills in American history and it was carried out by Nixon and Kissinger. But there were also critics of the Nixon-Kissinger China policy, and their critiques were usually linked to the Watergate scandal that forced Nixon’s resignation and to the arrogance and duplicity that Kissinger sometimes exhibited. But another view that must be taken, to add another facet to the Nixon-Kissinger China policy, is the foreign policy of China towards the United States. It would appear that both countries have mirror image policies and this is what led to the establishment of diplomatic relations.

Taiwan Issue – Nationalism and Identity

The Taiwan issue is largely about the ideology of nationalism and identity. After being separated from the mainland for decades, Taiwan has developed a unique “Taiwanese” identity. This is the core reason why Taiwan refuses to unify with the PRC and acknowledge the PRC’s “One China Policy”, as it has certainly became a political tool in Taiwan.
In examining this Taiwanese identity, I draw upon Brown’s observations and research into Taiwan’s newly developed national identity. The growing number of nationalists, especially among the younger generations, and their support for independence claims will also be discussed. To explain the significance of the “Taiwanese” mentality, this thesis draws upon Lin’s analysis of Taiwanese people’s emotions towards mainland Chinese. I also draw on Gellner’s definition of Nationalism, and Anderson’s imagined communities to provide a clearer understanding of the new Taiwanese nationalism.

Gellner offers a dynamic framework for examining Nationalism. He points out that Nationalism is an emotional act. Gellner (1983: 1) states that,

“Nationalism as a sentiment, or as a movement, can best be defined in terms of this principle. Nationalist movement is the feeling of anger aroused by the violation of the principle, or the feeling of satisfaction aroused by its fulfilment. …But there is one particular form of the violation of the nationalist principle to which nationalist sentiment is quite particularly sensitive: if the rulers of the political unit belong to a nation other than that of the majority of the ruled, this, for nationalists, constitutes a quite outstandingly intolerable breach of political propriety. This can occur either through the incorporation of the national territory in a larger empire, or by local domination of an alien group.”

Gellner’s view of nationalism provides a model for understanding the emergence of Taiwanese nationalism. The first sign of pan-Taiwanese identity emerged prior to the arrival of Japanese troops in 1895. “James Davidson, an American war correspondent with the Japanese army reported that Taiwan formed a short-lived “Republic of Taiwan” and organised a seven-year resistance to Japanese occupation of the island”
(Brown, 2004: 8). The movement was evidently nationalist, yet it was an unsuccessful attempt to form a nation-state. However, a link to Gellner’s theory of nationalism is apparent. Currently, Taiwan faces pressure from the PRC over unification. The PRC’s forceful political stance, missile testing, and its blocking of global recognition of Taiwan have all encouraged Taiwanese nationalism.

“Nationalism was, first of all, a doctrine of popular freedom and sovereignty” (Hutchinson 1994). For Hutchinson, there are varieties of nationalism, one of which is nationalism for the purposes of liberation; for example, after the first partition of Poland in 1775, the American declaration of independence in 1776, the commencement and second phase of the French revolution in 1789 and 1792, and so on. If we consider China as a kingdom, we will be able to see why Taiwan persists with its independence movement despite possible consequences that may endanger the security of the Taiwan Strait.

Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities* (1991) seeks to comprehend the ideological term “nationalism”. He argues that nationalism and the idea of a nation state is imagined. But nationalism isn’t imaginary. Let’s draw a parallel between Anderson’s view on imagined nationalism and the sense of Taiwanese nationalism. In *Imagined Communities* (1991: 6-7), Anderson states that nationalism: “…is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them. Yet in the minds of each,
lives the image of their communion.” “The nation is imagined as limited because even the largest of them encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic boundaries, beyond which lie other nations.” “It is imagined as sovereign because the concept was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm.” “It is imagined as a community, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship.”

Anderson’s theory provides an explanation for what I define as the incompatibility of the current imagined Taiwanese Identity/Nationalism and the sense of “Taiwanese-ness” with the issue of cross Taiwan Strait relations.

The type of language used in Taiwan and its political overtones show what Anderson regards as the voice of official nationalism. There are two main languages, Chinese and Taiwanese (Min-Nan). Using a certain language in a particular city is an important practice for politicians during election periods or when trying to raise a certain type of political awareness. Taiwanese (Min-Nan) has proven to be the most popular language for gaining votes from independence supporters, as it is a language that demonstrates “Taiwanese-ness”.

Anderson points out that official nationalism emerges when the ruling class feels
threatened by nationalist movements. Forming an official language is a key to securing governmental power. “The philological-lexicographic revolution created and gradually spread the idea of language as personal property, that people who speak and read the same language belong to a certain group, a form of an imagined community” (Anderson, 1991).

Brown’s extensive work on defining Taiwan’s identity provides in-depth analysis valuable for conceptualising the Taiwanese identity and also provides a useful foundation for examining the political rivalry between Taiwan and China. However, while agreeing with Brown’s definition of identity, I will be challenging Brown’s arguments that use identity to define a nation. First, we will look at how Brown defines identity.

Taiwanese identity is mentioned in several publications. How is Taiwan different from the PRC? Brown (2004: 13) conducted a remarkable study of Taiwanese identity, arguing that: “identity is based on social experience, not cultural ideas or ancestry; cultural meanings and social power constitute two distinct, though interacting, systems that affect human behaviour and societies differently; demographic forces such as migration affect human behaviour and societies in yet another why; and human cognition – both cognitive structure and decision-making progresses – mediate the influences of culture, power, and demographic conditions.”
“Identity must be negotiated; [it is] not simply a matter of choice, because identity formation in individuals and groups derives from their interaction with the social and cultural context in which they live. …identity of individuals as members of groups – especially national identity and ethnic identity – are portrayed by political leaders as fixed, with borders that are not based on individuals” (Brown, 2004: 13)

In developing a greater understanding of Taiwanese-ness and trying to examine the intricacies of the Cross-Strait issue from the point of view of the Taiwanese public, I draw heavily from Lin’s analysis of Taiwanese people’s emotions towards the mainland Chinese. His work has influenced much of my research on this topic. In more ways than one, Lin’s work has also reflected, albeit more eloquently, some of my own arguments and views on the “Taiwan Strait problem”.

Lin argues that Taiwanese society is becoming more open and has a different political standpoint, but that no one should avoid this issue: Cross-Strait relations are the key to Taiwan’s development in the future. Misunderstandings come from a lack of communication, especially in the case of China and Taiwan, where each had closed the door to the other for decades before resuming social and business exchanges. Although close social and business ties across the Strait have formed, trust and understanding between the two was still nowhere to be found (Lin 2005).

Lin discusses “the subjective feelings” of the Taiwanese in their view of
contemporary Chinese society. Taiwanese people purposely pay no attention to the changing Chinese society today. They still view the Chinese as third world citizens and ignore the success of mainlanders in global economics. This attitude has placed Taiwan in a disadvantageous position in handling the Cross Strait problem and it may result in a devastating outcome. A poor economy and a war is not something Taiwan can afford (Lin 2005).

But Lin isn’t criticising the Taiwanese people in his book. He only points out the reality and the erroneous emotional political approach taken by the Taiwanese people in facing this sensitive issue. Embracing “Taiwanese-ness” and “de-Chineseness” is not the right path to take (Lin 2005).

Taiwanese politicians are known for their strategy in targeting their supporter groups. In Taiwan, middle and lower working class people are the most enthusiastic in political demonstrations and they discuss politics “with passion”. Lin defines the behaviour of these working class Taiwanese as a “paradox”. He argues that since both China and Taiwan believe in capitalism, it does not matter who is ruling the country – whether it’s the Democratic Progressive Party, the Nationalist Party or even the Communist Party. This would not have any direct affect on the middle and lower working class Taiwanese. Lin believes that this intense interest is due to the dissatisfaction of those people with their reality. Thus, they feel fulfilled when they talk about something that concerns the whole society. They are clearly being
manipulated by politics (Lin 2005).

Furthermore, Lin does not believe that Taiwanese people should forget their pride while facing the PRC government; after all, Taiwan has experience that the PRC can doubtlessly learn from. Taiwan is a small island, but that is no reason for China to disregard its potential. It isn’t right to say, “how far advanced Taiwan is beyond China” in terms of technology, society, living standards, etc. The correct way to describe the situation should be, “How much can Taiwan contribute to or share” with China in terms of their experience. Despite taking different paths and having grown apart from each other, they still have common ancestral roots (Lin 2005).
Chapter 3: The Main Thesis

This chapter discusses the One-China Policy which was formulated and implemented by Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger. It chronicles how the policy came to be, what transpired during the Nixon-Mao meeting in Beijing, what the policy states, and what outstanding issues there are regarding the One-China Policy.

I shall firstly discuss briefly what the United States of America had acknowledged and recognised as the legal government of China prior to Richard Nixon’s term as president, before the formulation and implementation of the One-China Policy. The following is an excerpt from an article written by John J. Tkacik, Jr. in September 5, 2002 for The Heritage Foundation: “On July 25, 1928, driven by a legalistic concern, but not necessarily a practical respect, for the integrity of China’s landmass, the United States concluded that Chiang Kai-Shek’s “Republic of China” (ROC) was about as close as anyone would get to a viable Chinese regime and decided Chiang could represent all of China. Through the 1930s, World War II, and the Chinese Civil War, Washington continued to view the ROC as the sole legal government of China. The ROC, however, was defeated by the Communists in 1949 and for all practical purposes, it was replaced by the “People’s Republic of China” (PRC).” (Tkacik, 2002)

On July 19, 1971, then United States President Richard Nixon made a brief but very
significant announcement (Time 1971). Taking only about ninety seconds of television time, Nixon changed the course of history by making an announcement that modified almost all of the political and social assumptions as well as the patterns of post war diplomacy that were set by his predecessors. The announcement was a fairly simple and not unexpected one from a president: he was to make a state visit. However, the destination and purpose were what made the announcement surprising: Nixon is going “to Beijing to meet with China’s Mao Tse-Tung, sometimes referred to as Mao Zedong, and Premier Zhou Enlai before next May” (Time 1971). The meeting and visit was co-ordinated by then National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger through a secret meeting with Chou in Beijing the previous week. The main objective of his visit was “to seek normalisation of relations between the two countries and also to exchange views on questions of concern to the two sides” (Time Magazine 26/07/1971).

Indeed, the announcement created a stir, soliciting an enthusiastic and excited response from various officials and sectors in US society. It was considered to be a turning point in history primarily because there had not been any form of correspondence between the two countries prior to the Nixon administration. In addition, this propelled Nixon and Kissinger into the global spotlight and to the height of their brilliant careers. This was the first time that a Western head of state would visit Beijing since Mao’s revolutionaries had defeated Chiang Kai-Shek’s government on the mainland in 1949 (Time 1971). This entailed the breaking down of the official
estrangement between the United States and the People’s Republic of China which had been operating for almost twenty-five years. Nixon and Kissinger’s action plan had signalled that it was now the right time to change their stand and to convene and discuss matters that were long overdue. To the American people, their president had demonstrated courage and the determination to improve their country’s international relations. The mere fact that a meeting and a state visit had been set meant that international relationship, regardless of between which countries were now viewed in totally different perspectives.

Nixon’s announcement was met with exuberance because the meeting between he and Mao could signify a resolution or answer to the long-term and bloody Vietnam War. It could also pave the way, slowly but surely, for the two sides to settle their conflicts thereby allowing them to finally address each other civilly. Such conflicts or issues included the status of the Chiang Kai-Shek's Nationalist government in Taiwan, the admission of Beijing to the United Nations, and the establishment of diplomatic relations.

It was later revealed that Kissinger had met with Zhou for sixteen hours prior to the latter inviting the U.S. president for a visit and meeting. This and the eventual invitation for a state visit to Beijing clearly insinuated that there was already some progress regarding the resolution of the outstanding issues because otherwise, both sides would not have deemed it necessary for their national leaders to meet at the
summit level.

As mentioned, this was also a brilliant addition to the resumes of Kissinger and Nixon, especially the latter who has been considered to be perhaps the most embattled US president. This gave Nixon a chance to establish his ability as a peacemaker and public relations strategist, perhaps also a helpful factor to his re-election. A lot of people noticed Nixon’s 360-degree turn from the politician who gained prominence on the basis of impassioned anti-Communism ideals to the state leader who sought to bring together the capitalist and the communist. Clearly, this move was a bid to re-define history. Ironically, two years prior to this announcement, Nixon had urged the bombing of China during the Korean War and for that, the Chinese or Beijing officials had thought Nixon to be a “cunning and crafty swindler and a murderer” (Time 26/07/1971). However, the current turn of events had allowed the US president to walk chin-up in Beijing and meet with leaders Mao and Zhou.

Apparently, the planning for Kissinger’s secret trip as well as Nixon’s shift from anti-Communism to global public relations officer had started as early as Nixon’s election to presidential office. He had asserted earlier that “any American policy toward Asia must come urgently to grips with the reality of China” (Time 26/07/1971). Even in his previous other state visits and foreign trips as president of the United States, Nixon had already expressed to other state and national officials that he would like to see an open communication line with China. He even went to the extent of employing the
assistance of the French and the Canadians to act as intermediaries. Perhaps the most helpful ally and intercessor that Nixon got was then Rumanian President Nicolae Ceausescu who was, by far, the only Communist leader who was on good terms with both Russia and China. The American government also made some modifications in its press releases and public announcements. For instance, then Secretary of State William Rogers had issued several public announcements in which he recommended and justified the need to ease the tension with the Chinese; this was as early as 1969. In addition, in 1970 saw the very first time that a presidential and official document had referred to China formally as the People’s Republic of China since the Communist takeover; the US government had always referred to China as Communist or Red China prior to the issuance and release of this document. After this, President Nixon was always quoted as using that phrase in public and in social functions. This is a clear indication of what Nixon used to say that his administration is “not bound by previous history” (Time 1971) in reference to the relationships of the previous administrations with the Chinese government. In his intention to seek good relations with the emerging superpower in Asia, Nixon had given the Chinese the idea or message that he wanted to resolve and get his country out of its involvement in the Vietnam War.

The first time that the US had expressed its intention to open communication and cooperation channels with China, the latter did not give an immediate and positive response. It was only around late 1969 that Chinese officials demonstrated some
interest. For instance, they had agreed to resume the discussions in Warsaw which had first started in 1955; this was an attempt to explore and negotiate on the options of a possible peaceful co-existence. These discussions were temporarily suspended when the US invaded Cambodia. When the US bombed Laos, the Chinese still had not reacted as vehemently compared to their previous responses to US military movements. By the time the Americans had bombed North Vietnam, the latter had reacted against their Chinese ally, owing to the mild response and reaction that they had shown and given to the Americans. The Chinese had no choice but to reassure them that such was not the case; Zhou Enlai personally led the delegation that pacified the North Vietnamese.

Indeed, the state of affairs as well as the pace of changes had improved in April 1971 (Time 1971). To start things off, the American Ping Pong team had been invited to Beijing for an exhibition game. The US for its part had lowered the trade barriers specifically on non-strategic products. Edgar Snow, an old China correspondent, had returned from a trip to Beijing, bringing with him news that was generally considered to be good but somewhat surprising: that Chinese leader Mao wanted Nixon to visit him, preferably sometime after May of 1972. This is in response to Nixon’s earlier statement in one of his press conferences that he wanted to go to China. The reason for Mao's preferred date was cited as being for political reasons. As early as April of 1971, Nixon, with the help of some of his trusted staff, conducted intensive research and study that eventually concluded with Kissinger’s secret trip to Beijing to meet
with Zhou. At that time, complete secrecy was required and imposed in order to allow some room for further strategizing and action plans and also so that should the discussion yield unfavourable results, it would not cause both parties any humiliation or embarrassment. The strategy was kept well secret, so much that Nixon and Kissinger were said to have worked on it not within the White House for fear of leaks, but in the more secure Lincoln Room. Even the Chinese people were said to be excluded from the secret planning.

Kissinger was eventually able to go on his planned trip. The press release for this trip was that it was supposed to be a foreign trip including five countries and solely for purposes related to resolving the war in Vietnam. He was able to travel to Beijing from Pakistan without arousing suspicion because he had pretended that he was ill with some sort of stomach ailment. Kissinger arrived in Beijing, already aware that Zhou was more than willing to meet with the US president. However, not much has been said about the discussion that transpired between Kissinger and Zhou and even up to now, there is no clear evidence as to how these two were able to convince each other on the advantages of having a summit meeting.

One thing that remains for sure is that this plan and meeting would greatly affect three major outstanding issues of that time. First, it would definitely affect the ongoing Vietnam War even if Nixon had not mentioned it in his announcement. Anyone would say that his trip to Beijing would surely touch on the topic and that was inevitable not
to do so. In fact, people had seen this meeting as an immensely helpful channel or tool through which the war may be resolved and finally put to an end. Although it is accepted that China would not be able to force Hanoi and push for negotiations or a peace pact, the fact that China had great influence over Hanoi owing to the past and present assistance that the former had extended to the latter during the war. People and government officials alike were also predicting that the Chinese leaders were now growing tired of the war because it caused for them nothing but more time, effort, and finances down the drain so that they are more likely to focus on building and strengthening their economic aspects. The US had also assured the Chinese that they will never emerge from the war in any status that would cause humiliation and downfall to the Communist groups. It has also been speculated that Kissinger may have assured Zhou that the US government would push through with their withdrawal plans, culminating with Nixon’s state visit to Beijing. In return, Zhou may have informed Kissinger that the Chinese government would coordinate with Hanoi for possible negotiations and settlement without losing the confidence that they would eventually be able to conquer South Vietnam. In addition, Zhou may have volunteered to manage and organize a meeting that could resolve a settlement for the entire Southeast Asia conflict, a move that would give China an edge over the USSR (Time 1971). However, this never took place because the North Vietnamese diplomats had insisted that the settlement could only be concluded in the peace talks transpiring in Paris.
The second major issue that would be affected tremendously by the Nixon - Mao meeting was the subject of Taiwan. During his monumental announcement, Nixon had indirectly alluded to the US treaty commitment to Taiwan when he stated that his government’s action “in seeking a new relationship with the People’s Republic of China will not be at the expense of our old friends” (Time 1971). As all people know, the position and significance of Taiwan in world affairs at that time was relatively small, almost negligible when compared to that of China’s. As such, anyone could probably predict that even if the US defence commitment to Taiwan was legally binding and the emotional ties between the two are relatively strong and of a high degree, the US government officials could definitely forego and wash their hands clean of Taiwan should China ask them to. In addition, the ideology that the Nationalist government on Taiwan believes in and follows, that of Chiang Kai-Shek being the leader of the whole of China, has long been found to be senseless and weak. However, the US still found it hard to ignore the fact that Taiwan has prosperous and flourishing free economy and perhaps one of the largest non-Communist armed forces in the whole of Asia.

Unfortunately, this does not ring true for the Chinese who consider Taiwan as their highest priority problem. Very early on, there was speculating that China would probably insist that the US withdraw its support of 9,000 military personnel from Taiwan. In preparation for this, the US government has already halted its operations and the sending of regular naval patrols to the Taiwan Strait. Both parties, the US and
China, had, in due course, come to a considerably fair agreement: that the US could keep its treaty obligation to Taiwan and for its part, Beijing would not attack Taiwan.

The third issue that was likely to be touched upon by the summit meeting was of the admission and recognition of the US as to which state, the PRC or the ROC, was the legal government of China. Nixon’s move has caused the US to consider Taiwan’s position in the United Nations (UN) as something that was still on shaky ground. Until that time, the US was one of the sixty-three countries that had acknowledged Taiwan as the legal government of China. However, Nixon’s decision to proceed with Kissinger’s secret visit as well as his courtesy visit to Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai was only indicative of one thing: that his administration now recognizes the Beijing government as the legal government of China.

Both the US and China could enormously benefit from this co-operation. For the Beijing government, perhaps the main motivation was their desire to join the league of powerful nations and to give Communism a place in global politics which would also give them an advantage over the Soviet Union. Indeed, Mao Zedong’s administration would get more deals and benefits at only a little cost. The most significant gain for Beijing was that they would be able to acquire the reputation and credibility as a skilful operator and manager in world affairs. This would also give them an opportunity to strengthen their position in the world economy and in organizations like the UN as well as leverage with other industrialized and powerful
countries. Most of all, it would allow Mao Zedong to finally unite Taiwan with the mainland of China, forming a stronger and bigger nation.

For his part, Nixon saw this as an opportunity to reach toward Asia and to promote his influence and reputation beyond the boundaries of the United States. As mentioned earlier, this would be a good addition to his resume; an excellent passage in the history books; and a good point to remember his name for re-election. This would also eradicate his poor performance record and would entail better and wider success in foreign affairs. As for his country, the US, this will mean an additional ally, bigger and better, in the Asia-Pacific region.

Still, Nixon’s announcement was met with such favourable response that even his critics acknowledged his judgment and ability. The announcement gave the Americans hope for further growth and development, to grow and develop beyond the limits of the United States and to reach out to other continents.

Nixon was viewed as someone who had stepped over the borders and had succeeded in getting rid of the Americans’ fear of Communism. He had justified his decision and strategies by stating in a newspaper briefing that China will one day rise to be “an enormous economic power” (Time 1971). As such, Nixon believed that the isolation of the Chinese people should come to an end because, if not, it might later on post a threat to world peace. The US president also believed that the United States was the
only powerful country that could take steps towards a good relationship with China; other countries could not do that due to various issues including irreconcilable differences in beliefs and political systems. To further rationalise and expound his action plans, Nixon had cited the Chinese - American communities in the West Coast of the US all whom were able to rise out of poverty and had proved to be very law-abiding. He considered the Chinese people as the most industrious in Asia and that China would eventually provide the US with a supply of talented and highly skilful people. Clearly, Nixon now saw Communism less as an adversary or as a fault, an indication that ideology and culture was fast becoming less significant compared to the need to live peacefully and to the necessity to forge good international relations.

The result of the meeting between Nixon and Mao was what has become popularly known as the One China Policy. This is the culmination of Nixon and Kissinger’s historic week long state visit and meeting with the Chinese: a joint communiqué that was made public on February 27, 1972 (the Shanghai Communiqué of 1972). Actually, this was formally called the Shanghai Declaration because it was proclaimed and made public in Shanghai, China in 1972 (Kagan 2003). A declaration, in terms of international diplomacy, it was not a law but rather a statement that has been made or issued by state leaders in order to establish a working policy for international relationships. Based on history and on numerous cases, declarations are often effective in providing order but only for a limited period of time because certain conflicts or issues would surely arise later on, questioning the validity and tautology
of its clauses (Kagan 2003).

This Shanghai joint communiqué was said to have been drafted as early as during Kissinger’s secret visit to Zhou Enlai as part of the groundwork that the two had laid for the coming summit meeting. It was also Kissinger who laid the framework as well as edited and proofread all the details, working until late at night with then Chinese Foreign Minister Qiao Guanha during the Nixon-Mao meeting.

The Shanghai Declaration or the One China Policy was an agreement between the United States, as represented by Nixon and Kissinger, and the People’s Republic of China, as represented by Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai. It recognised there was only one China and that Taiwan was a province, a part of China. The One China Policy had likewise assured the public that both countries would continue to work toward the normalisation of their relations through the expansion of so-called “people-to-people contacts” and the opening of various trade opportunities between them (Shanghai Communiqué, 1972). True enough, it was also, in part, an indirect reference to the Soviet Union when both parties stated that neither of them “should seek hegemony in the Asia Pacific region and [that] each is opposed to [the] efforts by any other country or group of countries to establish such hegemony” (Shanghai Communiqué, 1972).

Earlier, the Chinese and the Americans found it hard to achieve common ground owing to the numerous differences in their political beliefs and culture. Because of
this, Chou had put forward a non-conformist and unconventional draft for the communiqué. This paved the way for the two sides to finally agree on certain terms and conditions. For instance, each country had been allowed to state its own views in separate paragraphs if necessary such as on the issue regarding the ongoing Vietnam War. The US had backed Nixon’s latest peace plan whereas China had articulated that they were still firmly supporting and pushing for the Communist proposal.

Perhaps, in spite of the joint effort to co-operate and iron out all the outstanding issues, the US and the Beijing administration found next to impossible to come to a concrete agreement regarding Taiwan. The US had been working on a dual purpose: it had sought acceptance and improved relations with the Beijing government but at that time, it still recognised Chiang Kai Shek’s Nationalist government in Taiwan as the legal government of China (Shanghai Communiqué, 1972). This was the main reason why the US had a preference for a policy that would advocate and recognise “two Chinas”. On the other hand, Beijing had always viewed the outstanding issues between them and Taiwan as being an internal political matter. They tried to convince the US to withdraw the American troops in Taiwan because they saw this as a violation of their sovereignty. In return, the US was adamant that the Beijing administration should resolve their outstanding issues and conflicts with Taiwan without using force. The two parties were finally able to reconcile these indifferences. Kissinger said that both the US and China were more than willing to meet halfway, setting aside the issues concerning Taiwan; they will certainly not allow any kind of
impediment to surface in their new relationship: “The basic theme of the Nixon trip - and the Shanghai Communiqué – was to put off the issue of Taiwan for the future, to enable the two nations to close the gulf of twenty years and to pursue parallel policies where their interests coincided” (Kissinger, 1979).

The US had declared its “interest in a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question by the Chinese themselves” (Shanghai Communiqué, 1972) and had given in to Beijing’s request by withdrawing its military forces from Taiwan, agreeing to reduce its military support and involvement in Taiwan as the tension in the said area also lessened. The PRC, on the other hand, had rejected the option and suggestion of the existence of “two Chinas”. They were firm in their pronouncement that the government being administered by the PRC should be the sole legal government of China and that Taiwan was just a provincial constituent of China. Hence, the US acknowledged such belief without clarifying its own conviction as to their stand about Taiwan and as to who was the rightful legal government of the “One-China”. This is because Nixon knew that his administration could not just turn its backs upon its commitment to Taiwan.

The term “One-China” had not also been well defined because it could generate different types of interpretation based on the stance and belief of the one interpreting it. The origin of this term may be traced back to the Qing Dynasty (1644-1911) and had been used extensively in various declarations such as that of the Cairo
Declaration in 1943 and the Potsdam Declaration in 1945 (Jue, 2005). In both documents, Taiwan was included and attributed as a Chinese territory that Japan had to restore to the power and administration of the ROC by the end of war (I will give more details later in this chapter). However, the PRC stood firm on its grounds that the ROC had already been defeated in 1949 and should therefore cease to exist. As such, the US had to assure the Beijing government that they were not in favour of Taiwan gaining its independence and, based on a National Security Archive report released in December 11, 2003, Nixon had gone to the extent of assuring the Chinese that he would work against such an outcome.

Up to the present, a lot of people still lack a good understanding of the One-China Policy. Perhaps it would help to detail what actually had transpired during the Nixon state visit to Beijing’s Mao Zedong, as well as some discussion on the contents of the One-China Policy. It is common knowledge that Nixon flew to China on an invitation from Zhou; he was accompanied by his wife, Secretary of State William Rogers, Kissinger, and other officials. The state visit lasted from February 21-28, 1972. Nixon met with Mao on the first day of the visit, discussing and exchanging views on Sino-US relations and some matters regarding world affairs (Joint Communiqué of the United States of America and the People’s Republic of China 1972). Subsequent discussion followed not only between the two national leaders but also between the other American and Chinese officials. Both parties had said that the visit and the meetings were indeed beneficial to both countries because, after so many years, it was
only during this time that the two were able to express and explain their views and actions on a variety of issues. They had also evaluated outstanding international concerns together, detailing each side’s position and opinions about the said matters and how they will be able to face the challenges together as allies.

Early on in their meetings, the Beijing administration stated the grounds and conditions upon which they would enter into an agreement with the US. They had expressed that wherever there is oppression, there is also resistance and that countries yearn for only one thing, and that is independence. People resolve to revolt to gain liberty. Such is the trend in history. The Chinese people advocated equality and deterred bullying and domination of bigger and more powerful countries over the smaller and weaker countries. With this, the Beijing administration was clearly telling the US that they would enter into an agreement only if they are treated as an equal; the agreement should not be to the advantage of US and should not entail US interference on how the Chinese government would prefer to run their country. The Chinese accept the fact that they will probably never gain prominence as a superpower with the same status as that of the US, but they still oppose domination and power politics of any kind. Instead, they opt to support the struggles of the oppressed people and have always advocated campaigns for freedom and liberation. They also believe that one country should never be under the power of another. In this regard, the Chinese had clearly expressed their support to the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. All of these countries have experienced being attacked by the
US; this is an apparent indication that the Chinese may be willing to negotiate with Vietnam on the ongoing warfare but they will not force the latter to go into a settlement with US.

The US also made some statements concerning their side. Foremost of these was an assertion that “peace in Asia and peace in the world requires efforts both to reduce immediate tensions and to eliminate the basic causes of conflict” (Joint Communiqué 1972). This is actually their way of seeking cooperation from China. They had also expressed their willingness to work towards a just and secure peace, fulfilling the aspirations of the people for freedom and development and assuring the Chinese that this relationship shall be devoid of foreign aggression. The US likewise seeks to maintain an open communication line between them and the Beijing government in order to avoid tension, misunderstandings, and conflict later on. They had conveyed that countries should treat each other with mutual respect and should there be any competition, then the contest should be healthy and peaceful; a country, whether big or small, is not always flawless and error-free which means that each and every country in the world is encouraged to evaluate their attitudes and stances from time to time in order to keep their values intact. The US also supports the ideology that the Asian people should be allowed to remain free and to claim their rightful place in the globe without any intervention or meddling from other countries.

Basically, the statements made by the US consisted of private assurances in response
to those given by the Chinese; these were assurances that should the Americans be
allowed to maintain a good relationship with mainland China, they would not attempt
to dominate and interfere with the Chinese government.

Although the social systems of China and the US are entirely different from each
other, they managed to overcome the discrepancies and come to terms of agreement
by considering that the two countries should carry out their relations based on the
principles of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity as well as on equality,
mutable benefit, and peaceful co-existence (Joint Communiqué 1972). As such, the US
and China expressed in the One-China Policy that “…progress toward the
normalization of relations between China and the United States is in the interests of
all countries; both wish to reduce the danger of international military conflict; neither
should seek hegemony in the Asia Pacific region and each is opposed to efforts by
any other country or group of countries to establish such hegemony; and neither is
prepared to negotiate on behalf of any third party or to enter into agreements or
understandings with the other directed at other states.” (Joint Communiqué 1972)

In addition, both China and the US had also aired their view that it would be against
the interest of the international community for countries to group together and
eventually divide the world into various spheres of interests.

A further review of history, specifically of past disputes, reveals that one of the root
causes or stumbling blocks in the negotiations was the US’s association with, and recognition of, Taiwan. As such, the US had given in to the Beijing government’s request to withdraw their military forces and had acknowledged there is only one China. In the Shanghai Declaration, the US reiterated that they “acknowledge” that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait form one China and that includes Taiwan which is a province of China. The US government did not challenge this stand but rather re-affirmed its willingness for a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan issue. Since the Beijing administration had expressed firmly that the dispute between them and Taiwan was purely an internal issue, the US had left the resolving of this concern to the Chinese. Both countries were encouraged to focus their attention on broadening their understanding of each other by discussing key areas such as science and technology, sports, culture, and broadcasting and journalism; these were key areas through which “people-to-people contacts” and regular correspondence would prove to be extremely advantageous.

Another area of great consideration for both parties was that of bilateral trade. This likewise demonstrated excellent mutual benefits for both sides. The US and the PRC had concurred that economic relations, founded on equality and mutual benefit would serve the best interests of the two countries. It is in this regard that they consented to facilitate the progressive development of trade between their nations.

To ensure that the One-China Policy would be implemented smoothly the US and
China both agreed to stay in contact and ensure regular coordination through the various channels available. For instance, an American representative was to be sent to Beijing regularly for evaluation and concrete consultations that would further enhance and contribute to the normalisation of their international relations, as well as to continue their exchange and discussion of views especially those concerning issues that are of common interest to the two countries.

The week-long trip was capped by the expression of hopes of the two countries that all of their discussions and the joint communiqué would assist in the opening up of new opportunities and prospects that could contribute to further enhancement and development of their relationship and to the betterment of their own country’s status. It was also believed that the normalisation of relations between the two countries would not only serve the interests of the concerned Chinese and American parties but would also play a significant role to the encouragement of world peace and in the ease of tension and conflict between Asia and the other continents.

**Behind the One-China Policy – US – People’s Republic of China – Taiwan**

If there was ever a more analogous story that occurred within a time-span of two decades, from the 1960s to the 1970s, it would have to be about the two sides of the Taiwan Strait and of their connection with the most powerful country in the world. As expected, much of the focus went to the bigger China and of the start of a “normal” relationship that had much excited everyone’s expectations and wishes. But this had a
price, the junking of a promising relationship with the other China, the Republic of China, and to observers and pundits, much of what had transpired in this “lesser” story, had been cloaked with much secrecy and media camouflage. And yet, the stage that had been set “with nearly identical casts of characters on the American side and with the pivot of action for both the decision to alter Washington's official commitments in East Asia.” (Tucker, 2005).

This was very important to the US which, emerging into the coming Cold War, was counting down potential enemies and China was seen as an important equation along with the Soviet factor. But the discounting of the Republic of China described as “being one day the United States was wedded to its ally, the Republic of China situated on the island of Taiwan, and the next it had opened relations with the People's Republic, which dominated the mainland”, raised enormous discussion and debate; and that because the sudden shift “was so radical, a myth came to surround it” (Tucker, 2005).

The originators and cultivators of this myth were both President Richard M. Nixon and Henry Kissinger who “told of a bolt-from-the-blue initiative undertaken at great political risk but carried out with consummate skill by the only individuals who could have realised it” (Tucker, 2005) But before one delves into the making and consummation of this myth, it would be helpful to backtrack and examine how the two major players, China and Taiwan came into the set-up.
When Japan defeated China in the Sino-Japanese war in 1895, it made Taiwan into one of its colonies, not really a sore point for the Taiwanese, even as the Japanese like to assert that it was responsible for laying down much of the country’s economic infrastructure. The defeat of Chiang Kai-Shek’s Nationalist Party by Mao Zedong’s Chinese Communist Party in a bitter civil war resulted in an exodus of almost 1.5 million people led by Chiang Kai-Shek, to Taiwan where he transferred the Republic of China with its capital in Taipei. Chiang of course, in the absence of any attempt by the PRC on mainland China to represent itself on the world stage, made the claim for the rest of the mainland on behalf of the ROC.

Even the United States and its allies recognised the ROC and it even remained a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, representing China of course. But in 1971, because of ever shifting currents in some of the world’s dominant player nations, the UN General Assembly voted to make the People’s Republic of China the official representative of China, in effect displacing Taiwan in the Security Council.

The next year, President Nixon’s historic visit to China and the signing of the controversial Shanghai Communiqué effectively committed the US to the PRC, but not without a few important questions raised with very few answers. As is true of myths in general, this one encompassed elements of truth and of fiction, papering over
sins and weighing heavily on future efforts to understand, not just the development of US relations with China, but especially the trajectory of US relations with Taiwan.

What exactly were these issues? How did Taiwan in particular fare amidst this achievement that the popular media touted as a major breakthrough?

Again as has been emphasised earlier, what was ultimately helpful in this regard was a careful analysis of how this re-opening of China played out in the interactions of America’s foreign policy decisions at a crucial time in the Cold War. The question that America was playing to see its enemies in a clearer light certainly belied the fact that it actually had more communists on its side of the fence than did the much feared and hated Soviet Union (Litwak, 2005) But did Nixon and Kissinger really act in the best interests of the US when they made the historic approach to normalise ties with China?

Some don’t think so and raise the important point that “that the means to that laudable end were deeply flawed, that they fundamentally undermined US credibility and sowed the seeds of continuing distrust in United States - Taiwan and United States - China relations.” An argument could be made that Nixon and Kissinger wanted so intensely to realise their goal that they surrendered more than was necessary to achieve it, and the price was paid, not in the near term by the Nixon White House, but over the long term by the people of Taiwan and by US diplomacy writ large (Tucker,
An overview of some recent revelations, most notably, by admissions from some of the players themselves, Nixon and Kissinger would help enlarge and illuminate the background drama that Taiwan played itself and how these have changed the future landscape of East Asian power and the role that the US continues to play in this area.

In newly declassified documents in 2003, available at the National Security Archives, President Nixon actually assured the People’s Republic of China during his Beijing trip that while the US “would not support, but could not suppress, the Taiwan independence movement.” These documents show the secrecy of these assurances, something that had been hidden from the general public for over two decades which still supports the kind of foreign policy that the US applies to Taiwan up to this day. (NSA, 2003)

More revealing in the documents were transcripts that showed how nervous and anxious China was over the possibility that Taiwan could actively assert its independence, which contradicts Henry Kissinger’s memoir account that they "spent very little of our time" on Taiwan. Also revealed by the documents was the extent to which the US was taking the Soviet threat seriously. During the same Beijing trip, “Kissinger also gave the Chinese a top secret intelligence briefing on Soviet forces arrayed against China.” (NSA, 2003)
In later interviews, Kissinger would never deviate from the outward appearances that the Beijing trip afforded. Asked about China being one of his great successes and of why rapprochement was the key word used, he replied: “The principal reason for seeking a rapprochement with China was to restore fluidity to the overall international situation. If there are five players and you can't deal with one of them, it produces rigidity. Secondly, we wanted to demonstrate to the American public that Vietnam was an aberration, that we had ideas for the construction of peace on a global scale. And thirdly, we wanted to isolate Vietnam”. (NSA, 2006)

There is no mention of Taiwan in the equation even as he along with most of Nixon’s close aides and advisers continued to press the obvious tension between China and the Soviet Union. In fact, if one is to make a blunt judgment of it, Taiwan, at least in that time frame and context probably wasn’t important enough of a variable to be included in what was always touted according to Kissinger as a triangular relationship between Russia, the United States and China, “in which we attempted to be closer to each of them than they were to each other so we could calibrate our policy in relation to specific crises that arose in relation to our national interests” (NSA, 2005). The only reference to Taiwan would be his assertion that this policy would give America “much greater flexibility in relationship with other Asian nations that were under the shadow of China.” (NSA, 2005)
Still, there is much of that modest bragging of how historic and overtly unpredictable the whole China thing was even as documents mentioned have revealed much of it already pre-planned. Asked when he stepped down about his feelings on China, Kissinger luxuriates in the large expanse of that moment: “when you read about great events, people always think that there was an elevated feeling. When I stepped off that Pakistani jet in Beijing, my major concern was whom I was going to meet and how were we going to conduct the conversation. I didn't put my foot down and say, "Now I've just made history, and this will never be forgotten." I thought "Whom am I going to meet, and how am I going to bring it to a conclusion?" (NSA, 2006)

Nixon of course couldn’t be far behind as Kissinger drew him in even as he downplayed the impact of the moment with some modest parrying saying that he knew they had made the history; But “Nixon had a different problem from me: Nixon was President, and Nixon rehearsed what he would say when he reached China; and that was quite appropriate: he needed to make an impact”. (Kissinger, 2001)

Yet away from the seeming pretence at some spontaneous and totally unpredictable challenge that lay before them, the facts as revealed by declassified documents show a much more dramatic and calculated drama that also revealed the extent to which Taiwan was involved, an involvement that was of course downplayed and even pushed further back into the shadows. The documents included such tidbit as Premier Zhou Enlai's claim that Washington had let pro-independence politician Peng Ming-
min escape from Taiwan, to which Nixon and Kissinger denied that Washington had
given any help and assured Zhou that they opposed Taiwanese independence (NSA,
2006). There were also Nixon’s repeated assurances to Zhou that Washington would
discourage any Japanese "military intervention" in South Korea or a Japanese role in
Taiwan.

Far from the generic assertions that sought to make the Soviets think that the visit was
simply one of diplomacy, there was Kissinger's detailed run-down of Soviet forces
along China's borders, including ground forces, tactical aircraft and missiles, strategic
air defences, and strategic missiles, with special attention to nuclear weapons (NSA,
2006)

On the home-front, this presents an intriguing look into how Nixon and Kissinger
were playing the game domestically even as Kissinger told the Chinese that; "none of
our colleagues know that we have given you this information and nobody in our
government except for the President and these people here know that we have given
you this information. The intelligence people do not know that we have given you this
information." (Burr, 2000)

This revelation is pivotal to understanding how much of the game had been
manoeuvred not by any strong outside forces, although the Cold War certainly
affected much of it, but rather showed the shrewdness, intelligence and political
courage of men such as Kissinger. Kissinger had always insisted that as Security Adviser, he didn’t run a bureaucracy, so therefore, if the White House were to conduct any negotiation, it had to be done by a back channel. (Kissinger, 2000) When he was Secretary of State, he said that there was lack of a back channel and that the need for one was specifically made for President Nixon who could be in a difficult situation if there wasn’t one.

President Nixon, who was very decisive and very capable of making big decisions, was not however capable “…in overruling subordinates to their face, and therefore he found it very, very painful – in fact he found it, for all practical purposes, impossible - to tell a bureaucracy, I disagree with you, and you will do it my way.” (Kissinger, 1979) And thus a back channel had been set up precisely for the China negotiations to avoid that complication.

William Burr in the Kissinger Transcripts however paints a different picture of the esteemed diplomat and downgrades the event as nothing more than a glorified photo-op saying that the “symbolism of the initial opening of China aside, the transcripts suggest there was little substance in the US - Chinese relationship, which does seem more like a pantomime to impress the Soviets than a real partnership.” Reviewers such as Zellikow concur that indeed, only when Kissinger and Mao talked about the villainous Soviets could they find a truly engaging subject if only for a few minutes. In the end, the transcripts are more interesting for what they reveal about the Chinese
and the Soviets than about the better-known Dr. Kissinger (1999).

Though much of the credit has been given to Henry Kissinger, which is not surprising because of the man’s impeccable savvy and diplomatic shrewdness, Nixon’s role, overshadowed later by the Watergate scandal that saw him resign from the White House, was also important, as his decisions (and solely made by him) laid the foundations of both America’s Asian foreign policies as well as Taiwan’s rise to power. So how exactly can we define Nixon’s role in this context and in the greater perspective of foreign-policy making by the United States and of his predecessors? In Robert Litwak’s very incisive and revealing book, *Détente and the Nixon Doctrine*, two very important foreign policy key words have been dissected, their greater significances explored beyond the historic Beijing visit.

Litwak opens for discussion the conventional wisdom which holds that when President Richard M. Nixon came into office in January 1969, he already had in place the defined set of foreign-policy principles that later came to be known as the “Nixon Doctrine.” Records from the Department of State show a far different set of facts which also corroborate Kissinger’s statements about how the rapprochement came about; obviously, Nixon was going through the whole thing in a far more casual and spontaneous manner than anyone had initially thought.

Within days of his inauguration, Nixon ordered that “every encouragement” be given
to speculation that the United States sought rapprochement with the PRC. Through Kissinger, Nixon issued National Security Study Memorandum (NSSM) 14, U.S. China Policy, on February 5, 1969. Although these documents indicate that the original impetus for re-examining policy toward the PRC came from Nixon, Kissinger’s enthusiasm for a major initiative toward China grew rapidly (Department of Security, 2006).

Further records from this period show the responses to this directive (NSSM 14) along with top level meetings that ultimately outlined the direction of US policies. The Department of State considered numerous strategies and various options—Present Strategy, Intensified Deterrence and Isolation, or Reduction of PRC’s Isolation and Points of US-PRC Conflict”—but ultimately, all “discussions tended to focus on how the United States could reduce tensions, and whether the PRC would be receptive to any initiative.” (DOS, 2006) In the midst of all these, Nixon and Kissinger were also playing delicate manoeuvres and diplomatic magic with Taiwan.

From 1969 right up to the middle of 1971, things were going smoothly between the US and the ROC, but in the background things were brewing that threatened to blow the whole thing wide open. Foremost was the growing concern and unease of Chiang Kai-Shek’s government over the seeming lessening of hostilities between the US and the mainland. American security and defence departments persisted in their efforts to monitor and reduce the military build-up of the ROC.
When in 1969, information on the planned modification of travel and trade restrictions to the PRC came out, Rogers and Kissinger scrambled for damage control by assuring ROC leaders that “there had been no change in basic US policy toward Communist China.” Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia and the Pacific, Marshall Green, Ambassador to the ROC, Walter McConaughy, and Rogers met separately with ROC leaders to explain the lessening of US-PRC tensions and the end of the Taiwan Strait patrols. Kissinger also met with the ROC Ambassador to the United States, Chow Shu-Kai. (DOS, 2006)

During the Warsaw Talks in early 1970, Nixon assured Chiang that meetings with PRC officials would not in any way affect US Defence commitments to Taiwan. But things were definitely not going the way they had before as more diplomatic complications arose. When the United States grudgingly accepted the admission of Taiwanese dissident Peng Ming-Min into the country, the ROC wasted no time in accusing America of explicitly supporting the Taiwanese independence movement even as Kissinger and the Department of State defended the move on the grounds of the US having no legal basis for refusing entry.

When Chiang Kai-shek’s son, the then Vice Premier Chiang Ching-kuo visited the US and met with Nixon in 1970, he raised concerns over the Warsaw talks and expressed the general sentiment of the ROC that US attention was diverted to Southeast Asia to
the detriment of ROC security. He also spoke with Kissinger and Defence Secretary Melvin R. Laird about the issue of army weapons and unequivocal American support in this regard (Kimball, 2006).

Still, the tensions grew as more eye-opening developments seemed to signal an inevitable American rapprochement with the PRC. One issue was the reversion of Okinawa to Japan and the final disposition of the Senkaku (Diaoyutai in Chinese) Islands, which are located roughly between Okinawa and Taiwan. Ambassador Chow Shu-kai urged Nixon and Kissinger to state publicly that any Japanese-American treaty would not prejudice ROC claims to these small islands (Kimball, 2006).

By and large, there seemed to be no stopping the inevitable, and records released by the State Department detailing the days and events leading up to Nixon’s trip to Beijing showed how and where Taiwan fitted in the scheme of things.

One of the most interesting transcripts prepared for this volume from the White House tapes covers a long conversation between Nixon and Kissinger on the eve of the February trip to the PRC. (192) Kissinger remarked that the Chinese are “just as dangerous (as the Russians). In fact they’re more dangerous over an historical period.” This fascinating discussion touched upon almost all aspects of Sino-American relations and the US role in East Asia. Nixon made clear his concerns over appearing to abandon the ROC or reduce its presence in East Asia (DOS, 2006).
Through this difficult time, Kissinger was always indispensably on Nixon’s side and in a memorandum that he prepared for the president titled “Mao, Zhou and the Chinese Litmus Test”, he urged that Nixon to show “seriousness and reliability” in talks with the PRC leaders, revealing exactly not only his influence, but incisive perception of the situation (Kissinger, 1979)

All throughout the discussions with Zhou, the issue of the ROC remained constant. Continuing where Kissinger had left off, Nixon affirmed the belief that the war in Southeast Asia was connected to the US presence in Taiwan and reiterated the assurance made by Kissinger that two-thirds of the US forces on the island could be reduced or totally removed if it would take that to resolve the war. Knowing full well by that time the possible repercussions of the communiqué, Nixon played up the tension drama further; “what we say here may make it impossible for me to deliver on what I can do.” Nixon claimed that three groups wanted his trip to China to fail: those on the left because they wanted better relations with the Soviets; those on the right who for “deeply principled ideological reasons” wanted to support the ROC; and supporters of India who feared Sino - American détente. (CRS, 2006)

But the die had been cast and as for the PRC, Zhou’s statements in the official declassified transcripts show a certain cryptic-ness typical of the Chinese, but hinting at the PRC’s future dealings with its so-called renegade province. However, as Zhou
stated on the final day of Nixon’s trip, “That is, we being so big, have already let the Taiwan issue remain for 22 years, and can still afford to let it wait there for a time. Although the issue of Taiwan is an obstacle to the normalization of our relations, yet we are not rushing to make use of the opponents of your present visit and attempt to solve all the questions and place you in an embarrassing position.” (NSA, 2006)

More revealing, and affirming the analysis of many on the right, was a memorandum by President Nixon to his top men (Rogers and Kissinger) which emphasised “the need to avoid public speculation over the impact of the trip to the PRC, and “there should be no further elaboration” on the communiqué, particularly those sections related to Taiwan.”(Nixon, 1990)

Inevitably in the days that followed, the United States sought to effect damage control over the effects of the secret meeting, in particular with Taiwan, although the tone was now that of what was done was done. Nixon himself hinted as much in a meeting with the American Ambassador to the ROC Walter McConaughy when he instructed him to tell the Taiwanese leadership that the US would continue favourable ties with the ROC. In typical counterpart fashion, Kissinger made his own moves when he met ROC Ambassador to the US James Shen to offer America’s continued support saying that, “nothing in his tenure in the White House had been more painful to him than what had occurred (the secrecy over Dr. Kissinger’s trip to Beijing and the announcement of the President’s visit).” But after all has been said and done, the final
analysis seemed to be agreement and that according to Nancy Tucker, “their promises were bigger, their compromises more thoroughgoing, and their concessions more fundamental than they believed the American people would readily accept.” (2005)

At the end of the day, what became more prominent was not the persuasive and diplomatic suaveness of the Beijing brokers, nor of an issue made out to be so urgent as to possibly threaten or provoke another tension-filled crisis, but of a deception made to cover what ultimately turned out to be vested interests. To Nixon and Kissinger, the overarching geopolitical significance of a relationship with China justified eliminating all intervening obstacles. Thus the effort to replace an established relationship with the Republic of China in favour of an exciting new tie with a more exotic mainland China progressed in secret, involving a minimum of staff to provide analysis. The pace was gruelling, and the focus relentlessly on Beijing. (Tucker, 2005)

In truth, Nixon and Kissinger hardly worried about the ROC leadership under Chiang Kai-shek; documents and records show that most of the actions taken to assuage Taiwan were simply nothing more than bland assurances. But at the end of the day, what really matters was how the people of the Republic of China felt about the events and of how it shaped their lives and the direction of their future endeavours. For most impassioned Taiwanese, their bitterness over the events was tinged not with absolute anger, but by a clear understanding of their position in the context of ever changing political currents, now swirling on a global scale.
The “creative ambiguity” of the Shanghai Communiqué, was the way in which the Beijing authorities were recognised as the government representing China, but in which the United States stated that it “acknowledged” the Chinese position, that there was but one China, and that Taiwan was part of China (New Taiwan, 2006).

There was a clarification in the wording of the communiqué; did it mean that the US “recognised” that Taiwan was part of China? The answer seemed to be an unequivocal, no, because the US simply took note of the Chinese position but did not state its own position in the matter (NT, 2006). The consensus however and events after 1972 showed that this distinction did not particularly matter anymore in the sense that if American actions are to be taken as an indication, the position was an outright rejection of recognition. But Taiwan has obviously moved on and has disregarded at least in principle any binding connections or communiqués with either the US or China pointing out in regard to those made without the proper representation of the people of Taiwan, such arrangements were moot.

The Taiwanese were proud to point out that they have made a very successful transition towards a very healthy democratic system. There was much agreement and pride that the new and democratic Taiwan “does not want to be a part of a repressive, dictatorial, and corrupt China, but cherishes its own Taiwanese identity, language, culture, and newfound political freedom and that this new nation wants to find its own
place under the sun, [and] contribute not only economically, but also politically to the international community.” (New Taiwan, 2006)

When the PRC celebrated its 50th anniversary in 1999, the ROC did not miss the opportunity to also celebrate its 50th anniversary on Taiwan, noting the significance of the fact that for over the past half-century, “order has been maintained in the Taiwan Strait through the "American model of peace" (the 1972 system), supported by the US-ROC Mutual Defence Treaty, the Shanghai Communiqué of 1972 and the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979.” (Wakabayashi, 1999)

While recognising the constant desire by mainland China to shake things up a bit with them, the Taiwanese have pointed out striking parallels in the fates of the two, pointing out that “while successful commercialisation has raised China's economic status in the international community, a reality that China cannot ignore is that Taiwan's 10-year-old democracy has gradually been asserting itself in the international political arena” (Wakabayashi, 1999)

And this is something that the PRC and the rest of the international community cannot ignore, least of all the United States which may have abandoned the ROC at a time when the PRC factor weighed heavier, but in some ways retained crucial links in recognition of the ROC’s importance in the region as being vital to future American interests. However, the US did not abandon its promise to defend Taiwan. In the
Shanghai Communiqué, the US advocated a “peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue.” Despite its gradual termination of direct military aid to Taiwan in the 1970s, the US steadfastly upheld its promise to provide military technology. After severing formal diplomatic relations with Taiwan, the US used the Taiwan Relations Act as a policy basis for selling "defensive weapons" to Taiwan (Wakabayashi, 1999)

The transformation across the Taiwan Strait began almost immediately, although the 'status quo' then and until today remains unchanged. The argument is that the so-called US model of peace was a double-edged sword; the rapprochement may have appeased fears for the PRC, but that in “maintaining only "civic relations" with Taiwan, the international community also denied the statehood of the KMT's colonial regime on Taiwan. Even so, the PRC has never actually ruled Taiwan because of the US promise of indirect defence.” (Wakabayashi, 1999)

The contradiction even extends as far as to the US policy of "peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue", which has indefinitely postponed an end to the civil war, which was actually the Chinese Communist Party's expectation and that while the international community overwhelmingly abandoned the lie of "the PRC not being China's legitimate government," it also imposed the false appearance of the ROC on Taiwan not being a state.” (Wakabayashi, 1999)

But beyond whatever political contradictions or mysteries the agreement may present,
one thing was certain, and that is the fact that after 1972 Taiwan was spurred to unprecedented growth on all fronts, social, political and economic. Politically, there was a plenty of experimentation and change; Chiang Kai-Shek’s son, Chiang Ching-Kuo, for one, tried a form of limited democratization which held elections for representation; this was a means of coping with the repercussions of the Beijing visit.

There was also effort by the Nationalist government to adopt a thoroughly Taiwanese identity and to appoint personnel and bureaucrats in the government whose Chinese ancestors had arrived in Taiwan before 1945. But the democratization process really began in the late 1980s when President Chiang Ching-Kuo lifted martial law, thus enlarging the democratic landscape of the country. His death and the subsequent assumption of a leader Lee Teng-Hui whose lineage belonged to early immigrants to Taiwan meant that things had come full circle.

On the economic side, a much heavier impact on Taiwan’s fledgling economy was not from the repercussions of the Beijing visit, but the first energy crisis which became the catalyst of a worldwide recession, raising inflation to record levels. In the ROC, commodity prices soared, as shortages of food and industrial raw materials added to the country's woes. Although commodity prices did not increase as much during the second energy crisis in 1979 as they did during the first, it still produced an adverse impact on economic growth (GIO, 2006)
Relying on its ingenuity, the government tried to deflect the impact of the energy crisis by setting up a heavy chemicals industry through the Twelve Major Construction Projects. Internal economic reforms and changes were implemented to boost foreign trade; these included lifting many trade restrictions, lowered tariffs, setting up of a unitary exchange rate, and abolishing the required permits for remitting money abroad. In 1979, the foreign exchange rate system went from a fixed rate to a floating rate, while controls on interest rates were loosened the next year (GIO, 2006). It was ironic that the period between 1963 and 1980, also the most turbulent politically, considered as having witnessed the most economic rapid growth in the history of Taiwan and that regardless of the successive energy crises, annual growth rates had been hovering at over 10 percent annually in a sustained decade long run.

The 80s became pivotal in a whirlwind of economic, social, and political changes highlighted by a surprising renewal of relations with the mainland as Taiwan’s economy became more and more open, shedding restrictive and protectionist policies and trends. In 1984, the first steps towards genuine openness happened when the ROC leadership laid the groundwork for both the globalization and liberalization of the economy. This was marked by the abolition of interest-rate controls, the slashing of tariff rates and the doing away of a central exchange rate.

With the establishment of the Hsinchu Science-based Industrial Park in 1981, Taiwan established a strong foundation for the industrial development which would later
prove to be its strongest point, with the following years seeing several more strategic developments in this area; in 1990, the Statutes for the Encouragement of Investment were allowed to expire and in 1991, the Statutes for Industrial Upgrading were adopted (GIO, 2006)

ROC foreign-exchange reserves ballooned to stratospheric levels because of the rapid growth of trade and of its attendant surpluses, reaching beyond the US$ 70 billion level. But because there weren’t enough provisions and channels to push these reserves into appropriate investment areas, the buoyed up stock market finally peaked and burst, exacerbated by inflated real-estate markets, the black market and unabated gambling. This resultant appreciation of the New Taiwan dollar against the US dollar meant lower competitiveness among small and medium sized companies and businesses that saw the practicality of finding other areas with more stable business climates. This proved to be another turning point for Taiwanese, who quickly understood the need for drastic measures to turn the industrial sector around as the landscape shifted.

Labour-intensive industries were no longer the mainstay of the industrial sector and were slowly being replaced by technology- and capital-intensive industries. This transformation of Taiwan's industrial structure stemmed in part from global economic trends at that time. The government's plans for technological development toward the end of the 1970s, which led to the establishment of the Hsinchu Science-based
Industrial Park in 1981, also played a hand in this transformation (GIO, 2006)

It was this same innovative industrial park that made the smart move of recruiting highly skilled Chinese who lived overseas to return to Taiwan for work, thus effectively using their technological talents to developing what would later become the country’s globally competitive strongholds in the electronics and information industries. To illustrate all these in numbers: in terms of production value, the ratio of light industries to heavy chemical industries, respectively, was 51.52 percent to 48.48 percent in 1986. In 1995, the output of the light industries dropped to only 33.63 percent, while the heavy chemical industries' share rose to 66.37 percent (GIO, 2006).

It is important to note the year 1987 not only because socially, martial law was lifted giving voice to a wide variety of social complaints and grievances that needed airing, but also because it was the year that saw the start of civilian contacts with the Chinese mainland.

In 1987, the ROC government announced that Taiwan residents could visit their relatives on the Chinese mainland, an event that led to growing private exchanges between the two sides. By 1996, Taiwan's business sector had invested US$6 billion on the mainland, according to the ROC's official records. However, according to Beijing's statistics, the figure surpassed US$20 billion (GIO, 2006)
It would seem therefore that in the politics of economics, the stronger voice would be the voice of need, and judging by the numbers from investments made in the mainland by the private sector, cross-strait trade will continue regardless of any political turbulence. Ironically, all the investment and trading with the mainland has effectively decreased the value of the same business with the United States.

“Over the last three years, Taiwan has registered trade surpluses with Hong Kong: this surplus amounted to US$19.73 billion in 1994, US$24.26 billion in 1995, and US$25.1 billion in 1996. A major part of the exports were actually destined for the Chinese mainland through Hong Kong.” (GIO, 2006)

What could have been perceived as hindrances to one’s growth to prosperity have even become assets that worked to Taiwan’s advantage. Take the case of the ROC’s exclusion from the United Nations which meant that it could also not participate or take advantage of World Bank programs, not that it needs them. It doesn’t!

Because of this Taiwan had to beef up its foreign reserves to be able to demonstrate that it could do business on a scale demanded by stringent global standards and as a result, “more than 100 nations have established trade and cultural ties with Taiwan, proving that having extensive foreign-exchange reserves helps demonstrate commanding solid financial power.” Substantial foreign reserves also ensured protection for the domestic market should any emergency arise, and, more
importantly, it does away with expensive foreign loans that have become the bane of most countries at the mercy of World Bank grants.

The Taiwanese would hate to boast, but comparisons with the United States in economic achievements cannot be avoided even as the memories of the surprise Beijing visit seem to be hazy. By the end of the 1980s, the United States had already become the number one debtor nation in the world, despite its outstanding economic achievements. Meanwhile, the ROC has not accumulated much foreign debt. In 1986, the ROC's foreign debts stood at roughly US$4 billion; however, by 1987 this figure had already been reduced to US$1.4 billion (GIO, 2006)

But more than figures, the Taiwanese would rather hinge their prosperity on good old-fashioned hard work and dedication. It couldn’t be helped however that the Taiwanese have achieved a level of prosperity that arouses envy in the length of time it took to achieve it.

In Taiwan today, 85 percent of people own their own homes. In terms of penetration of major home appliances such as television sets and telephones, Taiwan has almost reached the same level as England and the United States, with just about every single household possessing such luxuries. The number of households in Taiwan that own automobiles and personal computers is also rising, and is expected to reach the level of the developed world in less than ten years. (GIO, 2006)
Through all these, Taiwan was keen on sharing its economic development experience with the rest of the world. Without so much criticism, it cited the way the United States tried to impose its own methods, which when tested against Taiwan’s fell short of guarantees in the sense that while the US was a country of numerous resources and riches, it never really had the important context of struggling through poverty and near impossible hardship.

Japan may make a pitch for its own success-story, and while the Japanese are much vaunted for their precise management skills, their rigid cultural casting makes them virtually impossible to emulate. But even as progress may have been pegged and the formula almost perfected, an economy is still subject to the flux of time with all of its twists and turns, not all of them quite positive.

Today, like most affluent countries, Taiwan has to import labour and this has become expensive and socially problematic. On this front, it has pegged its strategy of using smarter technology and techniques to overcome the labour problem. The natural environment has proven to be a daunting obstacle simply because as a small island, Taiwan’s geographical profile has raised concerns over natural disasters such as earthquakes and typhoons and resultant damage like erosion and flooding, which threaten its agriculture and aquaculture production.
On the issues of trade, mainland China again presented a double-edged sword as concerns were raised over further liberalisation of imports which would literally flood Taiwan with products from the mainland, and over the direction of outward investments which has pitted manufacturers against government policy makers. The general sentiment on this issue was that “clearly, government and industry need to work together to reach a consensus that balances national security with economic development.”

Again, social factors like population growth accompanied imbalances on the labour front as the proportion of people under the age of 18 continued to decrease, with a higher percentage of older people. This of course might result in an unfavourable situation where a majority of dependent people rely on a minority of productive people. On the issue of economic partnerships with other countries, the equation changed when the game was no longer one on one. With economic regions such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the European Union (EU) shaping up all over the world, analysts are pointing out that Taiwan’s membership in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum might raise some questions when Beijing raises its own questions.

This again brings the whole discussion back to the One-China policy and how it continues to exert enormous unseen forces in the interplay of political, social and economic movements in the East Asian region. This is despite the call that if Taiwan,
Hong Kong, Macau, and the Chinese mainland can all put aside their political differences and work together toward enhancing economic interaction and realising their potential to support each other, they will be able to drive the continued economic development of the Asia-Pacific region.

According to a CRS Report made for Congress on the current status quo of the One-China policy made last September, 2006, the same issues remain at best, enigmatic and still unresolved. The report sums it up as despite “consistent statements in over three decades, the “one China” policy concerning Taiwan remains somewhat ambiguous and subject to different interpretations.” Perhaps this was the way it was designed.

Aside from the main question of whether the “one China” policy is still ideologically alive given the redefined contextual position it now occupies, the report also notes that much of the confusion and issues have arisen from the succession of American presidents after Nixon and whether they “have stated clear positions and have changed or should change policy, affecting U.S. vital interests in peace and stability” (CRS, 2006)

In a 2005 article in the Washington Post, Henry Kissinger himself cited this same ambiguity, saying that “the relationship between the United States and China is beset by ambiguity. On the one hand, it represents perhaps the most consistent expression
of a bipartisan, long-range American foreign policy." He goes on to say, however, that “seven presidents have affirmed the importance of cooperative relations with China and the US commitment to a One-China policy -- albeit with temporary detours at the beginning of the Reagan, Clinton and George W. Bush administrations.”

Kissinger made a pitch to the Bush administration when he mentioned that President Bush and his foreign-policy people have compared the current state of relations with China as equalling that when Kissinger brokered the Beijing visit in 1971 and that heads of state of both countries plan to make future reciprocal visits for various issues and forums. But of course, it is not surprising that Kissinger would still be praising the fruits of Beijing in 1971. He even manages to turn the ambivalence around and attribute it to others; various officials, members of Congress and the media for attacking China's policies, from the exchange rate to military build up; he describes “much of it [as being] in a tone implying China is on some sort of probation. To many, China's rise has become the most significant challenge to US security.” (Kissinger, 2005) But even if it isn’t, as present events would prove that the PRC is more concerned over containing the problems brought about by its burgeoning economy, Kissinger plods on, reiterating his own rhetoric of 50 years ago, updated yes, but still the same.

It is unwise to substitute China for the Soviet Union in our thinking and to apply to it the policy of military containment of the Cold War. The Soviet Union was heir to an
imperialist tradition, which, between Peter the Great and the end of World War II, projected Russia from the region around Moscow to the centre of Europe (Kissinger, 2005) He makes the assurance that after all is said and done, “the challenge China poses for the medium-term future will, in all likelihood, be political and economic, not military.”

On the issue of Taiwan, he says categorically that the “problem of Taiwan is an exception and is often invoked as a potential trigger. This could happen if either side abandons the restraint that has characterised US - Chinese relations on the subject for over a generation. But it is far from inevitable. Almost all countries -- and all major ones -- have recognised China's claim that Taiwan is part of China.” (Kissinger, 2005)

So what does this mean? A perpetual unresolved issue until such time that one gives in: which is asking for the impossible. And this is regardless of business as usual on all sides, to which Kissinger notes that “ despite substantial US arms sales to Taiwan, Sino-American relations have steadily improved based on three principles: “American recognition of the One-China Policy and opposition to an independent Taiwan; China's understanding that the United States requires the solution to be peaceful and is prepared to vindicate that principle; restraint by all parties in not exacerbating tensions in the Taiwan Strait.” (Kissinger, 2005)

Kissinger’s suggestion is as revealing as it is accurate; the answer for now is “to keep
the Taiwan issue in a negotiating framework.” He then cites the recent visits to Beijing by the heads of two of Taiwan's three major parties as possible forerunners and that talks on reducing the build up in the Taiwan Strait seem feasible. And again, similar to the same attitude he displayed in Beijing in 1971, Kissinger is really more worried about the prospects of decisions made by China on the political and economic front and of its effects on the world. Taiwan and the issue of the One-China policy may have to wait on the diplomatic sidelines, suspended in foreign policy limbo. But even as these sentiments may seem impatient in calling for a re-definition of One-China in light of Taiwan’s amazing and profound transformation from authoritarianism to democracy, the decision still lies not on the US, but on the main players themselves, the PRC and the ROC.

In Stanton Jue’s commentary for the AmericaDiplomacy.org he says quite succinctly, “that neither the PRC nor the ROC has ever retreated from the notion that Taiwan is part of China, and its claim of sovereignty over the island is not in dispute.” (2006)

Beijing emphasised it again by saying that “the Adherence to the principle of one China is the basis and premise for peaceful reunification. China’s sovereignty and territory must never be allowed to suffer [a] split. We must firmly oppose any words or actions aimed at creating an independent Taiwan and the propositions which are in contravention of the principle of one China.” (Jue, 2006)
One-China Policy – Taiwan and the United States

Indeed, the One-China Policy has been around for more than three decades now and the American government remain firm in its stand that “the United States acknowledges that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait maintain there is but one China and that Taiwan is a part of China. The United States does not challenge that position” (Tkacik 2002). This declaration has been a mantra for every US president since Nixon. Perhaps because people believed that if they say it often enough then it would someday become true and that all issues surrounding it would just vanish into thin air. In addition, the US administration has also consistently mentioned and stated in numerous press releases that the US will not support any movement or plan by Taiwan intended for the purpose of obtaining their independence and freedom from mainland China even if they have sworn to assist and to come to Taiwan’s defence should the need arise through the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979. However, one thing is for sure through the years and that is the One China Policy has evolved with time and with the circumstances surrounding not only the US and China but also Taiwan. For instance, this declaration has developed and advanced to cover three new related areas such as sovereignty, use of force, and cross-strait dialogue.

With regards to sovereignty, the US has never openly expressed its stand about Taiwan. In fact, in 1972 when the One-China Policy was first declared and made public, the US government still had certain inklings that it still recognised the
Republic of China in Taiwan as the legal government and representative of China. The shift in diplomatic recognition from the ROC to the PRC only formally occurred in 1979 as documented in the Normalisation Communiqué which was signed and declared on January 1. To further reiterate and reinforce these declarations, a later communiqué concerning arms sales was announced on August 17, 1982, stating in plain black and white that the US did not have any intention of pursuing the idea of having “two Chinas”, “One-China, One-Taiwan” or even the “One-China, two systems” (Kan 2001). Likewise, American presidents from Nixon onwards have released statements saying that the Taiwan issue is an internal matter, meaning that it should be left or set aside for the Chinese people on both sides of the Taiwan Strait to resolve. The matter is not on the hands of the US and they are not supposed to meddle in “internal” affairs because there is another passage in the Shanghai Declaration, to the effect that neither the US nor China should interfere with the affairs of the other. Furthermore, the Taiwan Relations Act did not make any mention of the One-China Policy.

In January 1979, the Carter Administration directly recognised China as the sole and legitimate government across China. It also broke official diplomatic ties with Republic of China on Taiwan. Along with the proclamation, the US government maintained three important points that would be used as basis for future relations with Taiwan. According to them, although the US recognised the People’s Republic of China as the sole representative of the Chinese people in the international arena, it
would still continue to maintain its commercial, cultural and non-governmental ties with Taiwan.

Although the Carter administration had decided to break diplomatic ties with Taiwan, supporters of Taiwan in Congress passed the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) of 1979. According to the TRA, United States would maintain friendly ties with Taiwan to a certain extent, if only to foster commercial, economic and cultural growth with each other. Included in the TRA is the stand of the US government that it would exert every possible effort in maintaining peace within the region, and protect the Taiwanese people from any entity who may jeopardize its social and economic systems.

Although the US would continue sales of arms to Taiwan to make it self-sufficient in defending its territory, it would be the duty of any US President and Congress to determine the quality and nature of arms they may provide the Republic of China.

President Ronald Reagan and Arms Sales - During his administration, the issue of defence sales by America to Taiwan became very prominent. Somehow, it also shook slightly the relations between the People’s Republic of China and the United States. President Reagan continually assured President Deng of the PRC that US still adhered to One-China Policy. The PRC Government, on the other hand, felt ambiguity on the part of US when it continually assured Taiwan about their implicit diplomatic ties.
This was due to the “six assurances” made by President Reagan in 1982. The six assurances included: “the US would not set a date for ending arms sales with Taiwan; would not hold prior consultations with the PRC on arms sales to Taiwan; would not play any mediation role between Taipei and Beijing; would not revise the TRA of 1979; has not changed its position regarding the sovereignty of Taiwan and; would not exert pressure on Taiwan to negotiate with the PRC.” Later, President Reagan added that such decisions were due, in part, to the peaceful ways the PRC chose to resolve its problems with Taiwan. It was also noted that although the PRC claimed that it would not use force against Taiwan, the US would not lower its guard against the PRC regarding the ROC. Any inconsistencies on the part of China would be brought to attention of Taiwan’s President if and when the US believed that the PRC was not being true to its word, and the US would stand up for Taiwan.

The Chinese government, however, had some doubts. President Reagan finally said that the US had continually adhered to the US - PRC Communiqué of January 1979. Having said that, the President pointed out that US would continually acknowledge that there was one China and Taiwan was a part of it. The sales of arms to Taiwan would be dependent on the perceived needs of Taiwan as assessed by the President of the United States. To assuage Chinese doubts regarding arms sales, the United States would gradually decrease sales of arms to Taiwan.

President George H.W. Bush Administration - During the administration of President
G.H.W Bush, Taiwan spoke out vehemently about the One-China Policy. Accordingly, Taipei embraced that fact that the ROC is the de jure government over all China as a nation ruled by ROC, it was established as a republic in 1911. It continued to have jurisdiction over Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu. It recognised itself as part of China, the same way that Mainland China, in itself, is a part of the ROC’s China. The PRC, meanwhile, maintains its stand that it is the sole representative of Chinese people in the international arena.

In 1992, in spite of the previous stand by President Reagan to gradually decrease weapons sales to Taiwan, President G.H.W Bush sold 150 F-16A/B aircraft to Taiwan. According to him, selling those articles of defence was a means for Taiwan to maintain its ability to protect itself and maintain peace in their area. It was also an extension of United States’ aims of maintaining order in the Asia-Pacific region. Conversely, he stressed that he as the representative of American people, was just being true to both the One-China Policy and the 1982 Sales of Arms Communiqué. He remained firm that there was only one China; the PRC. However, the 1982 Communiqué on the sale of arms to Taiwan stated that he, as the president, may decide whatever articles of defence may be sold to Taiwan, provided Taiwan used them to promote peace and stability in the area.

Clinton’s Administration - It was during President Clinton’s administration that attempts to conduct diplomatic talks between Taiwan and China were initiated. They
were conducted in 1993 in Singapore. Delegations from both parties came to discuss their concerns about the One-China Policy. During their talks, the PRC had been adamant in its stand that it is the sole legitimate government that may represent its people internationally. Although peaceful negotiations were their first option in resolving their domestic problems, it would not hesitate to use military means just to assure peace and order within its area.

Taiwan, on the other hand, used the historical fact that the Republic of China had been an independent state since 1911. It argued that the issue between China and Taiwan was not an issue of disparity between two different countries. However, it did not trivialise the matter as a domestic dispute. It adapted the term “political entity” a rather neutral representation of how it views the two sides. It may be equated to a country or political organisation.

In 1993, Taiwan attempted its bid for United Nations representation. The Republic of China argued that since Taiwan and Mainland China have separate political systems in their respective territories, it was only just to represent their people and allow them to participate in the activities of the international community. However, Taiwan’s bid was denied.

In 1994, Washington issued a statement about the PRC - ROC talks. The United States remained adamant that it remained true to its word with China. That is, they
recognized that there was one China as the sole legitimate government of the Chinese people but they are also being true to the ROC as required by the TRA of 1979; they have only conducted relations with Taiwan to maintain cultural, commercial and unofficial ties. All transactions are said to be non-governmental. The US also applauded the dialogue between China and Taiwan and that they had tried their best to maintain peace and order in both their countries despite their adamant stands. However, they would still continue to supply adequate quality and quantity defensive arms to Taiwan so it could maintain its ability to sufficiently defend itself from any other nation. Conversely, US would not allow legislative visits from leaders of Taiwan to the US.

Although the US did not agree with Taiwan’s bid to be a United Nations member, they would support Taiwan in its attempt to be a member of any international organization that did not require statehood. Accordingly, it was a good opportunity for Taiwan to cultivate their cultural and commercial systems and in despite such a stand; the US maintained its position of not interfering with the dialogue between the two countries and would not pressure either of them to arrive immediately at a resolution to their conflict.

The United States’ stand was greatly tested when President Lee of the Republic of China requested a USA visa to allow him to attend an alumni reunion event at Cornell University where he had obtained his doctorate. President Clinton reiterated that they
would allow such visits provided that President Lee agreed to them being 'unofficial visits' as a private citizen, and not as the head of the ROC. According to this, by granting Lee a visa, they still have remained true to the TRA of 1979. In relation to this, the US sent a secret letter to President Jiang Zemin of the PRC indicating the US’s stand and reassuring China that the US: “will continue to oppose Taiwan’s bid for independence; will not support two Chinas – one China, one Taiwan; will not support Taiwan’s admission to United Nations.” (CRS Report on One-China Policy, 2006)

In August 1998, the newly elected president of Taiwan, President Lee Teng-hui proclaimed that although there was one China, it was a divided China, the same situation as Korea, having a North Korea and South Korea; and the same as that of Germany and Vietnam in the past. The second Koo-Wang talks took place in the same year. Taiwan reiterated its stand that the status of China was that of a divided China and only when mainland China has achieved democracy could unification of China as a nation be fully considered.

The delegation of President Jiang Zemin retained its position of “one China, two systems” across the straits. Its government would continue its efforts to achieve unification of Taiwan and the PRC. It was during this time when Taiwan became unyielding to the request by China to be unified. With such a stand, the government of the PRC became more vocal in emphasizing the fact that they might resort to military
force to subdue Taiwan in its continued efforts of insisting that it be represented as part of one divided China.

President Clinton then emphasised that although the United States still followed the One-China Policy, it was also their duty to adhere to the TRA of 1979. Included in that bill is the fact that they may, too, have to exert extra-judicial means, such as military defense, to maintain peace within the region. However, the President still hoped that both parties would not have to resort to military means to bring about the unification of mainland China and Taiwan.

In August 1999, Taiwan proposed a “special-state-to-state” relationship between China and Taiwan. The paper reiterated that President Lee’s intention when he argued that the “one-Divided China idea” was not to cause chaos within the region, rather he only meant to present the true status of China and Taiwan. He professed that he still adhered to the One-China principle, as interpreted by the ROC. It was the PRC, not Taiwan which had abandoned its adherence to it when it became aggressively vocal about the possibility of exerting force in hastening unification. However, Taiwan emphasized that although China was divided, the two sides were still independent and equal to one another, and therefore, a special state-to-state relationship might serve as a buffer to open doors for possible unification in the future.

In October of the same year, the People’s Republic of China replied that as long as
Taiwan agreed to utilise peaceful negotiations with China about the unification issues, the PRC would not use force against it, but if and when there was be any form of foreign interference of Taiwan or if it continuously refused to be unified with China, then military force might be used to solve the issue.

In May 2000, Taiwan’s President Chen clearly and firmly stated that he would not declare independence from China as long as the PRC would not use military force against Taiwan to bring about unification. He also gave a “pledge that during his term, [Taiwan] will not change its national title; will not push forth inclusion of the state-to-state description in their constitution; and will not promote a referendum to change the status quo regarding the question of unification.” However, as I will give in more detail in a later chapter, Chen's real intention is to promote independence in Taiwan.

Of late, some of America’s presidents have used wordings that are quite confusing for the public and sometimes even for the Chinese and Taiwanese people. For example, statements and press releases have evolved such as when Nixon first made the declaration in 1972, he mentioned that there would be “no support” coming from the US when it came to the subject of Taiwan’s independence and sovereignty. The “no support” conception has changed to the use of the word “oppose”. For instance, it has been mentioned or quoted once or twice in print or in speech that the US opposes Taiwan independence. Of course, the word “oppose” gives a different meaning to the statement, thus, sparking new issues in world affairs. However, it is quite fortunate
that this did not go unnoticed for the US administration. Such wordings were apparently revised from the opposition viewpoint to a more neutral stance by using the word “non-support” or the phrase “no support”.

The next key area that is now covered by the One-China Policy is that concerning the use of force. The PRC in mainland China had never relinquished its right to use force in the Taiwan issue, primarily because this issue has always been viewed and considered as an internal problem. However, the PRC had explicitly expressed and demonstrated their willingness to adopt and implement a military solution if they have to; this is because they have also declared a policy in 1979 which favours and pushes for a peaceful unification of Taiwan and China.

This PRC policy further emphasises that should Taiwan refuse to negotiate a peaceful settlement, then the PRC would not have any other choice but to employ force in order to achieve unification; no definite deadline has been set, however, with regards to any ROC decision to merge with the PRC (Kan 2001). This policy had also warned the US that they should not sell or provide arms to Taiwan nor forge any form of alliance with Taiwan. This eventually led to another communiqué on the part of the US, this time concerning the selling of arms to Taiwan. This communiqué imposed the reduction of arm sales to Taiwan. However, the selling of arms would not be stopped but instead should continue in accordance to the Taiwan Relations Act. Perhaps it is worth noting in this paper that in spite of the Chinese policy and the
unofficial relations, the US arm sales made to Taiwan have been significant (Kan 2001). They also have the option to increase the volume of arms supply as well as their defence support to Taiwan when ever the safety and security of the latter is threatened. This is as stated in the Taiwan Relations Act. Another part of this act states that the US may be allowed to adjust their military deployments in Asia if there is a need to.

The third area that is now included under the One-China Policy is that concerning cross-strait dialogue. Ever since Nixon’s term and the Shanghai Declaration in 1972, all succeeding American presidents had followed the pattern, whether in print or in their speeches, of voicing their expectation that the Chinese people will eventually settle the issue concerning Taiwan (Kan 2001). At times, some of the presidents would make a promise to mediate between the ROC on Taiwan and the PRC in Beijing but there was always the precaution that they will never force the ROC to negotiate and settle with the PRC; Taipei will negotiate if they want to and when they are ready to accept the state that the mainland allows them. So far, nothing fruitful has come from these promises and the stance that remains the most applicable and appropriate: that “the future of the cross-strait relations is a matter for Beijing and Taipei to resolve. No administration has taken a position on how or when they should do so” (Kan 2001).

In addition, Taiwan has undergone a transition from a one party state ruled by the
Nationalists to a multi-party democracy. They do not support the One-China Policy, but instead treat such declarations and agreements especially those between that the US and Beijing as non-binding, ineffective, and of little relevance primarily because these were formulated and implanted without any consultation or even just minor representation from the people of Taiwan.

The One-China Policy may have been pronounced in China but the people of Taiwan insisted that they did not have any participation in it, whether in the process of creation or during the declaration. The policy was primarily thought of and created “to keep China out of the Vietnam War, to counterbalance the Soviet Union with China, and to open the markets for America” (Kagan 2003). Ever since the One-China Policy declaration, the PRC has used almost all means that could to support and strengthen its claim that Taiwan is a province of China and that the Communist government has every right to control and preside over it (Kagan 2003). To further subdue the Taiwanese people and to ensure that Taiwan would be united with China, the Beijing administration has even reserved the right to use force against Taiwan should the latter decide to revolt and claim its independence from the former.

Taiwan’s bid for International recognition and its stance in the Asian region

There is no denying that Taiwan has tried every means to gain global recognition to be an independent nation. Taiwan has maintained internal sovereignty, independently maintaining control over its internal affairs. However, it lacks the advantage of being
able to negotiate treaties and trade agreements in the international arena. This is because it has not been recognised as an independent country from China, with separate political system and Constitution. In spite of this, it has maintained itself as an important entity in the business world, constantly trading with independent countries.

There are only 27 countries with which Taiwan has formal diplomatic relations; however it still maintains substantive ties with over 140 countries and territories. Although their relations with others are informal, it never fails to extend assistance through the International Cooperation and Development Fund and the International Humanitarian and Relief Fund.

According to ROC Government Information Office, Taiwan utilises four important strategies in developing its international ties. The Republic of China, Taiwan, establishes friendly relations with other countries by way of participating in programs for culture, economics, technology, agriculture, and fishing. Fishing had been one of the main industries of Taiwan, and by exchanging information about cultivation of different species of fishes for trade, Taiwan is able to promote itself and participate in non-governmental diplomatic ties with various trading nations. It also participates in foreign trade with countries like the Cayman Islands, the United States and Japan, usually promoting technological products, most specifically computer parts, to these countries.
Taiwan and the United Nations - Taiwan had been seeking a chance to become a member of the United Nations since the 1970’s. To date, it has attempted on 10 occasions to become a member, however, each time it has been denied. Taiwan sought such membership to represent its 23 million people with their democratic government, legal system and foreign relations with other countries. However because of United Nations Resolution 2758, only the People’s Republic of China can be the sole representative of the Chinese community. This results in the Taiwanese being unrepresented in the deliberations over important social, economic and security issues concerning the people of the world.

Taiwan and the World Trade Organisation - Taiwan became a member of the World Trade Organisation in January 2002. However, its attempts for membership date back to 1990. Its bid for membership had been a source of some debate among WTO members. The conflict arose when the member nations had to make a decision whether or not they would allow accession of Taiwan when they themselves adhere to the One China Policy since they are diplomatically tied with PRC.

In 1992, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade signatories indicated that Taiwan would only be allowed to become a member after the PRC became a member. In 1995, Taiwan was allowed to become a member of WTO, the day after China became a member. A clause of this agreement was to treat Taiwan as a “developed
economy”. As a developed economy, it will abide to stricter rules.

Upon its accession to the WTO, Taiwan agreed to remove tariff barriers. The following are some of the laws Taiwan has to abide to to maintain WTO membership:

Tariffs – simple tariffs for agricultural products dropped to 14% in 2002 from 20%. By 2007, the tariffs should be lowered to 12.9%. Taiwan also agreed to join the Uruguay Round zero-to-zero which eliminates tariffs on pharmaceutical and medical equipment, construction materials and equipment, toys, and information technology products.

Services – Taiwan agreed to open entry of foreign professionals to work in Taiwan, to be part of the information technological sector, and retail and wholesale sectors.

Intellectual Property Rights – Taiwan agreed to conform to WTO standards in terms of their national program for international property rights.

Benefits of WTO to China and Taiwan - Taiwan and China have avoided direct political and economic links since 1950’s.

The issue of sovereignty had hindered each country from strengthening diplomatic ties with another. However, since the ascension of the two countries to the WTO, each had benefited from following the rules that minimized tariffs between member countries. Accordingly, Taiwan’s exports to China have increased from $8.1 billion to
$39.1 billion in 2001. Imports from China on the other hand, increased to $7.6 billion. China, conversely, received minimal imports coming from Taiwan. It was primarily because of the bills placed by the Taiwanese government to minimise exports by Taiwan to China to decrease the level of Taiwanese economic dependency on the Chinese market. Trade between the two countries largely happens via Hong Kong.

Although no direct and formal links between the two countries has occurred in the 1990’s, nor until the early part of the 2000s, such interaction may eventually lead to better relations between the countries initially in the economic arena, and perhaps leading towards political stability. The international community, however, is watching on the sidelines as the countries continue trade indirectly.

Taiwan and its Membership of Regional Organizations - Taiwan became a member of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, also known as APEC, in 1991, prior to its membership of the World Trade Organisation. This membership has allowed Taiwan to have substantial ties with the different leaders of the participant countries of APEC. Being an active member of APEC, it allowed Taiwan to visibly represent its cultural, commercial, and economic systems to other nation members. Another benefit of being a member of APEC is that it has managed to become familiar with the inner workings of being part of an international organisation. It has maintained substantial diplomatic relations with the different leaders of the participant countries, has opened numerous doors for communications with other governmental entities. APEC provided Taiwan
information about the different strategies these participant-countries employ in going about their economic ventures with other nations. It also increased the level of awareness in Taiwan of the current trends in management of trade structures.

Taiwan took advantage of this membership by actively participating in different economic summits. It utilized this experience as leverage to pursue its membership of the World Trade Organization (WTO) by working closely with leaders of participant-members of WTO.

Taiwan also actively participated in putting forward proposals to increase its degree of influence in APEC. It managed to win chairmanships of forums and groups and hosted APEC-related conferences in Taiwan. The contributions of Taiwan to APEC were:

Agricultural Technical Cooperation, 1995 – Japan and Korea created the Osaka Action Agenda to promote discussions about the guidelines pertaining to agricultural liberalization affecting the development of the participant-countries. Taiwan proposed Agricultural Technical cooperation which later becomes included in the Economic Technical Cooperation portion of the Osaka Action Agenda.

In 1996, Taiwan started a signature campaign within the participating countries about an information technology agreement. In 1998, Taiwan, along with New Zealand
shared chairmanship of the Agricultural Technological Cooperation section of the Osaka Action Agenda. In 1999, Taiwan managed to be Lead Shepherd of the Trade promotion working group and a convener of the Group on Services. It was also this year when it made a proposal that will greatly affect the venture capital investment of each member-participant country. The proposal was about promoting start up companies and venture capital investment as a way to promote economic recovery in the region. And in 2000, Taiwan put forward a proposal concerning e-commerce, entitled “Turning the Digital Divide into Digital Opportunity”. It advocates narrowing the gap between the more advanced nations in technological knowledge in E-commerce and the technological delayed. It become one of the highlights of 2000’s APEC summit.

President Lee of Taiwan has invested in substantial diplomatic ties the country has from countries within the Asia Pacific region. These countries included Thailand, Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Vietnam. President Lee’s efforts in shifting the political system of Taiwan to a democracy proved important in trading with these countries. Since Taiwan, in the meantime, can not be internationally recognized as an independent entity from China, President Lee’s programs for economic and investment relations indirectly supported its plans to be politically recognized by the countries it trades with.

Although the program created by President Lee with other countries were in particular
targeting improved levels of economic stability for Taiwan, President Lee also aimed to decrease level of dependency of Taiwan upon the indirect economic links it had with China as they traded their products in Hong Kong.

Taiwan and Indonesia - Indonesia had some level of hesitancy in maintaining strong diplomatic ties with the People’s Republic of China. Although it had been consistently abiding with the One-China Policy, its experience of the PRC in 1965 when the PRC had allegedly staged a military coup against Sukarno managed to cause some level of distrust in the PRC government. Indonesia broke off its diplomatic ties with China, and they weren't restored until 1990.

The democratic government of Taiwan made an impression upon the leaders of Indonesia as a lesser threat to its military defences, as compared with the capabilities of China to war against it, if and when some political upheaval between the two countries arises in the future. Both countries, Taiwan and Indonesia, took advantage of their strengths to foster the economic growth of both countries.

Indonesia considers Taiwan a significant business partner in taking exports of their products such as natural gas and coal. Taiwan’s investments, on the other hand, centred mainly in trading the products of their pulp and paper industries, agricultural sectors and fisheries with Indonesia. Its relations with Indonesia were hampered temporarily in 1998 when anti-Chinese riots erupted. Although the target of these
groups were Chinese from the PRC, Taiwanese businessmen in Indonesia were also alarmed. The Taiwanese government advised its businessmen to limit transactions, temporarily, with Indonesia while talks about increased protections for its nationals were being held between the Taiwanese and Indonesian governments. In the long run, the president of Indonesia complied with the request, thereby elevating the level of economic relations between Taiwan and Indonesia to stronger substantial diplomatic ties.

Taiwan and Malaysia - Unlike Indonesia, Malaysia regarded China as a better ally than its American counterpart. The stand of Malaysia during the administration of Prime Minister Mahathir was a by-product of the PM's personal stand regarding the quest for globalization by countries in the West. Such views reflected greatly upon the diplomatic relations of Malaysia and China. Although Mahathir proclaimed the country's loyalty to China, investment by China in Malaysia remained insignificant.

Taiwan remained the most significant investor in Malaysia. Malaysia’s reservations in communicating and forging ties with the West stopped when they forged relations with Taiwan. Taiwan’s investment in Malaysia was in the manufacturing of computer parts. The reasons businessmen chose Malaysia to invest in for their computer manufacturing industries mainly centred on cheaper labour and market potential. Taiwan also forged links with small businessmen in the textile and chemical industries.
In 1998, President Lee visited Kuala Lumpur and communicated with Malaysian leaders. President Lee indicated the expansion of investment ventures by Taiwan with the Malaysians in spite of the then economic crisis in the Asia-Pacific region.

Taiwan and the Philippines - Relations between China and the Philippines have been strained ever since China began loudly claiming Mischief Reef, an island within the Philippines EEZ. Mischief Reef was said to be an island with vast oil reserves. Such a move by the People’s Republic of China became a source of political stress in the country since the Philippines initially believed that the removal of US bases in their country would allow them to forge better relations with China. Since then, the country has participated in many legal and political disputes allowing the country’s military to train with their American counterparts via the Visiting Forces agreement. It was a way for the Philippines to gain help from the Americans if China chose to attack the Philippines over the Mischief Reef dispute.

Its relations with Taiwan were more for the economic gains it received from the Taiwanese investments. The Philippines has continually exported their computer components products along with data processing parts and machinery to Taiwan. On the other hand, Taiwan tried to maximize the use of Subic Bay Freeport, which was once an American military base. The major investment by Taiwan in the Subic Freeport were from Acer, a computer-producing firm and Hokey, a firm that
manufactures plastic materials. Both countries benefited from the large number of Filipinos working in Taiwan as professionals and labourers in different industries. The remittances coming from the Filipinos in Taiwan contribute to the income of the worker's families back home in the Philippines. As part of the continuing better economic relations between Taiwan and the Philippines, the administration of President Aquino tried passing a bill similar to the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979.

Taiwan and Thailand - Thailand's relations with China have always been firm, and are a by-product of the past tributary relationship with China. However, this has not stopped Thailand from forging better economic relations with Taiwan. Thailand has been one of the countries in the Asia-Pacific region where Taiwan has invested heavily. Thailand is attractive for Taiwan investment due to its cheap labour and its potential market for textiles and electrical appliances.

Taiwan and Vietnam - Vietnam was once attacked by China in the 1970s. It has experienced the capability of China to cause destruction for Vietnam and its people. This occurrence had forewarned the Vietnamese government to approach its diplomatic relations with China in a more guarded way. It managed within its government to limit its diplomatic relations with Taiwan. However, it did not limit it from economic dealings with Taiwan. Vietnam’s investments came more from the Taiwanese businessmen. Ventures in computer and electronic parts production by Taiwanese had been committed to because of the cheap labour and low infrastructure
Implications of One-China Policy for Taiwan

Many suggest that the One-China policy for Taiwan is considered detrimental because it sets certain limitations on its range of options in East Asia. Every move that Taiwan makes such as applying for membership in international organisations and application for international aid such as that offered by the Red Cross or the World Health Organisation is likely to be hindered or set aside because these are oftentimes interpreted as an undermining of the One-China Policy. It may be understood that the term ‘One-China” has been coined perhaps as a sign of nationalism and the desire to unite all cities and provinces into one country; however, they had included Taiwan, a territory that has never been under the authority and governance of the Beijing administration.

As such, according to Kagan (2003), the people of Taiwan have continuously implored the assistance of the US to help them convince Beijing why they should grant them their independence and sovereignty. Some reasons for this were cited as (Kagan 2003): “Taiwan could be a potential offshore base for independent technological and industrialised development that could also help in building the economy of the whole of China. The Taiwanese democracy may also prove to be a good and adequate model for Beijing’s own political modernisation. A free Taiwan could entail that it could share economic, intellectual, cultural, and political values
with Beijing. Taiwan is calling for an improvement in the status quo attributed to them by the Beijing administration because the Taiwanese deemed this to be destructive to their morale; instead, the Beijing government should give them what is due. As a form of gratitude and appreciation, the Taiwanese are willing to make an arrangement for Beijing to share and utilise their resources provided that these will be used solely for the purpose of developing China.”

However, it is still too conceited to say that “One-China Policy” is detrimental and suggest that China is still in need of various improvements from the help of Taiwan at present, as suggested by Kagan (2003). Indeed, there may be flaws in the policy when it comes to Taiwan issue, but, it is still a great achievement by Nixon and Kissinger in ensuring peace at a troubled time.

Also, Taiwan has always been seen as a victim in One-China Policy, however, it isn’t quite so. There is no doubt that the policy limited Taiwan’s options in the international arena but, Taiwan, on the other hand, had also benefited from the policy. The hostile relations between the Nationalists and the Communists on both sides of the Strait were more likely to have continued if the One-China Policy had not been established.

Chiang Ching-Kuo took control of Taiwan after his father Chiang Kai-Shek's regime. Under his government, he started paying attention to the development of Taiwan. It is
common knowledge that Chiang Kai-Shek had never intended to develop the island, since he only regarded Taiwan as a base for possible reconquest of the mainland in the future. It was the build up of relationships between China and the US and the One China Policy that made that ambition impossible, and so his son decided to develop Taiwan. During this period, education for the people was increased. Taiwanese overseas were encouraged to return to Taiwan as national income increased.

In 1987, martial law in Taiwan was lifted. This was perceived as a public declaration to change the ROC political system into a parliamentary one. One of the dissidents group, the Democratic Progressive Party, a united anti-Nationalist Party group was formed. This decision affected Taiwan’s political environment by opening doors to possible democratisation.

In January 1988, Chiang Ching-Kuo died. It hastened the pace by which Taiwan became a full-fledged democratic state. Social movements and protests against the government became prominent occurrences in the society. During this period, the Taiwanese government allowed Chinese mainlanders to go back to China to visit their relatives. Another significant change during this time was when Taiwanese businessmen were allowed to invest in China. However, the government controlled the size of investments for fear of decreasing the rate of growth of Taiwan economy. Such liberties were emphasised among Taiwanese. This democratic government became the representative of Taiwan’s liberation from an authoritarian regime.
Taiwan may well have helped in developing the mainland during that period. However, it had already turned around 180 degrees. The Chinese economy and its development had caught up if not passed Taiwan, and it is Taiwan who needs the bigger Chinese market today to grow. One thing for sure is that the closer the relationship between Taiwan and the PRC, the better it may be for Taiwan.

At present, the economic relationship between Taipei and Beijing has grown to significant levels. The effect of this is that it has convinced both sides to initiate discussions, but only through unofficial organisations. On the side, the US has constantly increased its demonstration of support for the cross-strait dialogues, continuously applauding the every bit of progress and development in the dialogues.

The biggest problem around the Taiwan issue remains in the consistent independent movement that is being used for political gain in Taiwan. Taiwanese politicians use the sense of identity and nationalism to gain support in Taiwan. The One-China Policy is being valued negatively by many in the island of Taiwan.

The Cross-Strait issue under Chen Shui-Bian since 2000 – Chen’s pro-independence agenda

Ever since their separation in 1949, Taiwan and China, despite their similar cultural background, have developed entirely different political and economic systems.
Democratisation and economic development have made the Taiwanese people believe that their identity is different from that of the PRC and have strengthened the island's already deep-rooted “Taiwanisation.” From Beijing’s perspective, the “Taiwan problem” is getting more serious and the newly elected DPP (Democratic Progressive Party) government has made the situation more uncomfortable than ever. Judging by the actions Chen Shui-Bian has taken, many PRC leaders doubt President Chen’s sincerity in working towards resolving the differences between the two sides to achieve a mutually compatible relationship.

Before the 2000 presidential election, Beijing laid out China’s central positions. It was clear that Beijing would be willing to work with the new leader of Taiwan; however, it has never been Chen’s agenda to consider reunification and the “one country, two systems” policy, although he vowed that he would not claim independence during his term as President. Even though he had announced the “Five Noes” in his inauguration speech (520 speech); namely, no declaration independence, no change to the title of the nation, no pushing the inclusion of the “two states” description in the Constitution, no promotion of a referendum to change the status quo with regard to the question of independence or reunification, and no abolition of the National Unification Council and the Guidelines for National Unification (Rigger, 2005), his real intentions remained unclear.

According to Sheng (2002), Chen is waiting to consolidate his power before he
becomes strong enough to stand up against Beijing’s reunification plan. Sheng (2002) points out that Chen made the “Five Noes” under two conditions. First, that Chen did not indicate his real stance on the “one China” principle – his “Five Noes” would only apply “during my term”, which does not specify what will happen after. Second, his “Five Noes” only stood for “as long as the CCP regime has no intention to use military force”. However, military force has always been a consideration for Beijing to ensure Taiwan never declares its independence, though it would only be used as the last option. Chen’s “Five Noes” pledge for “as long as the CCP regime has no intention to use military force” contradicts Beijing’s current political position. According to Sheng, Chen’s unclear political speech with its little hidden messages is enough to cast doubt upon Chen’s real agenda.

There are also many ambiguous declarations in Chen’s “Five Noes” policy. Chen’s statement “not to declare independence” does not mean he doesn’t intend to ‘promote’ the idea. He states that he is prepared to “not include the ‘two states theory’ in the Constitution”, which does not mean he rejects such a theory. Chen never stated his stance on the “one China” principle. Doubtless, the Chinese government has its own suspicions that Chen is insincere and it has been anxious about Taiwan’s new government. To avoid this issue, Taipei officials published a recommendation known as “three acknowledgements and four suggestions” (Appendix 4), to ease the tension.

This recommendation of “three acknowledgements and four suggestions” was
intentionally introduced to ease the tension between Beijing and Taiwan’s newly ‘pro-independence’ government. However, this turned out to be Chen’s strategy for dealing with Beijing’s “one China” policy. The recommendation was criticised by Beijing officials as irrelevant to the situation. According to the KMT (the major opposition party), this recommendation is simply a “play of words” and a “manifesto of non-agreement”, which was what Chen is good at (China Times, 17/09/2000).

Judging from his actions, Chen’s ambitions were obvious. Despite Chen noting that “reunification isn’t the ‘only’ way” (cited from Sheng, 2002), which indicates that superficially he considers the possibility of reunifying Taiwan and China, this was just a mask he put forward for the Beijing government. On the surface, he announced he was prepared to work with the PRC in resolving the Cross-Strait issue; however, deep down, he was working on ideas for promoting independence to the Taiwanese people and to ensure his support from the DPP’s core constituency of pro-independence native Taiwanese (as opposed to first or second generation immigrants from the mainland). Instead of uniting the mainland Taiwanese with the native Taiwanese, Chen was worsening the situation.

Chen’s policy had drawn criticism from opposition party leaders. The KMT leader Lien Chan, a mainland immigrant himself, criticised Chen’s unclear policies towards the PRC. He articulated the inconsistency between Chen’s speech and the actual actions taken, stating that a politician needed to decide what was best for his people
and not promote independence nor distinguish between native Taiwanese and those in Taiwan originating from the mainland. If China was willing to build an equal relationship between Taiwan and the PRC, then, Lien states, he would be interested in discussing further the “one China” principle. He also reminded scholars to face the Cross-Strait issue with wisdom, disregarding any subjective personal feelings (China Times, 2000/09/17).

In August 2002, Chen made his controversial remarks to a video audience in Japan. He expressed his support for a referendum in Taiwan to decide whether or not Taiwan should declare formal independence from China. The remarks infuriated the Chinese government, since “no passing of a referendum” was one of the “Five Noes” of his May 20 speech. Just a few days after Chen made such statements, a spokesman in Beijing accused Chen of “playing with fire”. The Chinese spokesman also said that Chen should “immediately rein in his horse at the brink of the precipice”, as he would “damage Taiwan’s economy and hurt the personal interests of Taiwan’s compatriots, which in turn will lead Taiwan to disaster” (The Economist, 08/08/2002). Chen must have known how China would react to any movement toward independence. However, Chen was pushing China to its limits to observe the reaction from China and from the Taiwanese people. Although his government tried to limit the damage and ease the Cross-Strait tensions initially caused by Chen’s remarks by claiming he had been over-interpreted by the Chinese officials, this was ineffective. According to the report, Chen had become anxious to display his anti-China stance.
Despite previous incidents, Chen once again raised tensions on the Cross-Strait issue in September 2003 by stirring up a debate over whether the country should formally declare itself independent. Chen is a ‘canny man’. He did not actually start the debate, as he did not wish to provoke China into invading Taiwan. Instead, Chen warned his rivals not to twist the constitutional issue into a debate on independence. Chen was aware such a comment would trigger the debate (The Economist, 02/10/2003). Chen aimed to bring in legislation to allow public policies to be decided by referendum, which could mean independence may come to the vote. At the time of Chen’s announcement, Beijing was celebrating the anniversary of the Communist Party’s takeover of the country in 1949 and could not give an immediate response.

Not only once, but many times Chen has broken his promise, endangering the already sensitive Cross-Strait relations. During his term as president, his government has not made any positive progress with Beijing; instead, he has created more obstacles than previously existed. He also created divisions not only between natives and mainlanders within Taiwan, but also separated the Taiwanese people from the mainland Chinese as well. Chen’s policy has not only created more problems for Taiwan internationally but had weakened Taiwan itself. Sheng (2002) argues that the DPP’s insufficiency, incompetence and lack of experience in effective governance were all factors in Taiwan’s weakness.
“... the DPP’s party culture, the product of long years as the grassroots opposition, makes it difficult for the party to adapt quickly to its new role as the ruling party. It still often resorts to the methods it used when it was the opposition, such as mobilising the pro-independence native Taiwanese to come all the way from southern Taiwan to demonstrate in Taipei to show the “people’s voice” in order to put pressure against the KMT-dominated legislature. As the ruling party, it should refrain from such tactics, as this will only intensify the social division and tension. A party needs these masses at the grassroots level for votes. However, once voted into power, it should rely on social elites for effective governance and help unite the masses at the grassroots level with those elites.” (Sheng 2002: 63)

In 2004, Chen was re-elected, perpetuating the already wounded relationship between China and Taiwan under Chen’s previous four-year presidency. To make the situation worse, Chen decided to heat up the already high tension across the Strait by announcing his pro-independence stance in an interview with the Washington Post soon after his election. In the interview, Chen stated that Taiwanese people would not accept the One-China Policy and that talks between China and Taiwan would be impossible if China were to insist upon it. He said he would proceed with plans to introduce a new Constitution in 2006 to be enacted in 2008 if passed (The Economist, 01/04/2004). If the Constitution were put to a referendum where the public were given the right to decide on whether or not Taiwan should be an independent country as described in the Constitution, confrontation would be almost certain.

The introduction of a new Constitution in 2006 may very well light the fires of war on the Cross-Strait issue. In response to movements toward independence and remarks made by the leader of Taiwan, China passed the “anti-secession law” in March of 2005.
Although Chen did not mention if a new constitution would be put to a referendum, it concerned many. Chen raised unnecessary tensions and damaged Cross-Strait relations. Has Chen ever considered working with the Beijing government to resolve the issue or has it all been an act? According to Shi Ming-de, former DPP leader and a former extremist independence supporter, Chen has failed in his role as leader. Shi points out that all the speeches Chen has made are in response to events and that they are not consistent. On the one hand, China has allowed Taiwan to discuss reunification in a variety of ways to ensure benefits and peace for both sides (Anti-secession law, 2005). On the other hand, the wave of “Taiwanese-ness” has become unstoppable, which places Taiwan in jeopardy (Anti-secession law, 2005).

The PRC’s blockage of Taiwan’s international political recognition has created a new sense of Taiwanese nationalism that has ironically helped promote the new Taiwanese identity. During his first term and into his second term of the presidency, Chen manipulated and promoted what he called “Taiwanese Identity” to his advantage, for his independence agenda. “Taiwanese identity” became an extremely popular phrase in Taiwan and, sadly, it has also become a tool for the politicians to use in order to win elections. Many politicians now try to emphasise their Taiwanese-ness in order to gain support from the public.

With the bad image most Taiwanese people already have of their neighbour, Chen
created a bigger gap through encouraging greater misunderstandings and harshness towards the people across the Taiwan Strait. Instead of encouraging better understanding of China and its people so that a peaceful resolution could be found, Chen criticised anyone who tried to do so. The “trip for a hopeful Taiwan Strait” to China by the two opposition leaders and their meetings with the Chinese chairman were strongly criticised by the pro-independence Taiwanese and President Chen (TTV News, 01/05/2005). Unfortunately, pro-independence supporters profoundly emphasise their Taiwanese identity in making such dangerous remarks. They do not realise the significance of what they are supporting.

Ties between Taiwan and the PRC

On 21 September 1999, a deadly earthquake struck Taiwan around 1:00 a.m. The quake measured 7.6 and had more than two thousand aftershocks. This tragedy caused tremendous damage to the island. The Taiwan Ministry of the Interior said the quake killed at least two thousand people. Beijing and Taipei, two cities that have regarded one another as eternal political enemies for more than 50 years, exchanged over 520,000 phone calls between family members in the 24 hours after the quake (Wang, 2005).

Politically, China insists on the One-China Policy that there can only be one China in the world. The Chinese government opposes any independence moves made by Taiwan and stands firmly behind the principle of reunification. But their hostile
political relationship is unlikely to end in the near future. Economically, China is Taiwan’s biggest business trading partner, with trade worth US $400 billion dollars between them. The majority of Taiwanese overseas investments are in China. Total investments by Taiwanese companies have exceeded US $80 billion dollars. The economic relationship between Taiwan and China has become the main powerhouse behind the economic growth of the entire Asia-Pacific region. There are also more than 300,000 Taiwanese and Chinese married couples across the Strait. On average, three million Taiwanese people visit China every year and there are close to a million Taiwanese families living in China (Wang, 2005).

In general, trade and investment should ease the political rivalry. Yet, a dense economic partnership can coexist with the deeply entrenched political conflicts across the Taiwan Strait. Compared with the close social and economic ties Taiwan has with China, Taiwan’s separatism from mainland China may seem incomprehensible. While Taiwan sends more capital to China than to any other country, the Taiwanese government proposes the idea of ‘de-mainlandisation’ to the public and increases its defensive missile spending with the US. The independence moves of the current Taiwanese government will clearly jeopardise Taiwan’s economy, not to mention its security.

Lin (2005) states that the majority of Taiwanese do not really concern themselves with which party is ruling the country, so long as they preserve a steady, safe society
with a strong economy. Fine governance is that of a government that understands and focuses on the basic needs of its people. Gao (2004), in his book *Improving Taiwan with 8 Thoughts*, mentions the idea of “Taiwan comes first”, meaning, “the prosperity of the Taiwanese people should be taken as the main consideration”. When facing Cross-Strait issues, politicians should first ensure the economic prosperity of the Taiwanese people and then build a positive relationship across the Strait as relations between China and Taiwan strongly affect Taiwan’s economy. Gao (2004) believes that the economy will be the key element in the 21st century for evaluating the strength of a country, not its military. The English Prime Minister William Ewart Gladstone (1809 – 1898) once said, “Budgets are not merely affairs of arithmetic, but in a thousand ways go to the root of prosperity of individuals, the relation of classes and the strength of kingdoms.”

Taiwan is the sixth biggest investor in China and could even turn out to be the largest, according to *The Economist* (13/01/2005). China’s latest list of its top 200 export companies is headed mainly by Taiwanese IT firms such as Hon Hai Precision Industry (whose exports from China in 2003 were in excess of $6.4 billion), Quanta ($5.3 billion) and Asustek ($3.2 billion). There are 28 entries on the list altogether and they are all high tech companies. These Taiwanese companies have helped China become one of the top high-tech countries in the world. In 2002, China became the world’s second-largest IT hardware producer after the United States, overtaking Japan and Taiwan. China has even become the world’s largest IT hardware exporter to
America. More than 60% of all export products are made by Taiwanese companies in China. According to a statement by Nicholas Lardy from the Institute for International Economics in Washington, “far from being undermined by competition from China, Taiwanese IT businesses are benefiting from their production on the mainland, increasing their global market share across a broad range of products.” Also, Taiwan’s huge trade surplus with mainland China has helped them build up the world’s third-largest holdings of foreign currency reserves, with a record $239 billion at November 2004 (The Economist, 13/01/2005).

Close business ties with mainland China not only helps development in China, but also helps reduce the economic gap across the Strait, which also benefits Taiwan’s own economy and global position. The 2000 Nobel Prize winner in Economic Sciences, James J. Heckman, believes that Taiwan has a very bright future with the PRC. Taiwan should use its unique role as an advantage in conducting business with China, also improving the skills of the mainland Chinese. The best opportunities will come from close business ties with China. Taiwan should not regard China’s positive developments as a threat and shut its doors to China. Instead, Taiwan should overlook its political disagreements and prosper together with China (Cited from Gao, 2004: 66).

Political influences on Cross-Strait business enterprises aren’t showing any positive progress. Since China is Taiwan’s biggest business trading partner and also the
biggest centre of investment for Taiwan, economically, Taiwan cannot avoid losing such a big account. According to Cheng (Cheng, 2005), Taiwan, as the weaker party (in terms of size, population and military might), is more dependent on China for export and investment opportunities. Nevertheless, Taiwanese governments, present and past have made and continue to make announcements that warn Taiwanese companies not to ignore the risks in Chinese markets. False information is given to the public and used as a strategy to promote the ‘de-mainlandisation’ of Taiwan and to slowly hollow out Chinese business investments. Former Taiwanese president Lee deng-hui said, “investing business in China is an act of suicide” (Cited from Gao, 2004: 72). He made a few predictions over recent years about the growing Chinese economy such as: China’s economy will collapse 2-3 years before or after 1995; and the Chinese currency will fall in 1997. On several occasions he even alleged that the Chinese stock market would fall and so would economic development (Gao, 2004). Judging from China’s strong and growing economy today, I believe we can rule out all of these predictions.

Unfortunately, the leader of Taiwan today still fails to confront reality and for that reason, Taiwan’s economy has to pay the price. Chen persists with his promotion of ‘de-mainlandisation’ and urges businessmen to conduct proper risk assessments when doing business with China, calling China a competitor and threat to Taiwan. He also says that Taiwanese people will only ‘lower themselves’ depending on the developments of its competitor. (Macroview Weekly, Issue 557, 2005) Chen, like
Lee, places his personal feelings for the PRC ahead of the people’s interests, which clearly ought to be for a steady, growing economy. During his term as president of Taiwan, the economy has not grown but rather declined.

Taiwan has the world’s 20th largest economy; China is 7th and America comes in at first place (The Economist, 13/01/2005). In 1999, Taiwan’s GDP growth was standing strong at 5.42%, and in 2000, just before the KMT handed over power to the DPP, Taiwan’s GDP growth was as high as 7.94%. However, the rapid growth in the economy did not last long after Chen came to power. In 2001, Taiwan’s GDP growth was at -2.18%; compared to previous years, this was a dramatic decrease. Public consumption, at 4.93% growth in 2000, had contributed 2.98% to the GDP growth of that year. However, public consumption growth declined to 1.04% in 2001, contributing only 0.62% to the GDP growth. In 2002, Taiwan’s economy didn’t seem to improve at all. 2002 showed less than 2% public consumption growth compared to an average of over 5% public consumption growth over the last 50 years. Public investments have also declined from 15.74% in 2000 to 1.56% in 2002. The impact on the economy has also been reflected in the unemployment rate. Taiwan’s unemployment rate has increased from 2.99% (293,000 people unemployed) in 2000 to 5.17% (515,000 people unemployed) in 2002. Although Chen’s government emphasises that Taiwan’s declining economy is caused by the poor global economy, this is not probably the case. In fact, Taiwan’s trading with other overseas markets (especially China) has contributed to its highest GDP growth. The declining numbers
in Taiwan’s economy have been unmistakably due to the lack of confidence in investments and consumption. Clearly, the Taiwanese public has no confidence in their new government (Su, 2003).

It is an undeniable reality that the Chinese market is important. “This is a time of global competition”, says Preston Chen, chairman of Ho Tung Group, which has over $100 million invested in China. “If you don’t go [to China], others will, and the first to suffer will be you” (cited from The Economist, 13/01/2005). Eamonn Kelly, GBN director and president, says, “China is going to surprise the world just like Japan and Germany after the devastation of war, by creating for themselves a new image” (cited from What’s Next: 141). Robert Hormats, Vice-Chairman of Goldman Sachs International, says, “China is going to be the great economic miracle in the first half of the 21st century” (cited from What’s Next: 99). During his visit to China in the 1990s, David Glass, the director and president of Wal-Mart, said: “China is the only country on earth that can again reach US $100 billion dollars in profit” (cited from What’s Next: 233). Indeed, while every international company watches China, it is only logical and responsible that the Taiwanese leaders should construct a system for both sides of the Strait to grow despite their political disagreements and not place Taiwan outside the beneficial Chinese market. As Larry Bossidy and Ram Charan mention in their book, Confronting Reality, “if you don’t confront reality, you are out of the game.”
Political tensions and Taiwan’s restrictions on some investments along with the absence of direct flights are costing Taiwanese investors in China enormous amounts annually. Due to political issues between Taiwan and China since the end of the civil war, many direct linkages across the Strait have been disrupted. Until the two sides come to some agreement about opening up the ‘three direct links’ (communication, trade and transportation), it is certain that Taiwanese people and companies will suffer unnecessary expense. Mail is channelled through Hong Kong; cargo ships are routed through a third area and passengers departing from Taiwan transit through Macao or Hong Kong if travelling to China. A direct flight from Taipei to Shanghai should take only 90 minutes, but can take approximately 6 - 7 hours currently. If direct air and sea links were allowed, there would be an estimated saving of 15-30% in shipping costs and air travellers would save an estimated $390 million per year. However, this will not be possible unless Taiwan sees progress with the PRC (The Economist, 13/01/2005). “You cannot create prosperity by law. Sustained thrift, industry, application, intelligence, are the only things that ever do, or ever will, create prosperity. But you can very easily destroy prosperity by law” Theodore Roosevelt (1858-1919), twenty-sixth US president.

Chen Shui-bian has been planning to endorse the Constitution since 2006. The proposed constitutional revisions will not only act like the September 21 earthquake, shaking the foundation of Taiwan’s economy, it will also make the public fearful of war. Economically, if we apply the 80/20 principle, also known as the Pareto principle
(achieving 80% with 20% effort) to Taiwan’s economy, Taiwan can use its geographical and political advantages to receive 80% of profits with only 20% effort. However, instead of building good relations with China to ensure its wellbeing, Taiwan’s current government is heading in the opposite direction. Should Taiwan continue to spend large amounts of money making friends with small countries that most Taiwanese people have never heard of, or should Taiwan make friends with the country that is most important? Chen’s main achievements after eight years should have been to help Taiwan achieve unprecedented prosperity, shoulder to shoulder with China. Making Taiwan a better place to live for Taiwanese people should be first on Chen’s agenda.

Kagan, 2003 suggests that, Taiwan’s democratic system can improve Beijing’s political moderation. However, according to (Rigger, 2005), Taiwan’s democracy is not yet mature.

In China’s Dilemma (2001), Sheng points out three main reasons for Taiwan’s refusal to reunify: “1) a disparity in living standards; 2) different economic levels; and 3) democracy.” However, these three arguments are not the main reasons for Taiwan’s refusal to reunify with mainland China, though they do play a huge role in the discussion (or justifications used by the pro-independence Taiwanese against reunification). Following the changes China had made in recent years, some previous arguments are no longer relevant. It is time to re-evaluate these three reasons and
redefine why Taiwan refuses China’s political proposal. In this section, I aim to acknowledge the core grounds of these pro-independence Taiwanese who are against resolving this issue peacefully. I will look under the surface to focus on Taiwanese identity, which I believe to be a deeper significant factor. However, I will first look at the living standards, the economy and democracy of contemporary Taiwan.

First, it is very important that the democratic system of Taiwan isn’t disregarded, for it is what most researchers use to support their claims for Taiwan’s independence. The fact of Taiwan’s democracy has attracted considerable sympathy and support internationally, especially in the West. It is true that Taiwan has enjoyed a democratic society, and for many decades this has worked exceptionally well for them. The success of the first presidential election in 1996 displayed Taiwanese beliefs and their respect for freedom and democracy. However, democracy is not yet adequately consolidated in Taiwan. Rigger (2005) notes that “Taiwan’s democracy is not consolidated, because fundamental structural problems stand in the way of political institutionalisation and improved regime performance.”

A column from the Economic Daily News in December 2002 points to the increasing frustration over Taiwan’s new government:

During the more than two years in which the DPP (Democratic Progressive Party) has been in power, national affairs have been chaotic and the economy has declined; despite the various rationalisations it resorts to, the ruling group cannot escape responsibility. The high-sounding excuse that was used in the initial
period of the administration was that with new hands on the job it was difficult to avoid an inadequacy of experience, and that constant sharpening and refining was needed. But half of the administration’s term of office has already passed, and it is hard to exercise that excuse any more; nevertheless, today’s administration can still be described as having an inadequacy of experience and the need for constant sharpening and refining. Besides the fundamental reason that the DPP is lacking in talented people, an even more important factor is that those in power do not know how to use people properly; they frequently appoint the wrong people to the wrong post… (Cited in Rigger, 2005, Danger Strait: 16-17)

Sheng (2002: 61-63) argued that “Taiwan’s democracy is weak in three essential areas: civil society, core values of the society, and state building.”

“In a mature civil society – the base for a stable democracy – the intelligentsia as well as businessmen are comparatively highly independent, politically.” Unlike in a stable democracy such as the United States, the interests of businessmen and the intelligentsia could be easily affected by a change of government in an immature civil society like Taiwan. Also, Taiwan does not have a strong “civil power”, a “broad and horizontal social connection within the social system rather than the vertically connected social structure along family and/or ethnicity lines”.

Therefore, the dramatic change in governance in Taiwan has doubtlessly brought about enormous political as well as social disorder that will last for quite a while (Sheng, 2002).

“A stable democracy cannot be built on severe conflict of societal core values; if this occurs, it may lead to social and political chaos.” In Taiwan, the debates over independence, reunification and whether citizens are of Chinese or Taiwanese descent have become more divisive and volatile as the pro-independence DPP has come to power. The conflict over core societal values in Taiwan is an issue of much greater
concern than race relations, the origin and sanctity of human life (abortion, capital punishment), etc. What is more devastating is that after Chen’s election, the political mess exposed a weakness in Taiwan’s state building capacity, failing to accommodate the debates both internally (within Taiwan) and internationally (China and United States). “…Taiwan’s weak state building, which cannot accommodate ‘rule by rotation’ and ‘coalition government’ – both of which are common features in many stable democracies” (Sheng, 2002).

Overall government performance has suffered as well from the new administration’s lack of governmental experience and shortage of technocrats. The inexperience coupled with disputes between various DPP factions and between the President’s Office and party members in the executive branch and the Legislature often results in inconsistent expressions of government policy. It has also led to two Cabinet reshuffles, including the change of premier. The separation of power issue among the President’s Office, the Cabinet, and the Legislature poses a pressing task for the new government. This has had a continuing impact on the Chen Administration’s ability to achieve policy consistency and administrative efficiency. In short, as many analysts point out. “The ruling party hasn’t learned how to rule, and the opposition party hasn’t learned how not to rule.” (Rigger, 2005, Danger Strait: 17)

“Historically, democratisation has been used to improve governance, and not to split or challenge sovereignty.” Many Chinese are convinced that Taiwan is trying to relate
reunification with democratisation in its “pragmatic diplomacy” in order to gain support for independence claims (Sheng, 2001).

Should democracy become another tool for politicians to use to win votes? In the case of Taiwan, should politicians use democracy against the PRC? Anthony Giddens in Runaway World states that while the idea of democracy is spreading around the world, bubbles are slowly bursting in mature democratic countries. In the United States, a growing number of younger people have lost interest in politics. Fewer people are voting because they do not trust politicians. Giddens called this a “paradox of democracy”. Politicians focus their policies on specific areas of the community in order to secure more votes, thereby slowly losing people’s trust (Giddens, 2001).

One the other hand, it is clear that the PRC is changing. People in China are slowly having more rights than they have ever had. In the major cities, people live their lives as we do in Australia and in other democratic countries. In 2002, China’s leader Hu Jintao said that China “must enrich the forms of democracy, make democratic procedures complete, expand… political participation and ensure that the people can exercise democratic elections, democratic decision-making, democratic administration and democratic scrutiny” (The Economist, 10/07/2005). Certainly, a change towards democracy will not happen overnight. For a country like China, with a population ten times larger than the United States, it will take more time to adopt any changes. Nevertheless, we must not discount the changes that have already been made in
contemporary Chinese society as well as the changes that are already taking place. Although Taiwan has demonstrated its impressive democracy by means of its success in holding presidential elections, it was not until 1996 that people were given the right to vote for their chosen leader.

The majority of Taiwanese still believe that China is a poor third world country, even though this is no longer the case. Little do many people in Taiwan realise that China has moved forward as one of the top competitive countries in business. Politicians and the media are to blame for creating such an image and spreading false information about China to the Taiwanese public. China’s economic growth has not only matched Taiwan but has even managed to surpass it.

Lower living standards are an unavoidable step for all developing countries. However, with the rapid growth in the economy and their emphasis on education, it will not take China too much longer to enhance people’s living standards and social status. Lower living standards do not mean that all Chinese people are living in poverty. In most Chinese cities, people already enjoy high living standards. The World Exposition was awarded to Shanghai for 2010 and Beijing won the 2008 Olympic Games, both further proof of China’s growing economy.

Taiwan formed its own identity after Japanese colonisation ended in 1945. It took a different path socially and politically from the PRC, which caused an incompatibility
of identity between the Taiwanese and the Chinese today. Taiwan focused on its
economy and reconstruction after the Japanese left. They built up a strong economy to
become one of the “Four Asian Tigers”. However, it may be argued that if social
experience makes one’s identity (Brown, 2004), then wouldn’t it also be possible for
the Chinese to have the same identity as the Taiwanese, assuming they share the same
social experiences, especially when they even use the same official language?

The recent economic growth experienced by Taiwan and China does not only build up
the good economic relationship between them, it also boosts social exchanges. Popular
Taiwanese TV and music programs are viewed by the majority of
mainlanders and receive great responses. As an example, Taiwanese singers often
hold concerts in many Chinese cities. Also, TV dramas are made in various Chinese
provinces, demonstrating this popularity further. The point is that although one may
still be able to notice the Taiwanese identity at present, continued social exchanges
will be a foreseeable lead to a culturally combined Taiwan and China.

The conflict between Beijing and Taiwan may have been resolved if only the
wordings in the Shanghai Declaration were selected with utmost care and tact. The
common notion and thinking that “One China” means that Taiwan is a part of China
is both true and false. This is true because Taiwan is indeed a geographical
component of China. However, this is also false, because Taiwanese do not see
themselves as part of the PRC. There are still issues for both sides of the Strait to
Nationalism and Identity of Taiwan

Nationalism can affect people’s thoughts in a most unexplainable way. Tom Nairn writes that “‘Nationalism’ is the pathology of modern developmental history, as inescapable as ‘neurosis’ in the individual, with much the same essential ambiguity attaching to it, a similar built-in capacity for descent into dementia, rooted in the dilemmas of the helplessness thrust upon most of the world (the equivalent of infantilism for societies) and largely incurable” (cited from Imagined Communities: 5).

Taiwan’s nationalism has emerged from the persistent political blockages to international acknowledgement from the PRC as well as from its threats of military confrontation. After years of fighting for a global political status and fear and anger over war games and missile testing from the Beijing government, nationalism has slowly consolidated in Taiwan. Taiwanese-ness has been produced by Taiwanese politicians for the purposes of promoting independence and, later, as a tool for winning votes.

Brown (2004) states that Taiwan’s new Identity, “with its basis in actual social experience, contributes to the increasing numbers of Taiwanese who approve of the calculated risk of angering China in order to win international support for Taiwan’s
The growing numbers of the pro-independence Taiwanese threaten Taiwan’s wellbeing by refusing to nourish a good relationship with the PRC. They ignore the close ties between the two sides and the similarity in cultural backgrounds to insist upon what they believe is more important: an independent Taiwan. They emphasise the term “Taiwanese-ness” to distinguish themselves from the mainland Chinese. In a way, Taiwan seems to be closer to the West and even to Japan than to a country with a similar cultural background (China). “… many Taiwanese have strong bei qing (a complex that they are being victimised by mainlanders). People in the mainland will then have such bei qing, but in a reverse way. Chinese mainlanders are likely to take the view that the people in Taiwan have joined the West to weaken and contain China when it was in difficulty, instead of helping it” (Sheng 2001).

The political and economic transformation between 1980 and 1990 changed Taiwanese identity dramatically. Taiwan’s identity became increasingly inclusive, proud and nationalistic. Unfortunately, the term “Taiwanese-ness” is today being manipulated by many Taiwanese politicians. According to The Economist (13/01/2005), the term Taiwanese nationalism was fostered by President Chen to win popularity. “DPP politicians largely echo the TIM (Taiwanese independence movements) when they promoted the ideas of an island-wide identity that combines elements of aboriginal, Chinese, Japanese and Western culture. Policies designed to
create, reinforce or protect this culture could prove key to strengthening an imagined community and thus furthering the nation-building project” (Phillips, 2005). The idea of independence has spread more widely among the Taiwanese people, especially among the younger generations. “Taiwanese-ness” is an imagined identity produced by widespread independence activities in Taiwan. What younger Taiwanese people believe in is the link between independence and patriotism; that if people are to show their patriotism, they must also support Taiwan’s independence (i.e. Taiwanese-ness = Patriotism = supporting Independence).

Without a doubt, Taiwanese nationalism has become a political tool that has been abused by the pro-independence politicians and their supporters. For example, the recent visit to China by the opposition leader Lien Chan (chairman of the KMT) in April of 2005 and his historic meetings with the Chinese President/Communist Party General Secretary Hu Jintao, was criticised by many independence supporters. Soon after, the visit to China by opposition People First Party chairman Soong (who broke from the KMT in 2000) was also severely criticised.

We have identified what “Taiwanese-ness” is about and seen politicians’ manipulation of this sense of identity. The younger generation pays no attention to any positive progress that Taiwan and the PRC make towards an agreement and would rather fight for an identity that in so many ways has proven unrealistic and imaginary.
Chapter 4: Conclusion

The One-China Policy was created by the United States and China to put the tension between them to an end – détente. It was an effort that recognised the People’s Republic of China as the sole governing body that may represent the people of China in the international community. It was also an effort by the United States to recognise that Taiwan, in spite of their good relations with the United States was just a province or dependent state of China, and may not be represented in international organisations as a country with its own government.

Disputes between Taiwan and mainland China started in the early 1940’s. The Republic of China was ruled by the Chinese Nationalist Party (KMT) under Chiang Kai-shek. However, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) lead by Mao Zedong became dissatisfied with the KMT’s governance. The Chinese Civil War erupted and in October 1949, mainland China came under the governance of Mao Zedong and the CCP. Chiang Kai-Shek and his army retreated to Taiwan. However, instead of recognizing Mao Zedong as the new ruler of China, Chiang Kai-Shek continued ruling over Taiwan, following the Republic of China constitution.

During this period China still had good diplomatic ties with the Soviet Union but after some years had passed Mao Zedong realised that the Soviet Union was more preoccupied with “co-existing” with other countries. Since then the People’s Republic
of China departed from its relations from the Soviet Union. While these events were happening, the United States, on the other hand, had been establishing rather strong relations with Taiwan. Finally, in 1969, a bloody dispute along the border of the Ussuri River erupted between China and the Soviets. The relations between China and the Soviet Union were almost irreparable.

The United States has been in the picture for quite sometime, negotiating with the Chinese government about “trivial” issues like “American claims to compensation for nationalised property and defaulted debts. …efforts to secure the release of Americans imprisoned in China.”(Kissinger, p. 684) However, its role had become more active in January 20, 1970 when it conducted its 134th meeting in Warsaw, Poland. Both envoys from the United States and China played a rather active role to promote the completion of One-China Policy in 1972.

This paper aimed at evaluating the One-China Policy created by President Nixon in 1972 by presenting and analysing the incidents that took place between 1970 and 1972 that lead to the eventual creation of the policy. The incidents were presented in two parts: those that happened before the invitation to Beijing took place and the eventual happenings during the journey to Beijing.

Invitation to Beijing

In Henry Kissinger’s 'White House Years', he told of the incidents that took place
between China and the United States leading to the creation and establishment of the One-China Policy. He showed how both parties remained cautious in approaching the settlement and agreement leading to peaceful and diplomatic ties with each other.

In the section entitled “The End of the Warsaw Channel,” Kissinger expressed the view that the strained relations between China and the United States had been a product of years of prejudices between the people of both countries. According to him, “for 20 years, US policymakers considered China as a brooding and chaotic, fanatical and alien realm difficult to comprehend and impossible to sway.” They had viewed the stand and actions of the Chinese government in the Vietnam War as an ardent need to expand. “Chinese, for their part saw the scale of our [United States’] efforts in Vietnam as disproportionate to any objective to be achieved” (White House Years: 685) He later expressed the view that the Chinese government read the United States’s role in the Vietnam war as an excuse for it to implicitly war against the Chinese.

With such prejudices, both governments became very guarded in dealing with one another. Although both parties were willing to settle and resolve significant issues involving their respective governments, they remained firm on certain stands. During this period, it was the Chinese government which wanted to lessen the number of its adversaries. They wanted to make certain that in the event the Soviets became aggressive towards them, enough alliances with other countries had been formed to
support China to fight off the Soviets or that fewer countries would participate in the “seeming” war with Soviet Union.

On the other hand, the Nixon administration was still hurting from the trauma incurred during the Vietnam War, but was still convinced that it could shape a new approach to international diplomacy. Nixon believed that by being on good terms with one-fourth of the world’s population, “it will restore new perspective to their diplomacy” (White house years: 685)

The United States was willing to give the strategic reassurance the Chinese government needed in this hostile time for Sino-Soviet relations. However achievement of each other’s aims became hard-earned. Both had to overcome the prejudices that had been lurking in their minds for the last twenty years. The barrier between them had to be broken down, or even cracked in to several pieces initially to ensure they could pursue their respective goals.

American ambassador to Poland Walter Stoessel was the US representative while Lei Yang, charge d’affaires of the People’s Republic of China represented the PRC in several meetings in Warsaw, Poland. In January 20, 1970, the 134th meeting took place. It was used by the Nixon administration as the venue to express their willingness to send emissaries from America to Beijing. He utilized it to confirm the stand of the United States regarding their “would-be” involvement in resolution of the
Sino-Soviet issue. As read by Ambassador Stoessel, President Nixon stated firmly that “the United States did not seek to join in any condominium with the Soviet Union directed against China.” (White House Years: 687) Also, in the event when the United States decides to step in to settle the problem between the two countries, “it will not be based on their ideology but on their mutual interest.” (White House Years: 686)

Lei Yang meanwhile, responded by reading a statement drafted by the Chinese counterparts. It says “We are willing to consider and discuss whatever ideas and suggestions the US Government might put forwards in accordance with the five principles of peaceful coexistence, therefore really helping reduce tensions between China and the US and fundamentally improving relations between China and the United States. These talks may either be conducted at the ambassadorial level or may be conducted at a higher level or through other channels acceptable to both sides.” (Kissinger 1978: 687)

Both statements from the two parties have somehow eased some tension between them. Although it took several months after the January 1970 meeting before the success of the proclamation became notable. In the 136th meeting that took place in Warsaw, the Chinese government finally accepted the United States’ proposal to send an emissary to Beijing. During these times, the government of the Soviet Union had constantly communicated with the US Government inquiring about the stand of President Nixon. It was Henry Kissinger’s choice to evade such inquiries.
This commitment to maintain this truce was tested when the war in Cambodia erupted in May 1970. The governments of China and the Soviet Union continued their disputes when each supported various insurgent forces in Indochina.

When the disputes over Cambodia subsided in June 1970, attempts to open the contact were ventured once again. General Vernon Walters of America was the one tasked by the US Government to deliver the message to the emissary of the Chinese Government, Fang Wen. Several times, in diplomatic parties, both envoys from China and America crossed paths but the message was not delivered. The message this time, coming from the government of United States was about the possibility of sending secret envoys from both governments since the unsuccessful and public talks that happened in Warsaw. However, on the third time that their paths crossed, General Walters managed to communicate the message of the American government.

Agreement to such a request on the part of China did not come through until late November of the same year. The answer from the Chinese government was delivered through the President of Pakistan, Yahya Khan. The message stated that the government of China, along with its leaders, Mao Zedong and Vice Chairman Lin Biao “has always been willing and has always tried to negotiate by peaceful means.” *(White House Years: 701)*

All the efforts of both governments culminated in April 1971. During this time,
several more countries had recognized Mainland China and its government as the sole representative of the Chinese people in the international arena. China had been trying its best to establish new ties and re-establish old ties with its former allies. This had been enough for the world to see the sincerity of Chinese government to gain recognition and admittance to the United Nations. What the envoys of both countries tried to accomplish was finally consummated unknowingly by the table tennis players from both countries. Glenn Cowan of the United States table tennis team approached Chuang Tse-tung, China’s three-time world champion in table tennis. They exchanged chit-chat and Cowan managed to obtain a ride home from the Chinese guy. The next day, Cowan approached Chuang to give him a shirt from the US. This friendly gesture was rewarded by a Chinese kerchief from Chuang. The Chinese table tennis team then invited the American table tennis team to come to China and play. The American coach, Graham Steenhoven, although hesitant at first to reply affirmatively to the request, deferred the decision to the American ambassador in Japan, William Cunningham. Since the ambassador was unaware of the Nixon overtures to Beijing, he told Steenhoven to accept the request.

President Nixon was informed about the decision of Cunningham to accept the invitation by the Chinese table tennis team. When the President heard this, he withdrew the 100,000 troops in Taiwan at the same time, defending the Indochina policy. Simultaneously, the Chinese government, led by Zhou Enlai, received the American table tennis team warmly. The gesture did not go unnoticed. The Chinese
team later that day received an invitation from their American counterpart to tour the US and they complied gracefully.

After many talks, the agreed day when Henry Kissinger would secretly proceed to Beijing was July 1. His trip to Beijing would be preceded by trips to Saigon, Bangkok, and New Delhi. The day remained significant for Henry Kissinger, for it was also the same day when Ambassador James Shen of Taiwan approached him to talk about Taiwan’s bid for dual seats in the United Nations. According to James Shen, he wanted reassurance from the United States that it would preserve Taiwan’s seat at the next United Nations General Assembly. It was heartbreaking for Kissinger because he knew that China and the United States had been secretly meeting to talk about formally strengthening its diplomatic ties which included the possibility of severing the United States ties with Taiwan.

During his trip to different Asian countries mentioned above, he tried to prepare these countries about the impact of the forthcoming announcement of United States and Chinese diplomatic ties by subtly injecting in their conversations points about the Ping-pong diplomacy and their easing of trade with the Chinese. When asked by the different representatives from the respective countries he was visiting about the United States’ stand regarding the issues involving Sino-American relations, he stressed that by “moving towards China, the needs for global equilibrium were satisfied.” *(White House Years: 736)*
In Beijing, Henry Kissinger was met by four supporters of Premier Zhou Enlai. They were: Chang Wen-chin, the head of the West European, American and Oceania Department of the Chinese Foreign Ministry; T’ang Wen-sheng, a Brooklyn-born woman who had returned to China to serve as member of Premier Zhou Enlai’s government. Also present was Wang Hai-jung, a foreign ministry official and lastly, T’ang Lung-pin, from the protocol department.

This group of important envoys was transported back to Henry Kissinger’s guest house to meet and talk with Premier Zhou Enlai. The team of 4 members each, including Kissinger and Zhou comprised the group which would initially discuss what was to become the One-China Policy. According to Kissinger, his meeting with Premier Zhou took 17 hours. What was accomplished in the first day between Zhou and Kissinger was more of the establishment of their respective grounds in the creation of the policy. It was during this talk when both sides acknowledged the importance of the other in achieving their goal towards peaceful co-existence. On the second day, the easy banter reminiscent of the first was transformed into a more serious tone. Discussions were mainly centred on the views of both countries and their respective governments about the other countries surrounding them. China had shared strong opinions about India and the Soviet Union. It also attempted to justify its stand in supporting the causes of North Vietnam. Startlingly, the government of Zhou Enlai told the envoys of the United States that it would never aim to be considered in the
international arena as one of the superpowers. China also acknowledged the difficulties United States was experiencing in being torn between the struggles of its allies.

On the second day of talks, Premier Zhou finally asked the envoy from the United States whether a visit from President Nixon would be possible in the future. Later, it was agreed that the presidential visit might happen in spring of 1972, right after the elections in the United States to minimize criticism the US government would receive about the acceptance of the invitation.

The envoys for the United States returned home elated, having accomplished what they came there for. They were able to discuss the points stressed by President Nixon such as issues of Vietnam and the possibility of triangular relations with the Soviets.

**The Week that Changed the World**

Kissinger returned to the United States on July 13. He took time explaining to President Nixon what took place during the three days that he was in China, talking to Premier Zhou. On July 15, President Nixon decided to publicly announce the secret trip Kissinger took in July 9-11 to Beijing to talk to the government of China. During this announcement, he specified that he might go to Beijing in May 1972 to personally represent the United States in China and talk to Premier Zhou to further their causes of maintaining peace between their people. In the President’s speech, he
stressed that the policy he would create regarding the ties he had with China was not in any way directed against other countries and their governments, but rather directed towards achieving peace within its region.

The efforts exerted by both parties to secure the peaceful co-existence of China and United States were very tedious. Each had been prejudiced about the other. The American government and its policy makers saw China as a fanatical aggressor who aimed to maintain its identity and that any efforts of another government to loosen its grip on issues would be futile. This was because that the Chinese government was seen by their American counterparts as difficult to comprehend and to sway. On the other hand, the government of America was an aggressor, using seemingly “innocent” causes like the Vietnam War as an excuse to war against China.

These prejudices had been unconsciously motivating the different moves of both camps. When China started loosening its ties with the Soviets, it aimed to strengthen its ties with other governments. In spite of its capacity to fight off the Soviets, China wanted strategic reassurance from countries like the United States.

As a whole, the government of President Nixon had been very cautious in strategically creating a feasible environment for both parties to proceed with the creation and agreement of the One-China Policy. In the book written by Henry Kissinger *White House Years* the contents of the policy were not presented as being as
important as the details and incidents leading to the creation of the policy.

The most significant talk besides the one that brought Henry Kissinger to Beijing was the 134th meeting between the American and Chinese ambassadors in Warsaw, Poland. It was considered significant because it was where America tried to convince the envoys of the Chinese government, and in the long run, the Chinese government itself, to allow an emissary to Beijing. These efforts, although slightly dangerous for the envoys, should be treated as a sincere way of the American government to reassure the People’s Republic of China that at this point in time, they were willing to hear the side of China. President Nixon was initially trying to pamper the sense of security of the Chinese people that it was serious about maintaining peaceful relations with them and it was willing to even, internationally acknowledge China as the sole representative of the Chinese people in the international arena. However, the effort and commitment of both parties to maintain open communications were tested by the Cambodian war. Although there had been disputes between them in the past, even during the time that talks between the two governments were talking place, both the United States and China tried holding on with a firmer grip on the possible benefits of maintaining diplomatic relations with each other.

The government efforts were unquestionably well-thought of and carefully prepared. However, to date, the most significant event that promoted the hastening of the possibility of stronger relations with China was facilitated by the American table
In a tournament of table tennis players, the players found friendship and significantly affected the interactions of both parties. A simple gesture of the giving of shirts by the American table tennis players and the sharing of the cultural articles paved way to the eventual invitation to the American table tennis team to play in China. As remarked by Premier Zhou as he warmly welcomes the delegates of other countries, their efforts (American table tennis players) had been more effective, at least symbolically.

The visit by the President of United States to China opened many doors for both countries. Although the government of the United States remained firm on their stand to facilitate possible reconciliation between the Soviets and China via the triangular relations it wanted to establish, China and America were able to little by little resolve their differences and step up to create a more lasting bond via the One-China Policy.

**Taiwan Issue**

Pessimists believe that war between Taiwan and China is inevitable. The tension between the two could escalate to the point of armed conflict. However, the hostile relationship across the Strait comes from misunderstandings and the ignorance of extremists who constantly push for Taiwan’s independence. President Chen’s real intention in promoting Taiwanese independence is the main factor that prolongs this dilemma at the expense of Taiwan’s economy and security. The political invention of
“Taiwanese-ness” prevents any possible peaceful resolution that would not only ensure the safety of the Taiwanese people, but also give them a brighter future. Judging from the economic development and stronger ties between Taiwan and China, a good relationship across the Strait can guarantee Taiwan’s economic growth and people’s stable lives.

The question of whether Taiwan should distance itself from Chinese culture is irrational. Fundamentally, Taiwan shares the same culture, speaks the same language and shares the same writing system. Many who promote “de-mainlandisation” have created a discourse to indicate that Taiwan has a culture that is entirely different from that of China. The discourse suggests that being colonised by the Dutch, Japanese, the KMT and including influences from the West has made Taiwan different from China. Although Taiwan was colonised by the Dutch, one does not notice any influence of this on the island.

The political reinforcement of Taiwanese-ness continues to be used against the mainland Chinese. This will only isolate Taiwan from the rest of the world. Since Europe achieved the unachievable in forming the EU, there is no reason why Taiwan and China should not resolve their disagreements peacefully.

The One China Policy has not only proven to be a great achievement by Nixon and Kissinger in 1972, it should also work positively for Taiwan if they come to accept
the changes and see the reality. It does not suggest that Taiwan should reunify with the mainland in the near future. The reality is that, China has yet to meet the conditions to reunify with Taiwan. There are still many serious issues in China waiting to be resolved. Human Rights for instance: Falun Gong, Tibet, peasants protesting government land seizures and many other serious issues that are giving China a very bad image internationally. If any suggestions ever arose concerning reunification, then it would need to be viewed and implemented as a long-term goal. On the other hand, similar to China, Taiwan has yet to meet the requirements to declare independence. Taiwan cannot afford a negative relationship with the PRC as in so many circumstances Taiwan is relying on China’s booming economy. However, Taiwan should learn from the Nixon’s diplomacy with the Chinese as it has shaped the world and has kept the world peaceful even till today.

With the current US president, George W. Bush saying in an interview that “I am convinced the cross-strait issue can be solved peacefully. It is just going to take some time to do. And we will continue to work to see to it that it [is resolved]”. The resolution of the One China enigma just might not happen in our lifetime.
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1972 Shanghai Communiqué

President Richard Nixon of the United States of America visited the People’s Republic of China at the invitation of Premier Chou En-lai of the People’s Republic of China from February 21 to February 28, 1972. Accompanying the President were Mrs. Nixon, U.S. Secretary of States William Rogers, Assistant to the President Dr. Henry Kissinger, and other American officials.

President Nixon met with Chairman Mao Tse-tung of the Communist Party of China on February 21. The two leaders had a serious and frank exchange of views on Sino–U.S. relations and world affairs.

During the visit, extensive, earnest and frank discussions were held between President Nixon and Premier Chou En-lai on the normalisation of relations between the United States of America and the People’s Republic of China, as well as on other matters of interest to both sides. In addition, Secretary of State William Roger and Foreign Minister Chi Peng-fei held talks in the same spirit.

President Nixon and his party visited Peking and viewed cultural, industrial and agricultural sites, and they also toured Hangchow and Shanghai where, continuing with Chinese leaders, they viewed similar places of interest.

The leaders of the People’s Republic of China and the United States of America found it beneficial to have this opportunity, after so many years without contact, to present candidly to one another their views on variety of issues. They reviewed the international situation in which important changes and great upheavals are taking place and expounded their positions and attitudes.

The U.S. side stated: Peace in Asia and Peace in the world requires efforts both to reduce immediate tensions and to eliminate the basic causes of conflict. The United
States will work for a just and secure peace: just, because it fulfils the aspirations of peoples and nations for freedom and progress; secure, because it removes the danger of foreign aggression. The United States supports individual freedom and social progress for all people of the world, free of outside pressure or intervention. The United States believes that the effort to reduce tension is served by improving communication between countries that through accident, miscalculation or misunderstanding. Countries should treat each other with mutual respect and be willing to complete peacefully, letting performance be the ultimate judge. No country should claim infallibility and each country should be prepared to re-examine its own attitude for the common good. The United States stressed that the peoples of Indochina should be allowed to determine their destiny without outside intervention; its constant primary objective has been a negotiated solution; the eight-point proposal put forward by the Republic of Vietnam and the United States on January 27, 1972 represents a basis for the attainment of that objective; in the absence of a negotiated settlement the United States envisages the ultimate withdrawal of all U.S. force from the region consistent with the aim of self-determination for each country of Indochina. The United States will maintain its close ties with and support for the Republic of Korea; the United States will support efforts of the Republic of Korea to seek a relaxation of tension and increased communication in the Korea peninsula. The United States places the highest value on its friendly relations with Japan; it will continue to develop the exiting close bonds. Consistent with the United States favors the continuation of the ceasefire between India and Pakistan and the withdrawal of all military forces to within their own territories and to their own sides of the ceasefire line in Jammu and Kashmir; the United States supports the right of the peoples of South Asia to shape their own future in peace, free of military threat, and without having the area become the subject of great power rivalry.

The Chinese side stated: Wherever there is oppression, there is resistance. Countries want independence, nations want liberation and the people want revolution – this has become the irresistible trend of history. All nations, big or small, should be equal; big
nations should not bully the small and strong nations should not bully the weak. China will never be a superpower and it opposes hegemony and power politics of any kind. The Chinese side stated that it firmly supports the struggles of all oppressed people and nations for freedom and liberation and that the people of all countries have the right to choose their social systems according to their own wishes and right to safeguard the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of their own countries and oppose foreign aggression, interference, control and subversion. All foreign troops should be withdrawn to their own countries.

The Chinese side expressed its firm support to the people of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia in their efforts for the attainment of their goal and its firm support to the seven-point proposal of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam and the elaboration of February this year on the two key problems in the proposal, and to the Joint Declaration of the Summit Conference of the Indochinese people. It firmly supports the eight-point program for the peaceful unification of Korea put forward by the Government of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea on April 12, 1971, and the stand for the abolition of the “UN Commission for the Unification of Korea.” It firmly supports the Japanese people’s desire to build an independent, democratic, peaceful and neutral Japan. It firmly maintains that India and Pakistan should, in accordance with the United Nations resolutions on the India-Pakistan question, immediately withdraw all their forces to their respective territories and to their own sides of the ceasefire line in Jammu and Kashmir and firmly supports the Pakistan Government and people in their struggle to preserve their independence and sovereignty and the people of Jammu and Kashmir in their struggle for the right of self-determination.

There are essential differences between China and the United States in their social system and foreign policies. However, the two sides agreed that countries, regardless of their social systems, should conduct their relations on the principles of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states, non-aggression against other states,
non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. International disputes should be settled on basis, without resorting to the use or threat of force. The United States and the People’s Republic of China are prepared to apply these principles to their mutual relations.

With these principles of international relations in mind the two sides stated that:
progress toward the normalisation of relations between China and the United States is in the interests of all countries;
both wish to reduce the danger of international military conflict;
neither should seek hegemony in the Asia-Pacific region and each is opposed to efforts by any other country or group of countries to establish such hegemony; and
neither is prepared to negotiate on behalf of any third party or to enter into agreements or understandings with the other directed at other states.

Both sides are of the view that it would be against the interests of the peoples of the world for any major country to collude with another against other countries, or for major countries to divide up the world into spheres of interest.

The two sides reviewed the long-standing serious disputes between China and the United States. The Chinese reaffirmed its position: The Taiwan question is the crucial question obstructing the normalisation of relations between China and the United States; the Government of the People’s Republic of China is the sole legal government of China; Taiwan is a province of China which has long been returned to the mainland; the liberation of Taiwan is China’s internal affair in which no other country has the right to interfere; and all U.S. forces and military installations must be withdrawn from Taiwan. The Chinese Government firmly opposes any activities which aim at the creation of “one China, one Taiwan,” “one China, two governments,” “two Chinas,” and “independent Taiwan” or advocate that “the status of Taiwan remains to be determined.”
The U.S. side declared: The United States acknowledges that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait maintain there is but one China and that Taiwan is part of China. The United States Government does not challenge that position. It reaffirms its interest in a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question by Chinese them-selves. With this prospect in mind, it affirms the ultimate objective of the withdrawal of all U.S. forces and military installations from Taiwan. In the meantime, it will progressively reduce its forces and military installations on Taiwan as the tension in the area diminishes.

The two sides agreed that it is desirable to broaden the understanding between the two peoples. To this end, they discussed specific areas in such field as science, technology, culture, sports and journalism, in which people-to-people contacts and exchanges would be mutually beneficial. Each side undertakes to facilitate the further development of such contacts and exchanges.

Both sides view bilateral trade as another area from which mutual benefit can be derived, and agree that economic relations based on equality and mutual benefit are in the interest of the peoples of the two countries. They agree to facilitate the progressive development of trade between their two countries.

The two sides agreed that they will stay contact through various channels, including the sending of a senior U.S. representative to Peking from time to time for concrete consultations to further the normalisation of relations between the two countries and continue to exchange views on issues of common interest.

The two sides expressed the hope that the gains achieved during this visit would open up new prospects for the relations between the two countries. They believe that the normalisation of relations between the two countries is not only in the interest of the Chinese and American peoples but also contributes to relaxation of tension in Asia and the World.
President Nixon, Mrs. Nixon and the American party expressed their appreciation for
the gracious hospitality shown them by the Government and the people of the
People’s Republic of China.
Appendix 2

817 Joint Communiqué

In the Joint Communiqué on the Establishment of Diplomatic Relations on January 1, 1979, issued by the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the People’s Republic of China, the United States of America recognised the Government of the People’s Republic of China as the sole legal government of China, and it acknowledged the Chinese position that there is but one China and Taiwan is part of China. Within that context, the two sides agreed that the people of the United States would continue to maintain cultural, commercial, and other unofficial relations with the people in Taiwan. On this basis, relations between the United States and China were normalised.

The question of United States arms sales to Taiwan was not settled in the course of negotiation between the two countries on establishing diplomatic relations. The two sides held differing positions, and the Chinese side stated that it would raise the issue again following normalisation. Recognising that this issue would seriously hamper the development United States – China relations, they have held further discussion on it, during and since the meeting between President Ronald Reagan and Premier Zhao Ziyang and between Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig, Jr., and Vice Premier and Foreign Minister Huang Hua in October 1981.

Respect for each other’s sovereignty and territorial integrity and non-interference each other’s internal affairs constitute the fundamental principles guiding United States – China relations. These principles were confirmed in the Shanghai Communiqué of February 28, 1972 and reaffirmed in the Joint Communiqué on the Establishment of Diplomatic Relations which came into effect in January 1, 1973. Both sides emphatically state that these principles continue to govern all aspects of their relations.

The Chinese government reiterates that the question of Taiwan is China’s internal affair. The Message to the Compatriots in Taiwan issued by China on January 1, 1979, promulgated a fundamental policy of striving for peaceful reunification of the Motherland. The Nine – Point proposal put forward by China on September 30, 1981 represented a Further major effort under this fundamental policy to strive for peaceful
solution to the Taiwan question.
The United States Government attaches great importance to its relations with China, and reiterates that it has no intention of infringing on Chinese sovereignty and territorial integrity, or interfering in China’s internal affairs, or pursuing a policy of “two Chinas” or “one China, one Taiwan.” The United States Government understands and appreciates the Chinese policy of striving for a peaceful resolution of the Taiwan question as indicated in China’s Message to Compatriots in Taiwan issued on January 1, 1979 and the Nine – Point proposal put forward by China on September 30, 1981. The situation which has emerged with regard to the Taiwan question also provides favourable conditions for the settlement of United States –China differences over the question of United States arms sales to Taiwan.

Having in mind the forgoing statements of both sides, the United States Government states that it does not seek to carry out a long – term policy of arms sales to Taiwan, that its arms sales to Taiwan will not exceed, either in qualitative or in quantitative terms, the level of those supplied in recent years since the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and China, and that it intends to reduce gradually its sales of arms to Taiwan, leading over a period of time to a final resolution. In so stating, the United States acknowledges China’s consistent position regarding the thorough settlement of this issue.

In order to bring about, over a period of time, a final settlement of the question of United States arms sales to Taiwan, which is an issue rooted in history, the two governments will make every effort to adopt measures and create conditions conducive to the thorough settlement of this issue.

The development of United States – China relations is not only in the interest of the two peoples but also conducive to peace and stability in the world. The two sides are determined, on the principle of equality and mutual benefit, to strengthen their ties to the economic, cultural, educational, scientific, and technological of relations between the governments and peoples of the United States and China.

In order to bring about the healthy development of United States - China relations, maintain world peace and oppose aggression and expansion, the two governments
reaffirm the principles agreed on by the two sides in the Shanghai Communiqué and the Joint Communiqué on the Establishment of Diplomatic Relations. The two sides will maintain contact and hold appropriate consultations on bilateral and international issues of common interest.
Anti Secession Law

“Article 1 This Law is formulated, in accordance with the Constitution, for the purpose of opposing and checking Taiwan's secession from China by secessionists in the name of "Taiwan independence", promoting peaceful national reunification, maintaining peace and stability in the Taiwan Straits, preserving China's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and safeguarding the fundamental interests of the Chinese nation.

Article 2 There is only one China in the world. Both the mainland and Taiwan belong to one China. China's sovereignty and territorial integrity brook no division. Safeguarding China's sovereignty and territorial integrity is the common obligation of all Chinese people, the Taiwan compatriots included. Taiwan is part of China. The state shall never allow the "Taiwan independence" secessionist forces to make Taiwan secede from China under any name or by any means.

Article 3 The Taiwan question is one that is left over from China's civil war of the late 1940s. Solving the Taiwan question and achieving national reunification is China's internal affair, which subjects to no interference by any outside forces.

Article 4 Accomplishing the great task of reunifying the motherland is the sacred duty of all Chinese people, the Taiwan compatriots included.

Article 5 Upholding the principle of one China is the basis of peaceful reunification of the country. To reunify the country through peaceful means best serves the fundamental interests of the compatriots on both sides of the Taiwan Straits. The state shall do its utmost with maximum sincerity to achieve a peaceful reunification. After the country is reunified peacefully, Taiwan may practice systems different from those on the mainland and enjoy a high degree of autonomy.

Article 6 The state shall take the following measures to maintain peace and stability in
the Taiwan Straits and promote cross-Straits relations:
(1) to encourage and facilitate personnel exchanges across the Straits for greater mutual understanding and mutual trust;
(2) to encourage and facilitate economic exchanges and cooperation, realize direct links of trade, mail and air and shipping services, and bring about closer economic ties between the two sides of the Straits to their mutual benefit;
(3) to encourage and facilitate cross-Straits exchanges in education, science, technology, culture, health and sports, and work together to carry forward the proud Chinese cultural traditions;
(4) to encourage and facilitate cross-Straits cooperation in combating crimes; and
(5) to encourage and facilitate other activities that are conducive to peace and stability in the Taiwan Straits and stronger cross-Straits relations.

The state protects the rights and interests of the Taiwan compatriots in accordance with law.

Article 7 The state stands for the achievement of peaceful reunification through consultations and negotiations on an equal footing between the two sides of the Taiwan Straits. These consultations and negotiations may be conducted in steps and phases and with flexible and varied modalities.

The two sides of the Taiwan Straits may consult and negotiate on the following matters:
(1) officially ending the state of hostility between the two sides;
(2) mapping out the development of cross-Straits relations;
(3) steps and arrangements for peaceful national reunification;
(4) the political status of the Taiwan authorities;
(5) the Taiwan region's room of international operation that is compatible with its status; and
(6) other matters concerning the achievement of peaceful national reunification.

Article 8 In the event that the "Taiwan independence" secessionist forces should act
under any name or by any means to cause the fact of Taiwan's secession from China, or that major incidents entailing Taiwan's secession from China should occur, or that possibilities for a peaceful reunification should be completely exhausted, the state shall employ non-peaceful means and other necessary measures to protect China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. The State Council and the Central Military Commission shall decide on and execute the non-peaceful means and other necessary measures as provided for in the preceding paragraph and shall promptly report to the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress.

Article 9 In the event of employing and executing non-peaceful means and other necessary measures as provided for in this Law, the state shall exert its utmost to protect the lives, property and other legitimate rights and interests of Taiwan civilians and foreign nationals in Taiwan, and to minimize losses. At the same time, the state shall protect the rights and interests of the Taiwan compatriots in other parts of China in accordance with law.

Article 10 This Law shall come into force on the day of its promulgation.”
The “three acknowledgements” were:

“The current state of cross strait affair is the result of the developments of history;

The PRC and Taiwan neither mutually represent one another nor belong to each other; and

Any change to the current cross strait situation should be approved by the people of Taiwan through democratic measures. People are the pillar on a nation and the purpose of a nation is to guarantee their security and benefits. Seeing that languages on both sides of the Strait are similar and the physical distance between the two is small, the people on both sides of the Strait should work to uphold and enhance this.”

The “four suggestions” were:

“To improve cross strait relations, to deal with cross strait disputes, and to deal with China’s “one China” principle according to the ROC Constitution.

To create a new mechanism or adjust current measures to continually co-ordinate the different opinions on national development or cross strait relations, which would include all political parties as well as the public.

To appeal to the PRC to respect both dignity and the “space” of Taiwan and to end military threats and work together with Taiwan to sign a peace agreement. In this way, confidence can be built and a win-win situation will be established.

To declare to the world that the government and the people of Taiwan insist on peace, democracy and prosperity as cornerstones to co-operation with the international community. With this in mind, Taiwan will construct new cross strait relations with
sincerity and patience.”