“THE WEEK THAT CHANGED THE WORLD”: THE RHETORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF NIXON’S CHINA RHETORIC

by

WILLIAM HAYS WATSON

(Under the Direction of Edward Panetta)

ABSTRACT

President Richard Nixon’s decision to establish relations with the People’s Republic of China represents a watershed moment in U.S. diplomatic history. While rhetorical scholars have closely scrutinized President Nixon’s public discourse on a variety of issues, few have paid close attention to his public discourses about China. This project aims to highlight the rhetorical significance of Nixon’s China rhetoric by analyzing its historical transformation over a twenty year period, beginning with Nixon’s anti-Communist/anti-China discourses as a member of Congress, Vice President and presidential aspirant to the President’s linguistic and visual rehumanization of the People’s Republic of China in ritualized settings while on his historic diplomatic visit. This project argues that “looking back” to Nixon’s visit to China and beyond enables rhetorical scholars to accurately assess and evaluate contemporary U.S. diplomacy towards China as well as U.S. diplomatic strategy at large.

INDEX WORDS: Richard Nixon, The People’s Republic of China, Civil Religion, Realism, Chaim Perelman, Rhetorical Criticism, Rhetorical Theory, American Public Address

“THE WEEK THAT CHANGED THE WORLD”: THE RHETORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF NIXON’S CHINA RHETORIC

by

WILLIAM HAYS WATSON

B.A., The University of Georgia, 2005

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2009

“THE WEEK THAT CHANGED THE WORLD”: THE RHETORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF NIXON’S CHINA RHETORIC

by

WILLIAM HAYS WATSON

Major Professor: Edward Panetta

Committee: Thomas Lessl

Roger Stahl

Electronic Version Approved:
Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Chapter 1

"The Week that Changed the World": Looking Back to Nixon and China

Introduction

On July 15, 1971, President Richard Nixon announced to a national television audience "a major development in our efforts to build a lasting peace in the world."[1] The announcement of such a "major development" revealed to the American public Nixon's intention to accept an invitation to visit the People's Republic of China. President Nixon arrived in the People's Republic of China in February 1972 and his one-week visit represented one of the most historic, if not the most historic, diplomatic engagements in United States history. Nixon himself referred to his week-long diplomatic venture into the People's Republic as "the week that changed the world."[2]

The announcement and the resulting visit to the People's Republic of China repudiated twenty years of hostile rhetoric (and policies) undertaken by the United States government, which were staunchly advocated by Richard Nixon himself. Nixon's reversal of U.S. policy towards China as well as his own rhetoric towards the People's Republic was and continues to this day to be considered a diplomatic surprise. Denise Bostdorff comments on the shocking nature of Nixon's announcement, "Richard Nixon shocked much of the world on July 15, 1971, when he announced he was going to China. The president who had built his career on being a hard-line anti-Communist not only would visit the PRC in February 1972, but also would shake Chou En-lai's hand and offer a toast to Mao himself."[3] Moreover, Evelyn Goh notes that Nixon's public rapprochement with China "ended more than twenty years of Sino-American hostility and represented the most significant strategic shift of the Cold War era."[4] Historian Margaret MacMillan similarly describes Nixon's visit to the People's Republic and the resulting

improvement of relations as "an earthquake in the Cold War landscape."[5] It is this time period, beginning with Congressman and Vice President Nixon as the leader of anti-China sentiment within the Republican Party and ending with his arrival back to the United States from his diplomatic stay in the People's Republic that will serve as the rhetorical artifact for this thesis project.

Taking for granted the U.S.-China relationship overlooks the various historical, ideological, and strategic complexities that have and continue to underlie this ever-important relationship. Moreover, merely revealing the importance of Nixon's visit to the People's Republic elides the discourses and rhetorical strategies that played and likely will continue to play vital roles in the development of the U.S.-China relationship. More importantly, any attempt to rhetorically analyze such vital discourses should focus primarily on arguably the most important development in contemporary Sino-American ties: Nixon's historic visit to the People's Republic of China. Such a focus would permit an informative and realistic assessment of the rhetorical history U.S.-China relationship, an invaluable commodity given the importance of both nations in contemporary world affairs. As Margaret MacMillan states, "to understand" the U.S.-P.R.C. relationship, "we need to go back to 1972, to the moment when it started anew."[6]

This thesis project not only "goes back" to 1972, but beyond, to Nixon's time as an anti-China member of Congress and as Vice President to Dwight D. Eisenhower. This rhetorical analysis is invaluable for scholars of American war rhetoric, American public address, and rhetorical critics and theorists alike. Given the prominence of foreign policy considerations in today's world, the increasing tendencies towards hostility, violence and war-making in contemporary affairs, and the rising need to construct peaceful means of engaging international relations, especially with the People's Republic of China over the twenty-first century, the

discourses surrounding Nixon's pursuit of peaceful, diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China serve as indispensible artifacts in the articulation and construction of what Robert Ivie calls rehumanizing rituals,[7] those rhetorical practices that serve as an "antidote" and a corrective to the visions of dehumanization and destruction that permeate contemporary discourses. Rhetorically analyzing Nixon's discursive (textual and visual) history towards China not only illuminates an example of a "rhetoric of evil,"[8] but also reveals how Nixon's announcement of and eventual visit to the People's Republic serve as an example of Ivie's rehumanizing ritual(s). An examination of the discursive transformation of Nixon's China rhetoric from those privileging Manichean considerations of good and evil to those privileging cooperation, peace, and understanding also offers tremendous insight into how rhetoricians can analyze, encourage and participate in the formation of a constructive, US-Sino relationship for today and for the future.

Literature Review

Although rhetorical scholarship on President Nixon is considered quite extensive, there has been an absence of contemporary scholarship on Nixon and his foreign policy accomplishments. Ranging from analyses of Nixon's presidential debates versus John F. Kennedy in the 1960 presidential campaign[9] to the rhetorical strategies employed during the Watergate scandal,[10] a plethora of articles have been produced that aimed to evaluate the rhetoric surrounding Richard Nixon. For example, Celeste Condit has written on the 37th president of the United States, including her critical examination of Nixon's famous "Checkers" speech[11] as well as commenting on Nixon's rhetoric as a whole.[12] Similarly, rhetorical scholars have produced numerous works evaluating Nixon's rhetorical strategies regarding the Vietnam War.[13] Moreover, rhetorical scholars have even engaged Nixon's rhetoric in very specific situations,

ranging from the role of space policy in the 1960 presidential debates[14] to an evaluation of Nixon's rhetorical strategies in his public comments regarding the resignation of Spiro Agnew.[15] In addition, chapters of books and entire books themselves have been written that focus almost entirely on the rhetorical nature of Nixon's presidency as a whole.[16] Despite the quality and quantity of such work, gaps exist within rhetorical scholarship regarding Nixon and his foreign policy accomplishments. The first gap is the lack of recent scholarship regarding Nixon, his policies, or his presidency. Given that President Nixon remains one of the most influential presidents of the twentieth century, especially regarding issues of foreign policy, contemporary scholarship should continue to analyze his rhetorical legacy. The second gap revolves around the relative absence of rhetorical analyses of Nixon's discourses regarding the People's Republic of China among rhetorical critics and theorists. In light of China's rising influence in global affairs and the likely importance of Sino-American ties during the twenty-first century, contemporary scholars should actively and critically engage United States discourses towards China, with Nixon's groundbreaking discourses towards the People's Republic as the starting point.

A dearth of recent scholarship exists about Richard Nixon, the Nixon presidency and more specifically Nixon's discourses on China. For example, Robert Asen published an article in 2001 regarding the rhetorical strategies in congressional debates regarding welfare reform under the Nixon administration.[17] Predictably, Asen's work did not address the issue of China in Nixon's public rhetoric. Robert Newman, however, has written on the role of China in public rhetoric between the 1950s and the 1970s.[18] Aside from the fact that "Lethal Rhetoric" was produced over 30 years ago, Newman's effort focused largely on discourses surrounding the public at large and within the Republican Party of the time, sidestepping any effort to analyze the

primary sources of Nixon's public discourse on China.[19] Given the importance of Nixon himself to the formation of United States policy towards China and the numerous speeches, press conferences, presidential debates, and other public announcements Nixon made towards China, Newman's analysis of U.S. discourses towards China at the time, although informative, needs to be supplemented in order to achieve a comprehensive rhetorical analysis.

Denise Bostdorff, however, has recently engaged in a rhetorical analysis of Nixon's rhetoric towards the People's Republic.[20] Bostdorff's piece, entitled "The Evolution of a Diplomatic Surprise: Richard M. Nixon's Rhetoric on China, 1952-July 15, 1971" does an impressive job of laying out and analyzing the progression of Nixon's rhetoric towards the People's Republic of China during a 20 year period, staring with Nixon's role as an anti-China member of Congress until his public announcement of his intention to visit China. Additionally, Bostdorff's work effectively illuminates how Nixon's announcement to visit China evolved over time rather than appearing, as it did in the eyes of many in the American public, as a sudden change in U.S. foreign policy. However, Bostdorff's work fails to "shed" sufficient "light" on the totality of Nixon's China rhetoric. While Bostdorff does highlight the "prophetic dualism"[21] inherent in Nixon's anti-China discourses as a member of Congress and as Eisenhower's Vice President, she chooses not to analyze the degree to which Nixon relied upon and deployed such Manichean notions of good and evil, freedom and tyranny in his public rhetoric towards the People's Republic. This limitation minimizes the role that such religiously-oriented discourses played in Nixon's public rhetoric as well as understates the seismic nature of Nixon's eventual shift in policy towards China.

The most effective aspect of Bostdorff's analysis involves her analysis of the "numerous signals" of a change in policy that Nixon provided over time. Bostdorff's overall assessment that

one could have easily have foreseen an eventual change in United States policy towards the People's Republic of China had they paid closer attention to the hedging/signaling strategies embedded in Nixon's public discourse is both correct and impressive. However, Bostdorff's analysis does not speak to *how* (through discursive constructions of time and through specific argumentative strategies) Nixon created the conditions for an eventual change in policy towards the People's Republic in the period of time prior to the actual announcement of his visit.

The primary limitation of Bostdorff's and Newman's individual works is their decision neither to closely analyze the discourses of Nixon's announcement itself nor to analyze the discourses—textual and visual—during Nixon's actual visit to the People's Republic. Although Bostdorff's work is invaluable to anyone studying Nixon's rhetoric towards China, her choice not to closely analyze the text(s) surrounding the announcement overlooks how Nixon's public rhetoric began the process of rapprochement with China. After reading the work of Bostdorff and Newman, one might come to the conclusion that Nixon's announcement was the "last instance" of Nixon's public rhetoric towards China. Even worse, one could be misled to believe that after Nixon's announcement, decades of hostile relations with the People's Republic of China suddenly were supplanted by a constructive and healthy diplomatic relationship. Given the perpetual tension in the U.S.-Sino relationship to this day, such a belief would not only be misguided, but could have potentially devastating consequences. This thesis aims to both supplement Bostdorff's and Newman's work while also addressing the potential consequences of the limitations of existing scholarship regarding Nixon's discourse towards China.

This thesis project aims to "fill the gap" in rhetorical scholarship regarding President Richard Nixon and U.S. policy towards China as well as addressing the limitations of past and recent work of regarding Nixon and his visit to China. By tracing Nixon's rhetoric from his days

as the fervent anti-Communist Vice President under President Eisenhower[22] to his China-centric 1967 *Foreign Affairs* piece entitled "Asia After Viet Nam"[23] to his First and Second Annual Reports to Congress[24] to the text of Nixon's July 15, 1971 announcement and the texts (verbal and visual) preceding, during, and concluding his actual trip to the People's Republic of China in February 1972, this process aims to not only illuminate the rhetorical significance of Nixon's decision to pursue diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China, but also to demonstrate *how* Nixon rhetorically made possible a constructive, friendly relationship for future U.S.-China relations. A rhetorical analysis of the images surrounding Nixon's visit is particularly important, both historically and for the future of U.S.-China relations; contemporary and historical scholarship has and continues to ignore the rhetorical significance of the visual text(s) of Nixon's trip to the People's Republic. Through an analysis of the visual texts of the visit, this project aims to reveal how Nixon and the Chinese leadership were not only able to embody forms of rehumanizing rituals through photographic images so that the American public and the world at large could "imagine" the People's Republic of China as a future friend and partner, rather than an aggressive, uncivilized, Communist enemy. This specific focus on the rhetorical significance of Nixon's trip is particularly important in light of historian Margaret MacMillan's comments that "We have been debating what it [Nixon's visit] really meant ever since."[25]

Rhetorical Approaches to Nixon's China Rhetoric

This project is one that is both critical and historical in nature and the intersection of rhetorical criticism and rhetorical history will form the basis of its critical perspective and methodology. Kathleen J. Turner describes the difference between rhetorical criticism and rhetorical history, "Broadly speaking, whereas rhetorical criticism seeks to understand the

message in context, rhetorical history seeks to understand the context through messages that reflect and construct that context."[26] In light of the differences between the critical and historical approaches, Turner argues in favor of rhetorical history as both a methodology and a perspective:

> Both as methodology and as perspective, rhetorical history offers insights that are central to the study of communication and unavailable through other approaches. Historical research provides an understanding of rhetoric as a process rather than as simply a product; it creates an appreciation of both the commonalities among and the distinctiveness of rhetorical situations and responses; it tests theory and complements criticism while standing as a distinct and valid approach in and of itself.[27]

Although Turner outlines the benefits of rhetorical history as a unique methodological approach, she also defends an interdisciplinary approach to rhetoric that includes both rhetorical criticism and rhetorical history, "To understand how those symbols and systems of symbols may have 'suasory potential and persuasive effect,' we need both rhetorical criticism's message-centered focus and rhetorical history's contextual construction."[28] Turner continues to defend the "essential" role that historical approaches have on the field of rhetorical studies, "If we truly believe…that 'rhetorical studies are properly concerned with the process by which symbols and systems of symbols have influence upon beliefs, values, attitudes, and action,' then historical research is an essential part of rhetorical studies."[29] Turner's conceptualization and defense of a critical-historical methodology lies at the heart of this critical project.

Sharing a defense of historical approaches to criticism with Turner, David Zarefsky reveals various ways to approach or engage in rhetorical history, two of which will be employed in this analysis. One approach is what David Zarefsky calls "the historical study of rhetorical

events."[30] Although Zarefsky believes that there are multiple ways to proceed within such an approach, he isolates way in particular that involves focusing on "patterns [that] can be found in groups of discourses that suggest a rhetorical trajectory."[31] This project seeks to find such patters in groups of Nixon's discourses in order to suggest a particular rhetorical trajectory, namely his call for and enactment of rehumanizing rituals with the leadership of the People's Republic of China.

Another approach outlined by Zarefsky involves "the study of historical events from a rhetorical perspective."[32] Zarefsky illuminates the benefits of such an approach to rhetorical history, "By studying important historical events from a rhetorical perspective, one can see significant aspects about those events that other perspectives miss."[33] Similarly, Ronald Carpenter describes how one can "see" the "significant aspects" of historical events by studying the primary sources unique to those events, "I am categorical: pertinence of some primary source material leaps off the page with its relevance for rhetorical critics willing to go beyond reading discourse alone."[34] This project engages in the study of such "important historical events" from a rhetorical perspective. More specifically, this project analyzes the rhetorical strategies embedded within and the rhetorical significance of events such as Nixon's participation in the 1960 presidential debates, the announcement of his visit to the People's Republic, and the events of the actual visit itself. By engaging in both "the historical study of rhetorical events" and the study of important historical events from "a rhetorical perspective," this analysis seeks to comprehensively demonstrate the rhetorical strategies unique to and the rhetorical significance of Nixon's public rhetoric towards China.

Overview of Chapters

Chapter two will utilize textual analysis of Nixon's public rhetoric towards the People's Republic of China while serving as Eisenhower's vice president and while campaigning against John F. Kennedy for the presidency of the United States in 1960. If Robert Newman is correct in saying that "only one whose entire past record was impervious to the charge of being soft on Communism could have gone to Peking and slapped backs and bubbled pleasantries,"[35] then any critical engagement of Nixon's rhetoric of diplomatic engagement must first closely examine Nixon's "past record" on China and demonstrate that such a record was truly anti-China. This analysis seeks not only demonstrate the nature of Nixon's anti-China credentials, but also seeks to isolate a common theme that permeated much of his hostile rhetoric towards the People's Republic: prophetic dualism.

In a 1984 essay, Philip Wander revealed the importance of the notion of prophetic dualism to debates surrounding United States foreign policy. As articulated during the Eisenhower administration, Wander reveals that the prophetic dualism endemic to American foreign policy "involved religious faith, the faith of our fathers, the ideas of freedom, individuality, a militant God, and the existence of evil in the world."[36] Wander further describes the characteristics of prophetic dualism:

> In its perfected form prophetic dualism divides the world into two camps. Between them there is conflict. One side acts in accord with all that is good, decent, and at one with God's will. The other acts in direct opposition. Conflict between them is resolved only through the total victory of one side over another. Since no guarantee exists that good will triumph, there is no middle ground. [37]

Ranging from the his comments regarding the Pacific Islands of Quemoy and Matsu in the 1960 presidential debates versus John F. Kennedy[38] to his public opposition to China's admission into the United Nations[39] and many other examples, Nixon's public rhetoric reeked of a prophetic dualism that not only posited the U.S.-Sino relationship as justifiably conflictual, but also presented the his fervent opposition to engaging the People's Republic as "being in accord with all that is good, decent, and at one with God's will."[40]

The third chapter will illuminate how Nixon, through his public discourse during the time period of 1967 to February 1971, temporally constructed the conditions whereby diplomatic engagement with the People's Republic was not only necessary, but inevitable "in the long-term". G. Thomas Goodnight's notion of "public time" is particularly instructive for the analysis of this time period. According to Goodnight, public time "is constituted in the urgency created by discourse that reshapes the landscape of common opportunities and constraints."[41] According to Goodnight, time becomes urgent, not to signal impending doom but rather to provide direction and capacity for action.[42] Likewise, Goodnight states that "by reconstructing or redirecting its temporal…options, a community recomposes its social constraints and possibilities."[43] In the time period between 1967 (with the publication of his *Foreign Affairs* article) and February 1971 (The "Second Annual Report to Congress"), Nixon created a sense of time that "reshaped" the "landscape of common opportunities and constraints," namely the opportunity to establish diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China. In this sense, Nixon's openness to establishing relations with China "as a long-range aim"[44] of the United States temporally provides the direction and capacity for such actions in the future.

This chapter will also reveal the powerful role that a realist view of international relations shaped Nixon's emerging views towards relations with the People's Republic of China. Drawing

upon the work of Robert Hariman and Francis Beer,[45] this chapter uncovers the realist nature of Nixon's discourse towards U.S. China policy. The annual reports analyzed in this chapter embody the substance and style of "realism," a worldview of international relations that privileges national self-interest and stability over other considerations. Nixon drew upon the lens of realism when articulating the strategic benefits of changing U.S. policy towards China, namely the benefits that a change in policy would have for U.S national interests, global stability, and the maintenance of the international order. Nixon's realist discourse helped lay the foundation for his eventual change in policy towards the People's Republic of China from one of confrontation to one of negotiation.

Along with Nixon's creation of a sense of "public time" that temporally creates the conditions for the eventual engagement with the People's Republic, Nixon's public discourse during this time period also serves as example of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's notion of loci communes, which can be defined as "conceptions of the preferable held by actors which aid their deliberation about practical affairs."[46] Stephen Depoe argues that a particular form of loci commune, locus of quantity,[47] can create particular temporal visions. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca define such communes as "those loci communes which affirm that one thing is better than another for quantitative reasons"[48] such as larger in number, useful, lasting or durable, or commonplace.[49] More specifically, loci of quantity can "produce a conception of time emphasizing values of stability…and incremental growth or change."[50] Nixon's rhetoric during this time period embodies this linkage of time with values such as stability:

> Taking the long view, we simply cannot afford to leave China forever outside the family of nations, there to nurture its fantasies, cherish its hates and threaten its

> neighbors. There is no place on this small planet for a billion of its potentially most able people to live in angry isolation.[51]

This illustration of locus of quantity, along with others that are commonplace in Nixon's rhetoric during this time period, illuminate how the 37th President temporally created the conditions for the eventual establishment of relations with the People's Republic of China.

The fourth chapter will engage in textual and visual analysis of Nixon's announcement of his intention to visit the People's Republic and the texts (verbal and visual) preceding, during, and following his visit to China in February 1972. Focusing on these primary texts not only reveals the continuation of Nixon's rhetorical strategies as they relate to the overall U.S.-Sino relationship, but such a focus more importantly reveals how Nixon rhetorically created the conditions for a constructive relationship with the People's Republic by discursively rehumanizing them as a friend rather than an enemy. As mentioned earlier, Ivie's scholarship regarding rehumanizing ritual has much to offer in theorizing potential alternatives to contemporary discourses of conflict, violence, and war, but it remains incomplete insofar as it does not provide a tangible example, historic or contemporary, of such rehumanizing rituals. Ivie's work also fails to specify why kinds of rituals could or would be considered rehumanizing. In attempt to supplement Ivie's theorization, this project argues that Nixon textually rehumanizes the People's Republic of China in ways that embody the concepts of cooperation, friendship, and respect suggested by Ivie. For example, on February 21, 1972 while making a toast to his Chinese hosts, Nixon says, "In that spirit, I ask all of you present to join me in raising your glasses to Chairman Mao, to Prime Minister Chou, and to the friendship of the Chinese and American people which can lead to friendship and peace for all people in the world."[52] In this quotation, Nixon (re)defines the relationship between the Chinese and Americans as one of

"friendship," rather than one of hostility, a rhetorical move that would that would likely characterize any form of rehumanizing ritual as conceptualized by Ivie.

Similarly, this chapter will isolate the visual texts of Nixon's actual visit to the People's Republic and analyzes their rhetorical potency as rehumanizing rituals. John Lucaites and Robert Hariman define visual rhetoric as "a large body of visual and material practices, from architecture to cartography and from interior design to public memorials."[53] Included in this definition of visual rhetoric is photojournalism. According to Lucaites and Hariman, photojournalism serves a vital role in public culture. They argue:

> Its freezing of a critical moment in time intensifies the journalistic experience, focusing the viewer's attention on a particular enactment of the tensions that define the public culture. But more than this, it does so ritualistically, as it repetitively conjures images of what is unsayable…in print discourses otherwise defining the public culture.[54]

The photojournalism that emerged from Nixon's historic visit to China only underscores their point. Not only did the photographs of Nixon shaking the hand of Chairman Mao, toasting with the Chinese Communist leadership and walking along the Great Wall of China "freeze a critical moment in time" to focus American public "attention" on a particular occurrence, but they also ritualistically "conjured" images that portrayed the People's Republic of China as a friend and partner. More importantly, the images of Nixon in China have and continue to serve as ways to "imagine" China as an example of a rehumanized friend and partner, exactly what Ivie seems to be calling for in the discourses of contemporary politics. Robert Asen underscores the crucial link between our imagining of an enemy and the resulting attitudes and actions we take towards them, "the politics of representation produces consequences—both for those representing and

those represented. Our attitude toward and treatment of others depends crucially on how we imagine others."[55] Such a critical analysis of the visual texts of Nixon's visit to China demonstrates that such politics of visual representation can, in fact, produce positive consequences in the real world of diplomatic relations. As seen in the photographs, the United States' attitude toward and treatment of the Chinese depended crucially on how Nixon "imagined" the People's Republic in China.

Although President Richard Nixon has been the subject of rhetorical scholarship for decades, contemporary scholarship seems to have forgotten about one of the most important American presidents in history. Moreover, although Nixon's public rhetoric towards the People's Republic of China has been analyzed by some rhetorical critics, the most important aspects of Nixon's public rhetoric have largely been overlooked. This analysis aims to address both issues. Through a critical-historical analysis of Nixon's public rhetoric from the period of 1960 until his arrival back to the United States from his visit to China on February 28, 1972, this project aims to reveal how Nixon rhetorically (textually and visually) made the case for diplomatic engagement with the People's Republic. In addition, such an analysis can help shed light on how particular rehumanizing rituals can not only overcome the violent discursive representations of the status quo, but more importantly, how such rehumanizing rituals can help guide the "imagining" of a constructive and sustainable relationship with the People's Republic of China, a relationship of vital importance globally for the twenty-first century.

Chapter 2

Richard Nixon: America's Anti-Communist/Anti-China Crusader

Introduction

Few could have predicted President Richard Nixon's decision to open diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China (P.R.C.). Not only was his decision surprising given his long-standing distrust of "Red China," but it was even more surprising given his twenty five year record of being one of the most notorious anti-Communist politicians in the United States. Nixon used anti-Communist sentiment to first get elected to the U.S. House of Representatives and continued to ride on the coattails of such sentiment for an overwhelming majority of his political career, including his time as president. The magnitude of Nixon's decision to warm ties with the People's Republic has been commented on by many scholars, in the field of rhetoric and beyond. However, the degree to which Nixon's anti-Communism shaped his politics and the ways in which his anti-Communism was articulated publically prior to his decision to visit the People's Republic of China deserves further interrogation by rhetorical critics.

The rhetorical significance of Nixon's diplomatic surprise is best surmised by first tracing the discursive progression of Nixon's views towards the People's Republic prior to his emergence onto the presidential landscape. This chapter will closely inspect Nixon's public rhetoric from his election to the House in 1948 to his razor-sharp defeat to President John F. Kennedy in the presidential race of 1960. This period, in particular, highlights the extent to which Nixon's anti-Communism animated his views towards the People's Republic as well as revealing the unique nature of Nixon's anti-Communist appeals, both of which represent

invaluable assets in attempting to recognize and understand the rhetorical significance of Nixon's announcement of his intensions to visit mainland China in 1971 and his eventual visit in 1972.

This chapter will begin by revealing the historical context surrounding Nixon's rise to political prominence, documenting how his rise to both a member of Congress and vice president under Eisenhower came on the back of anti-Communist rhetoric. It will then proceed to closely analyze a variety of Nixon's public texts (campaign speeches and each of the presidential debates) during the 1960 election campaign against John F. Kennedy, illuminating the extent to which anti-Communism animated then-Republican presidential nominee Nixon's views towards China. In so doing, this analysis will reveal three rhetorical concepts or themes that saturated Nixon's public rhetoric towards the People's Republic during the 1960 presidential campaign: the power of "civil religion" amongst the American populace, a belief in the sacred, political myths of divine, righteous mission and destiny for global American power, and a prophetic dualism that posited an inevitable conflict between the "good" America and the "evil" Chinese Communists. The prevalence of such themes in Nixon's public rhetoric during the presidential campaign underscores the rhetorical significance of his unexpected decision as president to pursue diplomatic ties with the P.R.C.

Historical Context

Richard Nixon first sought national political office in his home state of California in 1946. Nixon's reputation as an anti-Communist first began during his election against Jerry Voorhis, the Democratic incumbent for the twelfth district of California.[56] During the course of the electoral contest, Nixon consistently put the incumbent Voorhis on the defensive about his alleged endorsement by political action committees dominated by communists.[57] Nixon accused the Democrats (including Voorhis) of allowing Communists to enter important positions in the

federal government, thus undermining American security and threatening to "socialize" the United States; such accusations played well to the American public as the Cold War began to heat up. Republicans swept to victory in the 1946 congressional elections, including Nixon, who received 57 percent of the vote in the district.[58] The anti-Communist sentiment that won him his seat in Congress soon became his "trademark issue" on Capitol Hill when he gained appointment to the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC).[59] In 1948, Nixon led the investigation of Alger Hiss, a former State Department official and adviser to President Roosevelt, who was accused of being a Communist agent.[60] Hiss' conviction and the spotlight resulting from the controversy gave Nixon a national reputation as a "diligent hunter" of Communists and established him as a rising political star in the Republican Party.[61] Nixon would take the favorable publicity as an anti-Communist and use it as the opportunity to run for the U.S. Senate in 1950.[62]

Only after four years in the House of Representatives, Richard Nixon eyed the newly-opened Senate seat held by the retiring Democrat Sheridan Downey.[63] Nixon's opponent in the 1950 senatorial contest was former actress Helen Gahagan Douglas, a liberal Democrat who did not receive the endorsement of Senator Downey.[64] Ironically, Nixon's accusations of communism towards Douglas were initially coined during the bitterly-contested Democratic primary by one of her primary opponents, conservative Democrat and newspaper publisher Manchester Boddy.[65] Boddy both during the primary contest and afterwards, accused Douglas of being a part of a "subversive clique of red hots," of consistently voting with communist members of Congress, as well as supporting "Soviet tyranny" through her opposition to aid to Greece and Turkey.[66]

After the Democratic primary, Nixon began his anti-Communist assault against Douglas. Inspired by the Boddy campaign, Nixon sought to demolish Helen Douglas by adopting and expanding the conservative Democrat's argument that Douglas did not appreciate the Communist challenge.[67] His major weapon during the campaign was a pink handout that cited Douglas' record as a congresswoman and accused her of currying favor with communists; the handout revealed her 354 votes alongside communist representative Vito Marcantonio of New York as well as her opposition to the creation of House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC).[68] The pink handout was of tremendous symbolic significance during the campaign. To some the pink color implied that Douglas was at least a communist sympathizer, if not a full-blown communist herself; to others it was a reminder that Douglas was a woman playing the man's game of politics.[69] Even powerful Democrats spoke on Nixon's behalf during the campaign, largely due to concerns about Douglas' links to communists. A group called "Democrats for Nixon," which included George Creel, Woodrow Wilson's propaganda director during the first World War, and Ruth Turner, former president of the League of Women Voters in San Francisco, who both echoed Nixon's accusations that Douglas was pro-Communist.[70]

The 1950 campaign was also the first sign of Nixon's policy towards mainland China. On June 25, 1950, communist North Korea invaded South Korea and seemed to validate Nixon as a "prophet"; he has warned about communist aggression in the Far East, accusing Truman as focusing too much on Europe.[71] Nixon also claimed that Truman's response to North Korea's aggression was insufficient. In fact, one of the top priorities of Nixon's campaign was to clearly identify himself as a supporter of nationalist China (led by Chiang Kai-shek) and to pin the loss of mainland China to the communists on the Truman Administration.[72] Nixon identified himself closely with the powerful "China Lobby" by blaming the loss of China to the communists on the

Truman Administration.[73] This "China Lobby," composed of a powerful coalition of U.S. congressmen, publishers (most notably Henry Luce, publisher of *Time* and *Life* magazines), businessmen and military generals operating close to the highest levels of the U.S. government, attempted to ensure that the United States would oppose recognizing "Red China" and would continue backing Formosa (now known as Taiwan or the Republic of China) in its goal of ousting the Communist regime on the mainland.[74]

Nixon saw a series of events—the recent loss of mainland China to the communists, the Russian development of the atomic bomb, the conviction of Alger Hiss, and the rise of "dangerous" communists living at large in the United States—as proof that communism posed a clear and present danger.[75] Also during 1950, anti-Communism came into its own and when it came onto the political scene, it came "with a vengeance" and stayed on the political stage longer than most political issues.[76] During this time period, a public and congressional consensus on anti-communism emerged as the organizing principle of American foreign policy.[77] Because the American people felt the fear of communism so strongly, politicians used it to help themselves, especially Richard Nixon. In the final week of the campaign before the election and in front of a statewide radio audience, Nixon claimed that the most important issue of the senatorial campaign was how to deal with the global communist movement at home and abroad.[78] Although not mentioning Douglas by name, Nixon, as he had done throughout the campaign, called for the removal of office of those who were responsible for the loss of Asia to the communists.[79]

On November 7, a significant majority of Californians cast their vote in favor of Richard Nixon. Nixon's victory was nearly overwhelming, as he garnered 59 percent of the vote and ran well across the state with both Republican and Democratic support.[80] Nixon's victory was the largest margin of victory received by any senator during the 1950 national election cycle.[81]

Nixon's victory brought him increased prestige within Republican political circles and among conservative voters generally.[82]

During his time in the Senate, Nixon continued to formulate his policies towards Communist China. While on the Senate floor, Nixon (the youngest Republican in the body) led the assault against Truman for his handling of the Korean War.[83] In fact, Nixon argued that losing China to the communists was a direct result of Truman's decision to withhold aid from Chiang Kai-Shek.[84] The "China Lobby," in fact, saw the Korean War as a full-fledged Sino-American war and wanted to do to Communist China what the U.S. had done to Nazi Germany and militarist Japan. As a result, conservative Republicans (including Nixon) advocated declaring war on China.[85] Nixon wanted victory in Asia for U.S. interests. In addition to wanting to free Chiang from Formosa in order to drain Chinese forces from Korea, Nixon also urged the use of strategic bombers to destroy targets inside China as well as the imposition of a naval blockade.[86] After just one year in the Senate, Nixon made himself into one of the most important Republicans and he became one of the Republican leaders in the attacks against Truman's foreign policy.[87] These policy positions ensured the China Lobby's continued support of Nixon.[88]

By 1952, Nixon was a rising star in the Republican Party and mentioned as a potential candidate for national office. After General Dwight D. Eisenhower received the Republican nomination for president in 1952, he and his advisors put together a list of potential running mates with Senator Nixon's name at the top, largely due to the fact that party leaders had already decided that Nixon was their man.[89] Nixon was the ideal running mate for Eisenhower; he was a youthful counterpart to Eisenhower that possessed national stature and his presence also put the rising electoral influence of California in play in 1952.[90] Although Nixon had to endure

tremendous political heat following news reports of a secret political fund (and his controversial "Checkers" speech that was given in response to such reports), he remained Eisenhower's running mate in 1952 and even built his support among the party faithful.[91] The Eisenhower-Nixon ticket would later cruise to a comfortable victory in November.

The next eight years saw Richard Nixon elevate the office of the vice president to an unprecedented position of importance. No other vice president has been as active as Nixon during a previous administration or enjoyed as much responsibility (partially because of Nixon's energetic habits).[92] Eisenhower provided Nixon with unique opportunities and Nixon was more than willing to take advantage of those opportunities in order to cultivate an image of himself as an active and important vice president.[93] Nixon's role as an international goodwill ambassador represented the best example of his importance as vice president. In 1953, he visited numerous countries in Asia, which gave him a reputation in the United States as an expert on Asian affairs.[94] Nixon continued to receive bipartisan praise after his trip to South America, where he endured violent, anti-American protests.[95] But Nixon's final trip abroad garnered him even more favorable reviews. While travelling to the Soviet Union as a part of a cultural exchange program, Nixon and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev engaged in a lengthy and heated debate over the benefits and disadvantages of capitalism and communism.[96] Much of this debate was captured on American television, which portrayed Nixon standing in a model American kitchen defending American ideals and values against the aggressive Soviet leader.[97] The "Kitchen Debate" only solidified public support for Vice President Nixon and continued to underscore his anti-Communist credentials.[98] In addition to his role as a global goodwill ambassador, Nixon served as a party liaison between the Eisenhower administration and Republican members of

Congress and an advisor to the administration and a campaigner for Republicans running for election (or re-election).[99]

On the campaign trail, Vice President Nixon continued to demonstrate his anti-Communist credentials. He quickly gained a reputation as the Republican "hatchet man," whose campaign entailed a "hard-hitting anticommunist assault" that charged that Dean Acheson—T Truman's secretary of state—had lost China and Eastern Europe to the Communists and had instigated the Korean War.[100] Nixon even called Democratic presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson a graduate of the "Cowardly College of Communist Containment."[101] Nixon continued to serve as the party's spokesman during the Eisenhower administration, although with mixed electoral success.[102] Republicans had lost ground in Congress despite Eisenhower's political popularity in 1956 and suffered even greater losses in both the House and Senate in 1958.[103] Despite the lack of success in the congressional races, rank-and-file Republicans appreciated Nixon's efforts and nominated Nixon as their presidential nominee for the 1960 election.

America's Civil Religion according to Nixon

Upon receiving the Republican nomination for president in 1960, Nixon predictably used his anti-Communist credentials throughout the election campaign. But perhaps more unexpectedly, Nixon grounded much of his anti-Communist themes, including those concerning the People's Republic of China, within a larger religious-political discourse. This "civil religion," a term coined by Robert Bellah in 1967,[104] can be seen inundating presidential and public discourse, including then-Vice President Richard Nixon's during the 1960 presidential campaign. More specifically, Nixon's civil religious rhetoric relied heavily upon themes of sacred myth and mission, common historical themes well-known to most Americans, and such

themes played vital roles in the articulation of his anti-Communist message on the campaign trail.

Nixon's civil religion followed in the footsteps of many other iterations of civil religious rhetoric within American public discourse. According to Bellah, there are certain common elements of religious orientation that the great majority of Americans share and they have played a crucial role in the development of American institutions, providing a religious dimension for the whole fabric of American life, including the political sphere.[105] Bellah argues that this American "civil religion" is a genuine apprehension of universal and transcendent religious reality as seen in or as revealed through the experience of the American people.[106] Cynthia Toolin further elucidates this Americanized civil religion, "The American civil religion is a belief system that draws upon the religious ideologies and common historical experiences of the American people, unifying diverse peoples into one people and interpreting and giving meaning to their shared existence by putting that existence into a common frame of reference."[107] More than other public figures, presidents (and those seeking the presidency) play a leading role in the articulation and formulation of American civil religion; they are the central figures in American civil religion.[108] Presidents have historically served as the "prophet" of civil religion, using moralistic and religious rhetoric as a political symbol to impact the formulation of American political culture.[109] In fact, every president since the time of George Washington has publically requested or acknowledged help from God for the American people.[110] Especially in their public rhetoric, American chief executives—actual or aspiring—have deemed it necessary, time and time again, to remind themselves and the American people of their triune obligations to God, to country, and to God-and-country.[111] More importantly, this civil religion is inherently rhetorical; it has and continues to serve as a cultural interpretive resource, a discursive tool for connecting

morality and policy.[112] Roberta Coles highlights the symbolic nature of American civil religion, "A nation is constructed through selectively remembered and embellished events, myths of origin, heroic stories, and proclaimed values. These transcendent symbols constitute the nation's civil religion."[113] Nixon made use of the discursive and symbolic nature of this civil religion while on the campaign trail.

Nixon's rhetorical strategy to invoke civil religion made sense given the role that religion played in the lives of many Americans at the time. The decade of the 1950's was an especially curious time in the history of American civil religion; the glory days of anti-Communist crusades, McCarthyism, the war in Korea, and the Cold War all began or took place during this time period.[114] During the fifties, a full 62 percent of the American people professed church membership.[115] By 1970, this percentage had risen to 65 percent.[116] Moreover, only one of ninety-five senators in the Eighty-third Congress reported no religious affiliation.[117] Nixon's decision to employ religious themes fit with the "period of unparalleled rhetorical escalating of the American civil religion" that took place during the time period.[118]

Richard Nixon often invoked this civil religion on the campaign trail, reminding the American people about their special relationship with God. On accepting the Republican nomination for president, Nixon says, "Above all, in this decade of the sixties, this decade of decision and progress, we will witness the continued revitalization of America's moral and spiritual strength, with a renewed faith in the eternal ideals of freedom and justice under God which are our priceless heritage as a people."[119] Nixon's quotation invokes many aspects associated with civil religion, reminding the public of the role that God has played and will continue to play in America. Nixon's promise of that America will "witness" such revitalization also invokes the idea of witnessing as practiced in the Christian tradition. Nixon's expression of

confidence in the "continued revitalization" of America's moral and spiritual strength draws upon civil religious tones, placing religious values at the heart of America's strength. More specifically, Nixon's assurance of a "renewed faith in the eternal ideals of freedom and justice under God which are our priceless heritage as a people" also exemplifies a reliance on civil religious appeals. Nixon explicitly ties America's "priceless heritage as a people" and the ideals of "freedom and justice" to their "renewed faith" in (and "under") God. Later on during the heat of the presidential campaign, Nixon said:

> We have to realize in this country what America really stands for. You know what it is? Not just military might, and economic strength, but for great ideals that caught the imagination of the world 180 years ago. Our faith in God**.** Our belief in the dignity of all men. Our belief that the rights that men have, the rights of equality of opportunity, that these rights come from God, that they cannot be taken away from them by men.[120]

Again following in the civil religious tradition, Nixon links American identity –"what American really stands for"—to its long-standing relationship with God. The strength of America's "great ideals" comes from God, America's faith in God and their belief that the rights of all men come from God himself, according to Nixon. Both quotations also share in the civil religious tradition a focus on the past ("great ideals that caught the imagination of the world 180 years ago") and the future ("we will witness").[121] From the beginning of his presidential run in 1960, Nixon's public rhetoric seemed to follow in the civil religious tradition.

Myth, Mission and Destiny in Nixon's Campaign Rhetoric

Nixon's religious discourse on the campaign trail, similar to other presidential and American public figures, revolved around a well-established narrative, or myth, of the American experience. Northrop Frye argues that a myth is most commonly recognized as a certain kind of narrative.[122] More specifically, Frye believes that myth represents a certain type of story, a story in which some of the main characters are gods or other beings larger in power than humanity.[123]

As such, myths constitute "sacred" truths for the communities in which they develop.[124] Myths constitute the foundation of a community because they both describe how the society first came to be and provide principles for behavioral guidance through sanctions and taboos.[125] Sacred myths, in particular, are unique in this respect. Sacred myths represent immutable truth(s) from which a system of normative ethics is derived and in creating such a system of normative ethics, the sacred myth identifies and/or defines important aspects of people and their cultures.[126] As the public internalizes national mythology, conveyed through representation, culturally constructed narratives assume an aura of truth.[127] Moreover, myths imbue governmental policies with legitimacy, are relatively immune to factual attacks, and condition behavior in ways beneficial to political leaders.[128] According to Frye, myths may be told or retold, modified or elaborated.[129]

Similar to, but different from, myths are ideologies. Unlike sacred myths, ideologies are more programmatic and materially oriented; they are occasioned by and constructed in response to particular circumstances.[130] Ideologies rely less exclusively on the emotive, the immutable, and the divine than do myths.[131] However, ideologies are often infused with certain qualities normally associated with sacred myths; in a sense ideologies may be transformed into a type of myth.[132] One common example of this type of ideology is the doctrine of democracy.[133] The ideology of democracy becomes mythical when it is seen to be a part of a greater plan and when it is injected with a certain cosmological aura. Jeff Bass and Richard Cherwitz conceptualize this form of ideology, which combines elements of both sacred myth and ideology, as political myth.[134] According to Bass and Cherwitz, the political myth selectively interprets and constructs a social reality, influencing the perception of events and relationships.[135] This special power of political myth is a result of its unique blending of sacred myth and ideology.[136]

In his public rhetoric on the campaign trail, Vice President Nixon relied on the political myths of freedom and progress in his articulation of the struggle for victory between the United States and the forces of Communism. While speaking in front of the Fourth Annual Conference of the Magazine Publishers Association on September 28, 1960, Nixon comments:

> Well, of course, in the long run for the interests of the United States, for our freedom, because who wins this part of the world wins the whole world; but, as far as our aim is concerned, and what we must present to the world, we must fight it, having in mind that we are concerned about the future of these people, that we are concerned about their freedom, about their progress, and that whether there was any communism in the world or not, we would still be concerned. If we can present the case that way, if we can be tough-minded, realistic, but at the same time have a heart in our international relations, we will win against the Communists, because we will win for the fundamental reason that we're on the right side and they're on the wrong side.[137]

Nixon's use of political myth in this quotation is quite extensive. Not only does Nixon cite the importance of protecting American "freedom," but he also expresses his "concern" for the rest of the world's "freedom" and "progress" in light of the threats posed by Communism. Moreover, Nixon's willingness to "fight" reveals that the "fundamental reason" that the United States' will triumph over Communism is because fighting for "freedom" and "progress" means America is on the "right side" and the Communists are on the "wrong side." Progress and freedom are not merely things to uphold, but rather are moral, sacred ideals Nixon has pledged to fight for against the Communists. Similarly, on October 5, Nixon says, "…we will win this struggle. We will win it not because of our military strength or our strength materially, but we will win it because we're on the right side, the side of freedom, the side of justice, the side of faith in God. These are the ideals that count and there are the things for which you and I must always live."[138] Again, Nixon links ideological notions of freedom and justice with higher, cosmological ideals. According to Nixon, "we" (Americans) will prevail over the Communists due to America's moral and religious strength, derived primarily by "being on the right side," the side of

"freedom," "justice," and "faith in God." Both quotations demonstrate Nixon's use of political myth in his articulation of the struggle between United States and the Communists; through his pledge to fight for the sacred ideals of freedom, justice, and progress, Nixon mythologizes the United States as fighting on the "right side" of the impending battle against Communism.

In addition to his use of political myth when describing the United States' fight with Communism, Vice President Nixon's civil religious discourse on the campaign trail served to underscore the sacred myth of the United States as God's chosen nation whose mission and destiny it is to spread and protect freedom throughout the world. National mythologies that are naturalized and embedded within a culture over many generations, such as the American myth of mission, can provides a meta-narrative of American identity—an explanation of the past, present, and future trajectory of a people and a nation.[139] Historian Frederick Merk reveals the power of this myth of mission in America's history:

> A sense of mission to redeem the Old World by high example was generated in pioneers of idealistic spirit on their arrival in the New World. It was generated by the potentialities of a new earth for building a new heaven. It appeared thereafter in successive generations of Americans, with changes in the type of mission, but with the sense of mission unaltered.[140]

The myth of mission originated with the Puritans, who considered themselves to be God's chosen people, or in John Winthrop's words, a "city on a hill" for the whole world to see and emulate.[141] According to this myth, the United States has a moral duty to serve as a model for other countries and thus to encourage freedom around the globe.[142] The myth of mission, in particular, emphasizes the principle of freedom, argues that our nation is divinely blessed, claims that the United States is a model of morality for the rest of the world, and contends that the United States is destined to spread freedom around the globe.[143] This myth of mission, and its

emphasis on the principle of freedom, was and continues to be a type of national mythology in American culture.[144]

Vice President Nixon's civil religious rhetoric during the 1960 presidential campaign drew upon this myth of mission when referring to the Communist threat. During his nomination acceptance address, Nixon says, "…our answer to the threat of the Communist revolution is renewed devotion to the great ideals of the American Revolution, ideals which caught the imagination of the world one hundred and eighty years ago and that are still in the minds and hearts of people everywhere."[145] Not only does Nixon suggest that America's "answer" to the "threat" of Communism relies in the public's continued "devotion" to the "great ideals of the American Revolution," but he also suggests that those American ideals established during America's founding remain "in the minds and hearts of people everywhere." According to Nixon's representation of American mythology, it is America's mission to the world to renew its commitment to the "great ideals" that were established "one hundred and eighty years ago." On October 11 in Albuquerque, New Mexico, Nixon asks Americans that "you not only to work in this election for our cause, if you believe in it, but I ask you [to] work to make America a shining ideal for all the world to see, of equality of opportunity of all."[146] Again, Nixon invokes the myth of mission when calling on Americans to "work to make America a shining ideal for all the world to see." His invocation of Winthrop's "city on a hill," foundational to the myth of mission, is quite clear. In both quotations, Nixon rhetorically positions himself and the American people as vital members in America's "renewed devotion" to their national mythological mission.

This myth of mission also reveals itself in Nixon's public rhetoric towards the People's Republic of China, especially the controversy over the hotly-disputed islands of Quemoy and

Matsu. During the presidential debate between himself and Senator John F. Kennedy on October 21, Nixon reveals the importance of the principle of freedom to his worldview of U.S. foreign policy, "We also believe that in the great field of ideals that we can lead America to the victory for freedom—victory in the newly developing countries, victory also in the captive countries—provided we have faith in ourselves and faith in our principles."[147] Drawing upon a field metaphor, Nixon asserts that victory for freedom, even in "captive" areas like those near China such as Formosa, Quemoy and Matsu, can take place "provided" America has "faith in ourselves" and "our principles." According to Bostdorff, this emphasis on the principle of freedom is characteristic of the American myth of mission.[148] During the presidential debate on October 13, Nixon cites the importance of freedom in the matter of Quemoy and Matsu:

> And may I say, too, that I would trust that Senator Kennedy would change his position on this…because as long as he as a major presidential candidate continues to suggest that we are going to turn over these islands, he is only encouraging the aggressors—the Chinese Communist and the Soviet aggressors—to press the United States, to press us to the point where war would be inevitable…. But certainly we're not going to have peace by giving in and indicating in advance that we are not going to defend what has become a symbol of freedom.[149]

Nixon's quotation again focuses on the principle of freedom, foundational to the American myth of mission. Nixon criticizes Kennedy for suggesting that the United States would be willing to turn over Quemoy and Matsu to the "Chinese Communist aggressors," a move that would signal America's refusal to defend "what has become a symbol of freedom." In so doing, Nixon positions Kennedy as the "major presidential candidate" willing to undermine America's mission to defend freedom. In his most explicit reference to the principle of freedom at stake in the presidential debates over Quemoy and Matsu, Nixon says, "Now I think as far as Quemoy and Matsu are concerned, that the question is not these two little pieces of real estate—they are unimportant. It isn't the few people who live on them—they are not too important. It's the

principle involved. These two islands are in the area of freedom."[150] Nixon again focuses his attention on the principle of freedom, central in America's myth of mission, regarding Quemoy and Matsu. In refuting those that believe "these two little pieces of real estate" are "unimportant," Nixon takes a principled stand consistent with America's historic mission. Nixon defense of "these two islands in the area of freedom" is based on the "principle involved," namely the principle of freedom, which is central to America's missionary mythology. Frederick Merk reveals the language of the myth of mission:

> A truer expression of the national spirit was Mission. This was present from the beginning of American history, and is present, clearly, today. It was idealistic, self-denying, hopeful of divine favor for national aspirations, though not sure of it. It made itself heard most authentically in times of emergency, of ordeal, of disaster. Its language was that of dedication—dedication to the enduring values of American civilization.[151]

Nixon's constant focus on the power of American idealism, his portrayal of the struggle against Communism as an urgent challenge, and his optimistic calls for a renewed devotion to the principles of freedom exemplify this language of dedication, a dedication to the enduring myth of America's moral mission.

In addition to the powerful myth of mission, Nixon's campaign rhetoric relied on the myth of American destiny as a foundational theme in its portrayal of the impending struggle against Communism. The theme of American destiny under God has functioned as a motivating American mythology.[152] The obligation to carry out God's will on earth was the motivating spirit of those who founded America and has been present in every generation of Americans since.[153] As one of the well-established themes within American civil religion, the "American Destiny under God" posited the United States as the New Israel elected by God to carry out God's designs and serve as a light to other nations.[154] Conrad Cherry summarizes the lasting impact of the myth of destiny on the American psyche, "The belief that America has been

providentially chosen for a special destiny has deep roots in the American past, and it is a belief that still finds expression in our so-called 'secular age.' It has resided at the heart of the attempt by Americans to understand their nation's responsibility at home and abroad."[155] Moreover, Americans consider it their special responsibility to spread freedom around the globe through active means and, in this way, to serve as a model of morality for the rest of the world.[156] Nixon relied heavily on the destiny myth in his campaign rhetoric regarding American foreign policy, well aware of the continued salience of the destiny myth among the American people.

Remarks on the presidential campaign trail reveal the extent to which the destiny myth permeated Nixon's foreign policy and anti-Communist rhetoric. In Fort Wayne, Indiana on September 21, Nixon says, "…I think the next President must do to keep the peace without surrender and to extend freedom, not only to defend it, because in order to defend it you must extend it around the world."[157] Nixon's pledge "not only to defend" freedom but "extend it" because "in order to defend" freedom "you must extend it" jibes with the deep-seated belief among Americans that the United States has a responsibility to protect and extend such freedom around the globe through active means. On October 5 while speaking at Fordham University, Nixon states:

> The reason why the people of Poland received us as they did was because they knew that America from the time of its foundation has stood for more than military strength, more than economic strength; that we stood for great ideals that are much bigger than the United States, itself, ideals that we came into the world to preserve and to extend to all men – faith in God; belief in the dignity of men; belief that the rights of men come not from men, but from God and, therefore, cannot be taken away by men; belief, too, that all nations have a right to be independent, that all people have a right to be free.[158]

Nixon's anecdotal testimony of the desires of the Polish people is also heavily reliant on the American destiny myth. Nixon argues that more than military or economic might, America's strength comes from its ideals, namely the "great ideals" of America's faith in God as well as the

belief that "the rights of men" derive from God and God alone. More importantly, Nixon's use of a birth metaphor underscores the importance of America's destiny to spread its ideals to "all nations," ideals that Americans "came into the world to preserve and extend to all men." On October 14 in Beverly Hills, California, Nixon says with regard to the struggle against Communism:

> I have seen that around the world, yes, and our wealth is respected, but what America stands for most in the world is the fact that we believe in the right things—our faith in God, our belief in the dignity of all men, regardless of their background; our belief in the rights of men to be free and of nations to be independent; our belief that these rights belong to all nations, not just us alone. These are the things, the ideals, that caught the imagination of the world 180 years ago. These are the ideals that America came into the world to preserve, and these are the ideals that it is our destiny to extend.[159]

According to Nixon, "what America stands for most in the world" (its light to other nations, its model to be emulated) is the fact that Americans believe in "the right things," again a faith in God, the dignity of all men, and the rights of men and nations to be free around the world. Again, Nixon ties the "birth" of America to its obligation to "preserve" such ideals. More importantly, Nixon explicitly appeals to the myth of destiny when articulating the importance of America's godly ideals, ideals that are "our destiny to extend" as well as preserve. During the presidential debate on October 21, Nixon revealed the centrality of the destiny myth in his foreign policy worldview to the American people, "It is not enough for us simply to be the strongest nation militarily, the strongest economically, and also to have firm diplomacy. We must have a great goal. And that is: not just to keep freedom for ourselves but to extend it to all the world, to extend it to all the world because that is America's destiny."[160] Nixon's quotation reveals to the American people and to the world his "great goal" of his foreign policy, that goal being "to keep freedom for Americans and to extend such freedom to all the world." The goal itself would fit nicely within the American mythology of destiny, but Nixon's reliance on the

myth goes deeper when he explains why his "great goal" is to spread freedom. It is because extending it to "all the world" is "America's destiny." In articulating his foreign policy goals on the campaign trail, Nixon relies on the myth of the American destiny, a myth well-known and beloved by the American people.

Nixon's Prophetic Dualism

In 1984, Philip Wander coined the rhetorical concept of "prophetic dualism" in his examination of presidential and foreign policy rhetoric during the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations.[161] According to Wander, the United States underwent an "apotheosis" during two World Wars, during which America's mission, including its moral and spiritual superiority, became an official part of the war effort as well as themes absorbed in and recapitulated in popular culture.[162] Under Eisenhower (and Vice President Nixon), patriotism, high moral purpose, and its related religious tone became associated with the political coalition supporting the Republican party; it was a tone in contrast to the Democratic party which, during the 1940s and 1950s, was being attacked (most notably by Richard Nixon himself) for being soft on Communism, losing China, and harboring traitors.[163] In a rhetorical analysis of the foreign policy discourses at the time, Wander conceptualized prophetic dualism as a rhetorical frame that relied upon notions of religious faith, moral insight, a respect for the laws of God formed a set of virtues attributed to the nation which could be called upon to explain why the United States should engage in certain actions abroad.[164] Recent scholarship more simply explains prophetic dualism as rhetorical frame for interpreting American foreign policy that divides the world into the forces of good (exemplified by the United States) and the forces of evil (represented by America's enemies).[165] This explanation works well with Wander's original description of the concept, "In its perfected form prophetic dualism divides the world into two camps. Between

them is conflict. One side acts in accord with all that is good, decent, and at one with God's will. The other acts in direct opposition. Conflict between them is resolved only with total victory of one side over the other."[166] Prophetic dualism as a rhetorical frame possesses many characteristics, of which Wander and others have helped elucidate.

Prophetic dualism shares much with the civil religious myths of mission and destiny that characterize the presidential and public discourses of the time. It involved religious faith, the faith of our fathers, the ideals of freedom, individuality, a militant God, and the existence of evil in the world.[167] Similar to the myth of American destiny, prophetic dualism holds that Americans are morally and spiritually superior and destined to spread "good" around the globe.[168] In almost the same fashion as the destiny myth, prophetic dualism posits that the United States is the manifestation of truth, justice, and freedom, created on earth by a God whose purpose it is to make it an instrument for extending God's spiritual and material blessings to the rest of the world.[169] Sharing with the myth of mission, prophetic dualism relies upon the idea that Americans are especially well-suited to share the "creative gifts" of democracy and freedom.[170] Wander further reveals the similarities between prophetic dualism and the myths of mission and destiny when saying, "America's personification as an Actor with a sense of purpose, an important mission in a world of nations, and a moral and spiritual center raising it above all other nations forms the essential story out of which reasons are given in support of foreign policy."[171] Much like the meta-narratives of American mythology, prophetic dualism posits the United States as divine, on the side of good, and obligated to fight for freedom around the world.

The rise of prophetic dualism as a rhetorical frame common to foreign policy discourse is not surprising given the existence of a perceived Communist threat. American political culture

has a tendency to depict Communism as a perennial foe and to depict the United States as (always) defending its national self-interest.[172] Consequently, prophetic dualism constituted a sophisticated ideological apparatus for coping with a 'Communist menace' at home and abroad.[173] As a result, Americans of all political persuasion generally agree with the democratic ideals of prophetic dualism, since its ideals tend to embody what Americans sense as who we are as a "collective" people.[174] Consequently, Nixon's discourse on the campaign trail relied upon notions of prophetic dualism when describing American efforts to combat global Communism.

While sharing with the myths of mission and destiny a focus on the moral goodness of America, prophetic dualism simultaneously engages in a form of rhetorical enemy creation towards those who stand opposed to America's interests. According to Robert Ivie, the process of creating one's enemy involves portraying the enemy as a savage, an aggressor, driven by irrational desires for conquest, who is seeking to subjugate others by force of arms.[175] This portrayal of the savage enemy occurs by constructing the image indirectly through contrasting references to the adversary's coercive, irrational, and aggressive attempts to subjugate a freedom-loving, rational, and pacific victim.[176] According to Ivie, enemies are portrayed as "unspeaking brutes who know no respect for human liberty" and as such, "they symbolize the perfect enemy of freedom."[177] These discourses of enemy creation "generate rhetorical force by activating the national hierarchy of values which subordinates the ideal of peace to the necessity of preserving freedom."[178] Within the argumentative frame of prophetic dualism, negotiation with such a savage, irrational enemy is treated as a call for surrender.[179] This process of enemy creation is required in the rhetorical frame of prophetic dualism.

The simultaneous portrayal of the United States as the force for good and the Communist "enemy" as the force for evil can be seen in Nixon's campaign discourses towards the People's

Republic of China. Soon after receiving the Republican presidential nomination, Vice President Nixon on August 3, 1960 replies to a question that asked whether he would make any substantial change in U.S. policy towards China:

> I most certainly would not. I believe it would not be in the interest of the United States; it would not be in the interest of freedom, and would not be in the interest of peace for us to extend recognition to Red China or to change our position of opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations. There are a number of reasons for this. I can summarize simply by saying that Red China does not qualify to be admitted to the United Nations which, in its charter, is made up of peace-loving nations. Red China defies the United Nations in Korea at the present time. It is engaged in activities with regard to India and other U.N. members which certainly are provocative and certainly not in the interest of peace. Insofar as its attitude towards the United States and other nations is concerned, Red China is not following the policy which is designed to promote friendly relations in the traditions of the U.N.[180]

Nixon's quotation clearly portrays the People's Republic of China aggressive, savage, and war-like. Nixon's use of the term "Red China" instead of the People's Republic of China is quite instructive; the color red has and continues to signify power, aggression, and confrontation as a linguistic marker and Nixon's repetition of "Red China" rhetorically serves to underscore the aggression inherent in China's actions. Nixon also bluntly states that China "does not qualify" as a United Nations member which is "made up of peace-loving nations," suggesting that China is far from "peace-loving." The laundry list of "Red China's" indiscretions—defiance of the U.N. in Korea, provocative actions towards India—also serves to portray the People's Republic as an aggressive, threatening enemy. Moreover, Nixon cites China's "attitude towards the United States and other nations" as proof that "Red China is not following the policy which is designed to promote friendly relations." Throughout the quotation, Nixon rhetorically defines the People's Republic as red with aggression, defiant of international institutions, and committed to provocative actions towards the United States and other nations. On October 14 in Beverly Hills, Nixon again comments on China's international behavior:

> The Chinese Communists at the present time are international criminals. They're threatening us in Formosa. They're threatening free people in Korea. You know what they did to Tibet. And, so, we have got to tell all of those who are international criminals, and that is who use force to extend their aggression, that crime doesn't pay, because, if it does pay, they're going to use it.[181]

In this quotation, Nixon explicitly labels Communist China as an international criminal. In addition to threatening the "free people" in Korea and threatening America ("us") in Formosa, Nixon alludes to "what they did" in Tibet, suggesting that China committed not only criminal, but perhaps horrific, acts. Moreover, Nixon labels Chinese Communists as "international criminals" due to their "use" of "force to extend their aggression. Nixon also implies that China will continue to engage in criminal behavior, because if "crime pays," the Chinese are "going to use it." Again, Nixon rhetorically constructs an image of China as aggressive, a criminal hell-bent on making "crime pay." On October 18 in a speech in front of the American Legion Convention, Nixon reveals the extent of his distrust for the People's Republic:

> When are we going to learn that it isn't what the Communists say but what they do that counts…. But look at the deeds of the Chinese Communist government. That's why we oppose their [diplomatic] recognition. That's why we oppose their admission to the United Nations. Let me list them for you: Aggression in Korea; today an open contempt for United Nations resolutions; continued violence against a member of the United Nations, free China today; ruthless seizure of Tibet, a rule of force and genocide there; today military raids against India and Nepal, and illegal and unprincipled imprisonment of American civilians, which we have been objecting to and which they will do nothing about. I say today that to seat a regime with this record of gangsterism, regardless of what they said about their good intentions in the future, would make a mockery of the peaceful purposes of the United Nations to which we belong.[182]

Similar to the previous quotations, Nixon lists a host of actions that he feels should disqualify the People's Republic of China from being diplomatically recognized by the United States. Nixon's view that "it isn't what the Communists say but what they do that counts" reveals the extent of his distrust for China. Nixon cites the "deeds" of the Chinese Communist government in order to justify his distrust: aggression in Korea, contempt for U.N. resolutions, military raids, among

others. More importantly than Nixon's distrust towards China is the language in which he describes their actions. By citing their "aggression," their "open contempt," the "ruthless seizure" of Tibet and the "rule of force and genocide there," and the "illegal imprisonment of American civilians," Nixon rhetorically creates the Communist Chinese regime as one with a "record of gangsterism." In so doing, Nixon creates an almost perfect image of the Chinese Communist enemy, an enemy the United States must oppose.

Nixon's discursive construction of the Chinese Communist enemy can also be seen in his portrayal of Chinese Communist leader Mao Tse-tung. On September 28, Nixon says, "You can read a statement every day in the papers that Mao Tse-tung…to the effect that they are not a peace-loving nation. They are in an aggressive posture towards the United Nations in Korea today. There are engaging in an aggression, both indirect and direct, all over southeast Asia at the present time."[183] Again, Nixon uses statements from Mao Tse-tung to argue that China is not "a peace-loving nation"; rather, China's "aggressive posture" towards the U.N. in Korea and its "indirect and direct aggression" "all over southeast Asia" demonstrate its true intentions. During the same occasion on the campaign trail, Nixon distinguishes the behavior of the Chinese Communist leadership from their Soviet counterparts:

> Red China has a very dedicated, aggressive Communist leadership in the early stages of the development of communism. I think perhaps the best way to indicate the difference between the Communist leadership of Red China and the Communist leadership of the Soviet Union is in their attitude towards the use of war as a means of accomplishing the Communist objective of world domination.[184]

Nixon's description of Red China only serves to underscore the portrayal of Mao Tse-tung and the Chinese Communist leadership as enemy. Not only does China have a "dedicated, aggressive Communist leadership," but that the "difference" between the Communist leadership of China and the leadership of the Soviet Union is China's willingness to use war "as a means of

accomplishing the Communist objective of world domination." One week before on the campaign trail, Nixon expressly criticizes Mao, "Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese leader, say[s], over and over again, we must rule the world and we will conquer the world…they also indicate that they are going to accomplish this end by any means, if they can."[185] Yet again, Nixon characterizes China and its leader Mao Tse-tung as possessing insatiable desires to "rule" and "conquer the world," willing to accomplish the end of world domination "by any means." Nixon completes the process of creating Mao as enemy when saying:

> Mr. Mao Tse-tung…says that, in a nutshell, after the first World War we had the arrival on the international scene of the Communist government of the Soviet Union. After the Second World War, he said the result was the extension of communism to over 600 million people and a third of the earth's population. He goes further and says that after the third world war, it may be that communism will dominate the world. Now, when we look at this almost diabolical reasoning, here is what he is saying: He is saying that China with its tremendous population does not fear a third world war, that it would think that they believe that a third world war might result in Communist domination of the world, and, while, of course, the would suffer more, and the end result would be the extension of communism and not the extension of freedom.[186]

Nixon uses Mao's historical account of the previous 40 years in order to identify Communist China as enemy, as a strategic threat to America and the world. Nixon accuses Mao engaging in "diabolical reasoning." According to Mao's reading of history, says Nixon, China, "with its tremendous population," "does not fear a third world war" because such a war "might result in Communist domination of the world." Nixon concludes by listing the consequences of Mao's diabolical reasoning: suffering, the extension of communism, the curtailment of freedom.

Nixon furthers the process of creating China as enemy while discussing the topic of Quemoy and Matsu, the two "free islands" over which Nixon and Kennedy share major policy differences. During the presidential debate on October 7, Nixon reveals the importance of Quemoy and Matsu in the struggle against the Chinese Communists:

> These two islands are in the area of freedom. The [Chinese] Nationalists have these two islands. We should not…force our Nationalist allies to get off of them and give them to the Communists. If we do that we start a chain reaction; because the Communists aren't after Quemoy and Matsu, they're after Formosa. In my opinion this is the same kind of woolly thinking that led to disaster for American in Korea.[187]

Nixon's quotation reveals that Quemoy and Matsu are "in the area of freedom," thus worthy of protecting within the frame of prophetic dualism. Moreover, giving the islands "to the Communists" would "start a chain reaction" because the Chinese Communists "aren't after Quemoy and Matsu, they're after Formosa." Nixon's revelation of China's true intentions to conquer Formosa continues to portray the Chinese Communists as aggressive, militaristic and threatening to freedom. On October 11, Nixon criticizes Kennedy's refusal to defend the islands of Quemoy and Matsu in the face of Chinese aggression:

> [he] has used the contemptuous phrase 'these are a couple of worthless rocks in the Pacific.' And so we'll give them up….But may I say that kind of woolly thinking is dangerous for America, it's dangerous for world peace. You know what we have to realize. We can't run backward and win over communism, and we have to win over communism, and not just hold the line against communism around the world.[188]

Describing Kennedy's phrase that Quemoy and Matsu are "a couple of worthless rocks in the Pacific" as "contemptuous, Nixon accuses the Senator from Massachusetts of engaging in a kind of "woolly thinking" that is "dangerous" for both America and world peace. In addition, Nixon claims to "realize," unlike Kennedy, that "we can't run backward and win over communism." Nixon continues his thoughts on China by saying, "…regardless of the political consequences I intend to fight at every opportunity any return to the naïve and woolly policies which led to the loss of China and to the war in Korea."[189] Nixon not only demonstrates his willingness to deal with the "political consequences" of his policy positions on Quemoy and Matsu, but also reveals his intentions "to fight at every opportunity" the "naïve and woolly policies," supported by

Kennedy, "which led to the loss of China and to the war in Korea." By linking Kennedy's position on the issue of Quemoy and Matsu to the policies that led to the loss of China to the Communists and the war in Korea, Nixon portrays Kennedy as being "naïve" to the consequences of "running backwards" in the face of Chinese aggression over Quemoy and Matsu. During the presidential debate on October 13, Nixon uses the issue of Quemoy and Matsu in order to reveal the true intentions of the Chinese:

> Now what do the Chinese Communists want? They don't want just Quemoy and Matsu; they don't want just Formosa; they want the world. And this question is if you surrender or indicate in advance that you're not going to defend any part of the free world, and you figure that's going to satisfy them, it doesn't satisfy them. It only whets their appetite…those of us who stand against the surrender of territory—this or any others—in the face of blackmail, in the face of force by the Communists are standing for the course that will lead to peace.[190]

Nixon reveals that the Chinese Communists "don't want just Quemoy and Matsu," but rather "they want the world." Moreover, Nixon believes that if the United States were to "indicate in advance" that it would not protect the islands it would not "satisfy" the Chinese, but instead would only "whet their appetite." According to Nixon's portrayal, the Chinese Communists continue to possess an insatiable appetite for global domination. Thankfully, Nixon pledges to continue to "stand against the surrender" of Quemoy and Matsu "in the face of blackmail, in the face of force" by the Chinese Communists. In so doing, Nixon portrays himself as "standing for the course that will lead to peace." Within the frame of prophetic dualism, Nixon positions himself to the American public as representing the best hope for the continuation of America's benevolent leadership in the world in the face of the aggressive and diabolical desires of the Chinese Communist regime.

Conclusion

Given Nixon's history in the U.S. Congress, his decision to remain a staunch anti-Communist on the 1960 presidential campaign trail is not surprising. However, the degree to which Nixon was anti-Communist and the rhetorical methods he utilized when articulating his anti-Communism to the American populace remain important and worthy of closer inspection. Nixon, like many presidents and presidential aspirants before him, drew upon the language of American civil religion in his articulation of his anti-Communism as well as his efforts to earn the support of the American people. Nixon made a concerted effort to ground his public rhetoric in the tradition of civil religion in order to align his public discourse with the hearts and values of the American voting public.

Vice President Nixon drew upon two specific mythologies common in American civil religion—the myth of mission and the myth of destiny—when outlining his foreign policy positions to the public. Nixon's deployment of both myths in his public rhetoric initially served to appeal to the ideals and values that lie deep in the heart of every American at the time—a belief that American was blessed by God, the importance of preserving freedom for ourselves and the world, and the need to achieve victory over Communism. More importantly, Nixon's storytelling helped brandish his anti-Communist credentials in the eyes of every American, a powerful political feat given the strength of anti-Communist sentiments in America at the time.

Alongside the retelling of America's mission and destiny, Nixon's public rhetoric towards Communists in general, and Communist China in particular, perpetuated a prophetic dualism, a rhetorical frame in which the United States is posited as fighting for good while the forces of Communism represented threats to national and global security. Using prophetic dualism, Nixon was able to portray not only the United States but also himself as the protector of

freedom and God-given inalienable rights for the world in the face of the international Communist threat. More specifically, Nixon was able to characterize Communists as aggressive, threatening and violent enemies of the United States, the world, and the freedoms that each citizen of the world has the right to enjoy.

The issue of China, in particular, allowed Nixon to position himself, rather than Senator Kennedy, as the experienced, wise statesman well aware of the Chinese Communist threat, as opposed to his naïve presidential opponent. According to Nixon, "Red China" represented the greatest threat to the United States and the world and his responses to their "aggressive" and "provocative" actions towards Quemoy and Matsu, among others, seemed not only appropriate, but mandatory, given America's special role in protecting freedom across the globe. Within the rhetorical frame of prophetic dualism, Nixon served as America's foreign policy prophet, revealing to the electorate the "goodness" of America's intentions and its destiny as the key to victory against the "diabolical" reasoning that formed the foundation of the Communists desire to conquer the world. Moreover, Nixon was able to redefine America's self-image through the urgency conveyed in his foreign policy rhetoric. As Roberta Coles states, "By envisioning foreign affairs as a rescue, as an act of public good, America rescues itself. By framing mission as a duty and a contribution to the world's well-being, the United States renovates its own self-image."[191] By framing America's mission to spread freedom as a duty and by suggesting that it was America's destiny to ensure the world's well-being, Nixon bears responsibility for the renovation of America's own self-image. Communism, especially the brand espoused by "Red China," represented the perfect enemy for Nixon. It not only allowed Nixon to draw upon common civil-religious themes beloved by many Americans, but also empowered the vice president to assume the role of commander-in-chief in the impending battle against Communism.

It is this development—Nixon assuming the role of America's staunch anti-Communist—that makes his groundbreaking decision, as president, to pursue diplomatic engagement with the People's Republic of China so pragmatically and rhetorically significant. Yet the path to Nixon's diplomatic surprise in 1971 was long and unexpected; it took the better part of a decade, a successful presidential bid, and the creative use of time, realist sentiments, and quantitative valuations in order for Nixon to begin to articulate an eventual change in diplomatic policy towards China.

Chapter 3

Too Important to Forever Ignore: Nixon's Gradual Change in Policy towards China

Introduction

The prospects of Richard Nixon, the "hatchet man" on the China issue and fervent anti-Communist, changing his position regarding diplomatic recognition of "Red China" seemed impossibly low in 1960 and the years immediately following. Having spent the preponderance of his presidential campaign successfully brandishing his anti-Communist credentials in the eyes of the American public—as successful as one could brandish given the outcome of the 1960 presidential race—no one could have predicted a change in U.S. policy towards one of negotiation, rather than confrontation, with a global Communist power. Having presented a multitude of reasons against China's diplomatic recognition, against China's entrance into the United Nations, and for the continued support of the "free" islands of Formosa, Matsu, and Quemoy, no one could have predicted Nixon's eventual change of heart towards the People's Republic of China that first showed signs of emergence in 1967 and the early years of his presidency. Unlikely odds notwithstanding, Richard Nixon began to lay the groundwork for the eventual establishment of diplomatic relations in 1967 and continued to lay the groundwork during the infancy of his presidency. Nixon's rhetoric from late 1967 until early 1971, targeted not at the American public, but rather the foreign policy establishment and the U.S. Congress, would ultimately serve as stepping stones for Nixon's eventual revelation of his intention to pursue diplomatic relations with the country he formerly demonized as "Red China."

This chapter will isolate three primary texts during the period from October 1967 until February 1971 that highlight how Nixon laid the foundation for eventual diplomatic engagement with the People's Republic of China. The first text is an article written by the former vice

president in the in October 1967 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, an American academic journal on international relations and U.S. foreign policy aimed at and read primarily by the foreign policy establishment. The second text is the "First Annual Report" on foreign policy written to the U.S. Congress during February 1970. The third and final text is the "Second Annual Report" on foreign policy written to the U.S. Congress during February 1971, just months before Nixon's announcement of his intention to visit the People's Republic of China. The primary audience of these texts is of paramount importance, both pragmatically and rhetorically. As Philip Wander argues, "While the meaning of [foreign policy] rhetoric will not be exhausted in audience analysis…any effort to understand or, for that matter, to change policy must take such audiences into account."[192] As mentioned earlier, the primary audience for Nixon's willingness to eventually change U.S. policy towards China is not the American public, but rather the U.S. Congress and the foreign policy establishment. Nixon reveals the identity of his target audience in a message to Congress in his First Annual Report:

> Up to now, however, there has been no comprehensive report on foreign affairs submitted to The Congress on behalf of the Administration as a whole. I am, therefore, transmitting to The Congress this report on my administration's stewardship of foreign relations. I hope the report will lead to a better understanding by The Congress and the American people of the spirit in which this Administration has sought to guide our foreign affairs, of what has been accomplished so far, and of our new approach to the challenges and opportunities of the world of the 1970s.[193]

The reference to the American people notwithstanding, Nixon's *Foreign Affairs* article and his two "Annual Reports" on foreign policy are aimed at those most likely to oppose his change, albeit gradual and subtle, in policy towards Communist China: the members of Congress and commentators and scholars of foreign affairs that constitute the foreign policy community. One might ask why? One could surmise that Nixon was of the mindset that raising the idea of a gradual change in policy towards the People's Republic to the foreign policy establishment was a

far safer choice, politically, than suggesting a change in policy to the American public, a public who had come to know Nixon as the anti-Communist, anti-China politician. Always a strategic politician, Nixon chose to target a specific audience with his developing thoughts on China policy, rather than a likely skeptical American public audience.

The three texts analyzed in this chapter enabled Nixon to orient this particular audience towards a notion of time whereby a realization of China's growing global importance was urgently needed while a change in policy towards China was gradually necessary. This rhetorical orientation, a process known as "public time," is particularly noticeable in Nixon's *Foreign Affairs* piece and helps to explain how Nixon was able to articulate and defend his eventual change in policy towards the People's Republic prior to his election as president. Additionally, each of Nixon's annual reports embodies the substance and style of "realism," a worldview of international relations that privileges national self-interest and stability over other considerations. In addition to creating the temporal conditions for policy change, the realist concerns for stability and order that inundate Nixon's these reports helped lay the foundation for his eventual change in policy towards the People's Republic of China from one of confrontation to one of negotiation. Finally, the two "Annual Reports" on foreign policy issued by President Nixon represent an example of "how discourse about practical values and actions is produced."[194] The two reports serve as important rhetorical artifacts that demonstrate not only that Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's conceptions of loci communes appear in public argument but also how those communes are deployed by public actors in crafting values and changes in policy. The realist viewpoint that created a sense of public time whereby a change in policy towards China was necessary according to quantitative valuations enabled Nixon to carefully craft a position on China that was politically palatable to his immediate audience yet

groundbreaking in that it set the stage for his groundbreaking decision to pursue diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China as president.

Historical Context

Vice President Richard Nixon ultimately lost the 1960 presidential election to Senator John F. Kennedy, but lost barely. At age 47, Nixon came within 300,000 votes of winning the presidency despite the fact that the Republicans were greatly outnumbered (both within Congress and among voters) Democrats.[195] His taste for political power unsatisfied, Richard Nixon returned to California and challenged Democratic Governor Pat Brown in the 1962 gubernatorial race.[196] Nixon was defeated easily by Brown, largely due to the perception among Californians that his desires for the governorship were a mere stepping stone towards another presidential run.[197] Afterwards, a furious Nixon responded via press conference whereby he blamed the media for his defeat and even suggested his retirement from public office.[198] There was little doubt that the former vice president would remain a major figure in the Republican Party even after his defeat in 1962.[199] As historian Charles Jones states, "Not even two defeats could somehow lower the national and international recognition of Nixon."[200] Nixon's retirement threats were short-lived and hollow, however, as he later secured the Republican nomination and then the presidency in 1968.

Even before his electoral victory in 1968, Nixon again tested the presidential political waters. After his defeat for governor of California in 1962, Nixon contemplated running against Kennedy again in 1964; Nixon ultimately decided not to seek the Republican nomination, which was ultimately won by Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater.[201] In 1966, Nixon and other Republicans formed the political organization "Congress '66" in order to help Republican candidates achieve electoral success during the 1966 midterm elections.[202] "Congress '66"

ultimately helped Republicans achieve significant gains in the House and the Senate.[203] More importantly, the political entity had emerged to take advantage of an increasingly favorable political circumstance for Republicans and in support of a nationally recognized leader who possessed extreme personal ambition.[204] Nixon's active candidacy for the presidency began in January 1967 with his confident assertion to a group of several aides and friends that he would yet again win the Republican nomination.[205] Little did Nixon know that 1968 would be the perfect year for his return to presidential politics.

As opposed to 1964, the circumstances and events of 1968 created a political landscape that favored a Nixon presidency. The issues that emerged were ones that played to the political strengths Nixon developed as vice president: the foreign and national security problems growing out of Vietnam.[206] Although the candidacy of George Romney of Michgan and the prospective candidacy of Ronald Reagan of California at times worried the Nixon camp, Nixon would again triumph in the Republican primary and secure his party's nomination for president.[207] Nixon had originally thought that he would be running against Lyndon Johnson, but the president decided not to seek reelection.[208] Robert Kennedy, viewed by many as Democratic frontrunner after Johnson's decision not to run, was assassinated during the campaign.[209] Ultimately, Nixon faced off against Hubert H. Humphrey, the eventual Democratic presidential nominee, and third-party candidate Governor George C. Wallace of Alabama.[210] Nixon would emerge triumphant in 1968, finally achieving his political goal of securing the American presidency.

Public Time in Nixon's "Asia After Viet Nam"

Former vice president Richard Nixon began his second candidacy for the presidency in early 1967. Later on that year, Nixon wrote an article in *Foreign Affairs* entitled "Asia After Viet Nam." Since foreign affairs issues had risen to national prominence, mainly due to the

conflict in Vietnam, Nixon's article seemed particularly appropriate. Foreign and national security policy played to Nixon's political strengths and the article allowed him to reestablish himself as a national statesman in the eyes of an important audience: the foreign policy establishment. Beyond the articulation of his foreign policy towards Asia and the Vietnam conflict, Nixon's article laid the groundwork for an idea for something previously thought to be impossible under any Nixon administration: the gradual improvement of relations with "Red China." By expressing a willingness in the "long run" to change U.S. policy towards China in "Asia After Viet Nam," Nixon established a sense of "public time" that simultaneously conveyed the urgency of coming to grips with China's rising global importance along as well as encouraged a long-term change in policy towards cooperative, not confrontational, relations with the People's Republic of China.

The notion of time has long played an important role in the field of rhetoric, especially regarding the rhetoric of public figures and presidents. Communication is an important means through which time is socially constructed and experientially shared.[211] Robert Hariman reveals the temporal nature of rhetoric when saying, "Rhetoric has long been defined as essentially temporal. Rhetorical purposes and appeals must be timely, rhetorical power depends on some phenomenon of the moment such as the crowd or the crisis, and rhetoric has been distinguished from the other arts because it is ephemeral while they are enduring."[212] Moreover, Bruce Gronbeck argues that the timeliness of a message can be discovered by analyzing "events which progress through time and which demand a series of strategic decisions regarding when to speak, what to say, how to say it, and from what posture or stance to deliver the sentiments."[213] Similarly, time plays a crucial role in issue salience insofar as defining time (past, present, future) in particular ways serves a pragmatic function such as aiding a candidate in establishing

the salience of particular issues.[214] While rhetoric is produced at a particular moment in time, the speaker is attempting to construct a "persuasive view of time" to lead audiences toward desired actions or possibilities.[215] Additionally, depictions of time have always been a central feature of political ideology and argument; for example the competing political ideologies of "liberal" and "conservative" contain different views toward the future and the desirability of change.[216] Stephen Depoe underscores the continued importance of time to public discourse, "Time becomes an integral feature of public discourse when advocates use rhetorical strategies to invite audiences to reorient themselves in the present by…considering alternative possibilities for the future."[217] Notions of time continue to be utilized in a variety of ways by public actors.

One important conception of time in public rhetoric is what G. Thomas Goodnight calls "public time." Goodnight defines public time as time "constituted in the urgency created by discourse that reshapes the landscape of common opportunities and constraints."[218] Stephen Depoe further defines public time as discourse that "creates a temporal vision that invited audiences to consider and experience time in a particular way."[219] According to Goodnight, public time is created when "a community recomposes its social constraints and possibilities" by "reconstructing or redirecting its temporal…options."[220] Inherent in public time is the creation of a sense of time in which "the urgency and finality of decisions made in the present are heightened."[221] Similarly, Depoe argues that as public discourse creates a sense of public time within an audience, "the importance or necessity of an impending collective decision is magnified."[222] This process is essential to decision-making in that "a rhetorical construction of temporality may generate in audiences a sense of 'public time' that may influence decision-making."[223] Public time has served as an important source of legitimation in public culture[224] and served a similar role in Nixon's "Asia After Viet Nam."

In "Asia After Viet Nam," Nixon deploys a temporal vision that suggests an urgent recognition of the continued threat posed by China in international affairs. Consistent with the anti-China public rhetoric of his past, Nixon says, "But now the West has abandoned its colonial role, and it no longer threatens the independence of the Asian nations. Red China, however, does, and its threat is clear, present, and repeatedly and insistently expressed."[225] According to Nixon, "now" the West "has abandoned its colonial role" and "no longer threatens the independence" of Asian countries. In contrast to past Western behavior, Red China "does" threaten Asian independence and its threat is "clear, present and repeatedly and insistently expressed." In other words, Red China remains a "clear and present danger." Nixon later says, "Any discussion of Asia's future must ultimately focus on the respective roles of…China, the world's most populace nation and Asia's most immediate threat."[226] Again, Nixon highlights the "immediate" and present threat posed by China. According to Nixon, China presently represents the "world's most populace nation" as well as "Asia's most immediate threat." Moreover, Nixon's assertion that "any discussion of Asia's future must ultimately focus" on the role of China suggests an immediate obligation to realize and act upon China's growing role in global affairs. Both quotations show how Nixon temporally defined the present as being characterized by an immediate Chinese threat.

While continuing to recognize the present threat posed by China, Nixon simultaneously intones that U.S. policy should be open to cooperative relations with the People's Republic in the future:

> Any American policy toward Asia must come urgently to grips with the reality of China. This does not mean…rushing to grant recognition to Peking, to admit it to the United Nations and to ply it with offers of trade—all of which would serve to confirm its rulers in their present course. It does mean recognizing the present and potential danger from Communist China, and taking measures to meet that danger. It also means distinguishing carefully between long-range and short-

> range policies, and fashioning short-range programs so as to advance our long-range goals.[227]

Again, Nixon underscores the importance of "urgently" coming "to grips" with the "reality of China." Nixon cautions against "rushing" to grant China benefits such as diplomatic recognition or admittance to the United Nations in response to this reality. Instead, American policy should urgently "recognize" the dangers, present and future, posed by Communist China. Similarly, Nixon urges his audience to "distinguish carefully" between short-range and long-range policies towards China. Here, Nixon suggests that in "taking measures" to meet the Chinese danger, the United States should fashion policies in the short-term so "to advance" its long-term goals. This recognition, however, should not take the form of "offers of trade" or other rewards that would sacrifice U.S. long-range goals and "serve to confirm" the present, threatening actions of Chinese "rulers." Nixon outlines his specific short-term and long-term policies towards China, "For the short run, then, this means a policy of firm restraint, of no reward, or a creative counter pressure designed to persuade Peking that its interests can be served only by accepting the basic rules of international civility. For the long run, it means pulling China back into the world community."[228] In the short-term, Nixon argues that the United States should "persuade" China to "accept" the rules of "international civility" by pursuing the current policy of firm opposition. In the long-term, however, Nixon remains open to changing U.S. policy towards China, a desire to "pull China back" into the world community. Nixon reveals his long-term goal for U.S.-Sino relations, "Taking the long view, we simply cannot afford to leave China forever outside the family of nations, there to nurture its fantasies, cherish its hates and threaten its neighbors. There is no place on this small planet for a billion of its potentially most able people to live in angry isolation."[229] According to Nixon, the world "cannot afford to leave China" outside of the "family of nations." The consequences of doing so would threaten global security in the future

since “there is no place on this small planet for a billion” able-bodied Chinese people living in “angry isolation.” Nixon’s contrast between the “small” Earth and the large number of Chinese people only underscores the consequences of endangering global security in the future. Although arguing for policies in the present that serve to contain the immediate Chinese threat, Nixon begins to lay an opening for an eventual change in U.S. policy towards China if such policies are deemed to serve America’s long-term interest of global stability.

In “Asia After Vietnam,” Nixon rhetorically defines public time in global affairs as one in which China remains a “present” and “immediate” threat. In the “short-term,” this immediate threat compels an “urgent” and particular U.S. response, one of firm restraint and of no rewards for “threatening” Chinese behavior. Surprisingly, Nixon also temporally creates the possibility of an eventual change in policy towards the People’s Republic when referring to the “long-term” and “long-range” goals of the United States. Citing the consequences for the “small planet” (Earth) if China’s billion people live, in the future, in “angry isolation,” Nixon argues for an effort to “pull” China back into the “world community” as an important long-range goal for the United States. Nixon summarizes his two-pronged approach:

> Dealing with Red China is something like trying to cope with the more explosive ghetto elements in our own country. In each case a potentially destructive force has to be curbed; in each case an outlaw element has to be brought within the law; in each case dialogues have to be opened; in each case aggression has to be restrained while education proceeds; and, not least, in neither case can we afford to let those now self-exiled from society stay exiled forever. We have to proceed with both an urgency born of necessity and a patience born of realism, moving step by calculated step toward the final goal.[230]

Nixon’s analogy to the “ghetto elements” of the United States is instructive. In it, Nixon again refers to the present threats posed by China, namely its presence as a “potentially destructive force” that “has to be curbed” and its representing an “outlaw element” in need of being “brought within in the law.” But Nixon’s analogy also creates the possibility, in the future, of changing

how America "deals" with the Chinese. In the case of China, its aggression "has to be restrained" while education between the United States and China proceeds. In the case of China, a U.S.-China dialogue "has to be opened." In the case of China, the United States, along with the world, cannot "afford" to let the "self-exiled" Chinese people stay exiled from the world forever. According to Nixon, America has to presently "deal" to the current Chinese threat with an "urgency born of necessity" but should also "deal" with China in the future with a "patience born of realism" towards the long-range aim of pulling China back into the global community, "moving step by calculated step" towards the "final goal" of bringing security to this "small planet."

Having come to the realization that a change in U.S. policy towards Communist China was necessary, Richard Nixon created a sense of public time that made an eventual change in policy rhetorically predictable and politically possible in the eyes of the potentially skeptical foreign policy establishment. Nixon articulated the long-term need to change U.S. policy towards China while simultaneously discouraging any substantive changes in policy in the short-term. This rhetorical play likely served as a form of reassurance to skeptical members of Congress who feared that positive steps towards engagement would constitute "appeasement" to the threatening Chinese Communist regime. That being said, Nixon's articulation of the strategic importance for the United States to have constructive relations with the People's Republic temporally created the conditions for an eventual change in his administration's policy towards China. In this public time, Nixon effectively argues to his Congressional audience that his administration's policy in the short-term will be one that continues to recognize the present threats posed by the People's Republic; yet, the foreign policy establishment must realize, as

Nixon already has, the urgent need to establish a more constructive relationship with the rising power of China over the long-term.

Locus of Quantity in Nixon's Annual Reports to Congress

Having finally reached the pinnacle of political achievement in 1968, President Richard Nixon quickly began to articulate his policies, and his foreign policies, to the U.S. Congress and the American public which had just elected him president. Already renowned for his foreign policy acumen, Nixon offered comprehensive and novel ideas in his foreign policy addresses. More specifically, President Nixon crafted annual reports on foreign policy in which he would literally address his administration's positions on every major foreign policy issue of the day, which would be sent to Congress and made available to the American public. In his first and second "annual reports" on foreign policy, Nixon focused upon and isolated the issue of U.S. policy towards China. A particular rhetorical/argumentative concept prominently displays itself in both annual reports, a concept grounded in quantitative considerations that only served to strengthen President Nixon's case for establishing more constructive relations with the People's Republic of China.

A central aim of rhetorical theory is to provide an explanation of how discourse about practical values and action is produced.[231] Moreover, rhetoric is often considered a situated practice, "situated in the values, presumptions, predispositions, and habits of mind of a culture."[232] Among the most influential among rhetorical theorists are Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca and their treatise on argumentation, *The New Rhetoric.* According to Barbara Warnick, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's *The New Rhetoric* provides an exhaustive account of the situated nature of rhetoric and, as such provides an invaluable resource for textual criticism.[233] Particularly influential in the field of rhetoric has been Perelman and Olbrechts-

Tyteca's notion of loci communes, which can be described as the conceptions of the "preferable" held by actors which aid their deliberation about practical affairs.[234] One particular example of loci communes can be seen in President Nixon's rhetoric towards China in his annual reports to Congress.

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's notion of loci communes offer one explanation of how discourse about practical values and actions is produced. According to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, although values are instrumental in all arguments about practical affairs, agreement over common values often yields divergent opinions as soon as public actors move from general to specific actions.[235] Although many values are shared by most people, in situated practice we must often privilege some values over others.[236] Moreover, when actors wish to establish a particular value proposition, they resort to lines of argument relating to the "preferable."[237] The deliberation of actors is a process of elaborating what is preferable in particular situations or social contexts.[238] Common conceptions serve as the constitutive principles of actors' discourse and as the bases for interpretation of general values in situated moments of judgment or action.[239] These common conceptions are what Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca refer to as loci communes.

The Latin term loci communes is a literal translation of the Greek term koinoi topoi, or commonplaces.[240] Loci communes provide rhetorical ways of organizing reality that are general enough to be available in all circumstances and hence are "common places" for grouping and inventing relevant material.[241] Loci communes are a family of attributes regarding the object of an actor's preference.[242] Moreover, they are common premises regarding what is desirable, good, or preferable.[243] According to Robert J. Cox, "because [loci communes] direct …the substantive linkages of an argument, they offer a basis for one's adherence to particular

judgments of value and action."[244] According to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, "When a speaker wants to establish values or hierarchies or to intensify the adherence they gain…he may also resort to premises of a very general nature which we shall term loci."[245] These loci are headings under which arguments can be classified and have also been defined as storehouses for arguments; as such, they form an important tool on which a person wishing to persuade another will have to utilize.[246] In fact, loci communes are pivotal in struggles for social change because they provide means for establishing hierarchies among competing desirable values and hence for choosing among conflicting yet desirable courses of action.[247] Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca isolate the importance of analyzing particular loci when saying, "Our concern is with the fact that all audiences, of all kinds, have to take loci into account."[248] Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's work revealed the existence of many forms of loci in public argument.

A prominent example of loci involves loci of quantity. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, define loci relating to quantity as "those loci communes which affirm that one thing is better is better than another for quantitative reasons."[249] Obviously quantitative in nature, the concept is far more complex than "bigger is better" or that more of any good thing is better than less of it.[250]

Citing Aristotle, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca reveal the complexity inherent in loci of quantity, "It can take various forms, including advocating the superiority of an action course that serves the greater number of people, that is more durable and lasting, or that is more widespread, more common, or more prevalent."[251] Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca further clarify the characteristics of loci based on quantitative values, "We may regard the preference given to the probable over the improbable, the easy over the difficult, and to that which is less likely to be taken from us, as loci relating to quantity. Most of the loci which aim at showing the

effectiveness of a means will be quantitative."[252] Loci of quantity—arguments that privilege quantitative values and assessments—serve as an important example of the kinds of values that public actors present in order to help audiences choose between different courses of actions.

President Nixon himself draws upon quantitative values—loci of quantity—in his first annual report to Congress when articulating the need to change U.S. policy towards Communist nations such as China. Near the beginning of his First Annual Report to Congress, Nixon says:

> Our opportunity today—and challenge—is to get at the causes of crises, to take a longer view, and to help build the international relationships that will provide the framework for a durable peace. I have often reflected over the meaning of 'peace,' and have reached on certain conclusion: peace must be far more than the absence of war. Peace must provide a durable structure of international relationships which inhibits or removes the causes of war.[253]

Nixon's quotation represents an example of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's loci of quantity. Nixon urges the construction of "the international relationships that will provide a framework for a durable peace," advocating the superiority of actions that foster durable and lasting peace. Durability, seemingly a qualitative determination, is quantitative in force. According to Nixon a durable peace, one that is longer-lasting, necessarily entails more peace than temporary "absences of war." Moreover, Nixon argues for approaches that ensure the greatest amount of peace; he has reached the conclusion that peace "must provide a durable structure of international relationships which removes" or eliminates "the causes of war." Nixon's repeated use of the term durable also underscores the importance of maximizing the quantity of peace. Nixon goes on to enumerate the component parts of peace, "Partnership and strength are two of the pillars of the structure of a durable peace. Negotiation is the third. For our commitment to peace is most convincingly demonstrated in our willingness to negotiate our points of difference in a fair and businesslike manner with the Communist countries."[254] Again, Nixon relies upon the loci of quantity when arguing for negotiation. Not only does Nixon continue to articulate the

importance of a "durable" peace, but his identification of the "willingness to negotiate" with Communist countries such as China as a "pillar" of a "structure" of peace only underscores the importance of quantitative—long-lasting—approaches to peace. Nixon continues this line of thought by saying, "…the United States and the Communist countries must negotiate on the issues that divide them if we are to build a durable peace."[255] Nixon's quotation preaches the importance of quantitative approaches to peace; the U.S. and Communist countries like China "must" negotiate over difficult issues if "durable peace" is to be built. Nixon's repeated emphasis of the value of a "durable peace" represents an example of how Perelman and Olbrecht's Tyteca's loci of quantity is deployed by public actors.

Nixon continues to rely upon quantitative valuations when articulating the importance of pursuing diplomatic strategies based upon negotiation with the People's Republic of China. President Nixon says, "Our attitude is clear-cut—a lasting peace will be impossible so long as some nations consider themselves the permanent enemies of others."[256] Nixon's quotation exemplifies loci of quantity. Again, Nixon isolates the importance of a "lasting," durable form of peace. Moreover, Nixon reveals his preference for the probable over the improbable, crucial to the locus of quantity, when referring to the "impossibility" of achieving a lasting peace if nations continue to view other nations as permanent enemies. Nixon also highlights the superiority of his call for negotiation with former enemies (like China) by citing the "clear-cut attitude" (i.e. support) America ("our") has such an approach to international diplomacy. Coming full circle, Nixon reveals the long-term importance of changing U.S. diplomatic approaches towards China from one of hostility to one of openness, "In the long run, no stable and enduring international order is conceivable without the contribution of this nation of more than 700 million people."[257] Again, Nixon highlights the values of stability and durability,

central to loci of quantity, with regard to his approaches to peace. Moreover, Nixon values a stable and enduring "international" order, rather than an order focused solely on national or regional considerations. Nixon reveals a preference for the probable over the improbable when arguing that "no" such international order is "conceivable" without the contribution of the People's Republic of China. Nixon quantitatively underscores the importance of China's contribution to this international order by referencing the "more than 700 million people" who populate the People's Republic. Quantitative valuations—loci of quantity according to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca—play an instrumental role in Nixon's call for a change in U.S. diplomatic strategy towards China in his First Annual Report to Congress.

Loci of quantity continue to play an important role in Nixon's argumentative strategies in his Second Annual Report, especially regarding U.S. diplomatic policy towards China. Nixon cites the importance of the Asia-Pacific region to world peace, "The home of almost half the population of the earth, second to none in the richness of its human talents and energy, possessing vast material resources, and encompassing the central land mass of the earth, Asia and the Pacific region lie at the heart of the task of creating a stable structure of world peace."[258] Nixon's quotation overwhelmingly privileges quantitative values. Because the Asia-Pacific is "home to almost half" of the world's population, "second to none" in terms of human talents/energy, possessing "vast" material resources, and encompassing "the central land mass" of the planet, Nixon argues that the region is of utmost importance for fostering global peace. Nixon also reemphasizes peace from a quantitative perspective, citing the Asia-Pacific region's importance in the "task of creating a stable structure of world peace." Nixon's call for peace is also quantitative in nature; rather than seeking peace merely for the Asia-Pacific region, Nixon contextualizes the region itself as "lying at the heart" of efforts to achieve "global peace." Nixon

refers to the consequences of hostile relations between the U.S. and China, "The twenty-two year old hostility between ourselves and the People's Republic of China is another unresolved problem, serious indeed in view of the fact that it determines our relationship with 750 million talented and energetic people."[259] Nixon's quotation begins by quantitatively describing the hostility between the two nations as being "twenty-two years old." More importantly, Nixon argues that such hostility constitutes a "serious" and "unresolved problem" because such hostilities "determine" America's relationship with the People's Republic and its "750 million talented and energetic people." Nixon articulates the importance of having a constructive relationship with the People's Republic of China:

> It is a truism that an international order cannot be secure if one of the major powers remains largely outside it and hostile toward it. In this decade, therefore, there will be no more important challenge than that of drawing the People's Republic of China into a constructive relationship with the world community, and particularly with the rest of Asia.[260]

"International order," rather than national or regional interests, again serves as Nixon's primary interest. Nixon cites the impossibility, a quantitative assessment according to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, of "securing" such international order if China ("one of the major powers") remains a hostile member of the international community. Nixon also reveals that the "most important challenge" facing the entire world is "that of drawing the People's Republic of China" into a "constructive relationship" with the world community and the rest of Asia. This quotation highlights the global, rather than insular or national, interests served by having a more constructive relationship with the People's Republic. Much like the First Annual Report, Nixon's Second Annual Report to Congress uses quantitative assessments to argue for a more constructive diplomatic relationship with China.

Absent application to relevant and contemporary scholarship, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's work regarding loci communes loses its importance to the fields of argumentation and rhetorical theory. Michael Leff argues that loci communes "have received almost no attention by contemporary students of argumentation."[261] As a result, Leff believes that a "fresh view of the loci communes….has some value for contemporary argumentation theory."[262] Nixon's Annual Reports to Congress, especially as they relate to U.S. diplomatic policy towards China, represents a historical, yet presently salient, example of one particular form of loci commune, loci of quantity.

Having set the stage for the possibility of changing U.S. policy towards the People's Republic of China over the long-term to the foreign policy establishment, Nixon as president decided to make his case to the American public and members of Congress. In his First and Second Annual Reports to Congress on U.S. Foreign Policy, Nixon not only revealed his desire to change U.S. policy towards China, but also articulated the importance of doing so for global interests. Nixon effectively made the case for changing U.S. policy towards China by using argumentative concepts and strategies based upon quantitative assessments and valuations. These loci of quantity, according to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, are an important tool on which a person, in this case Nixon, uses to persuade the American public and Congress to support his call for changing U.S. diplomatic policy towards China. The privileging of global (rather than national) interests, the importance of securing durable and lasting structures of peace, the rising numerical importance (population, resources, etc.) of the People's Republic of China to the world community, and the improbability of building lasting peace absent constructive relations with China are quantitative reasons Nixon used in articulating the need to change U.S. policy towards China. As such, Nixon effectively drew upon loci of quantity in his

attempt to persuade the American public and Congress of the need to pursue a more constructive relationship with the People's Republic of China.

China through the Prism of Foreign Policy Realism

In addition to temporally creating the possibility for changing U.S. policy towards China as well as quantitatively articulating the benefits of such a change in policy, President Richard Nixon employed the discourse of realism when discussing the need to reorient U.S. foreign policy in light of the growing power of the People's Republic of China. President Nixon, heavily influenced by his foreign policy advisor Henry Kissinger, relied upon a realist style that viewed U.S. foreign policy considerations through the prism of stability, national interest, and a balance of power. Realist discourse inundated much of Nixon and Kissinger's public rhetoric, which dealt with a range of topics relating to foreign policy. More specifically, Nixon drew upon the discourse of realism in order to articulate the strategic necessity of changing U.S. foreign policy to account for the rising power of the People's Republic of China.

International diplomacy is inescapably a rhetorical enterprise. The conduct of international relations has always involved skillful use of persuasive discourse.[263] Although factors like military capability and access to natural resources play important roles in international relations, the actual decisions regarding the conduct of foreign affairs largely depend on the "successes, failures, habits, and nuances of persuasive appeal among elites and publics alike."[264] Realism represents a common and pervasive type of persuasive discourse in international affairs. In fact, realism characterized much of the foreign policy discourse of Cold War administrations.

The discourse of realism places nation-states as the primary actors in world politics; peoples, markets, ecosystems, cultures are all subordinate to a world predominated by states.[265] Realism, according to Francis Beer and Robert Hariman, argues that states:

> calculate and compare benefits and costs of alternative policies and rank each other according to their power, which is measured primarily in terms of material and especially military capabilities. Thus, national foreign policy decision makers use whatever means are most appropriate…to achieve the ends of national interest defined in terms of power.[266]

Moreover, realism "communicates not only propositions but also attitudes…it both represents the world and structures world politics; it describes some events yet also deflects awareness of others. Realism is not only a set of ideas but also a mode of symbolic action."[267] Realism formed the basis of much, if not all, of President Nixon's early foreign policy.[268] Nixon and Henry Kissinger, Nixon's assistant for national security affairs, drew upon realism as a way of "ordering the world" and in formulating U.S. foreign policy.[269] Despite seeing the world through an ideological, anti-Communist lens while a Congressman and vice president under Eisenhower, Nixon became a foreign policy realist as president.[270] Kissinger, Nixon's right-hand man regarding foreign policy, had long been a proponent of realist thought, viewing the concept of balance of power applied to international relations as a "shibboleth."[271] Along with many Cold War presidents, Nixon himself came to view the world through a realist lens.

In addition to encompassing a set of ideas and serving as a mode of symbolic action, realism as a discursive style is characterized by particular subjects and themes. The subject in realist discourse is always a world predominated by nation-states.[272] A major theme in realist discourse revolves around the evocation of world order.[273] The overriding concern of American foreign policy is deals with laying the foundations of "international order," so that America's leaders (and its peoples) can control our own future.[274] Moreover, realist views towards the

nature of international relations are designated by frequent use of terms such as "balance of power," "balance of forces," "equilibrium," "interests," and "stability."[275] According to Robert Hariman, realist discourse of world order psychologically "makes instability into a major anxiety…and executive leadership the only credible mode of action."[276] The discourse of realism possesses certain characteristics, characteristics that can be seen in Nixon's annual reports to Congress regarding U.S. foreign policy towards China.

Nixon's realism towards the People's Republic of China reveals itself in his First Annual Report to Congress. In the section entitled "A New Era," Nixon says, "Today, a revolution in the technology of war has altered the nature of the military balance of power. New types of weapons present new dangers. Communist China has acquired thermonuclear weapons."[277] Nixon's quotation is explicitly realist; the acquisition of nuclear weapons by China has "altered the nature of the military balance of power." Moreover, the "new types of weapons," of which China now possesses, present "new dangers" to the existing international order. Soon afterwards, Nixon says:

> The last 25 years have also seen an important change in the relative balance of strategic power. From 1945 to 1949, we were the only nation in the world possessing an arsenal of atomic weapons…. Today, the Soviet Union possesses a powerful and sophisticated force approaching our own. We must consider, too, that Communist China will deploy its own intercontinental missiles during the coming decade, introducing new and complicating factors for our strategic planning and diplomacy.[278]

Nixon's discourse is grounded in realist considerations. Nixon cites the "important change in the relative balance of strategic power" that has come due to the development of new military capabilities—nuclear weapons—of its strategic competitors such as China and the Soviet Union. Moreover, the fact that China will soon deploy its own intercontinental missiles introduces, according to Nixon, "new and complicating factors" for U.S strategic planning and diplomacy.

Nixon's reference to such "complicating factors" parallels realism's fascination with order and stability. Similarly, Nixon says, "we cannot ignore the potential Chinese threat against the U.S. population." This implicit reference to China's new nuclear capabilities is grounded in realist considerations of national survival. In Nixon's realist eyes, the acquisition of nuclear weapons by China represents a threat to the balance of power.

Nixon offers a realist response to the threat posed by China's rising power. Just as realism sees instability as a source of anxiety and executive action as the only credible mode of action, Nixon offers leadership and a solution. Nixon states, "For us as well as our adversaries, in the nuclear age the perils of using force are simply not in reasonable proportion to most of the objectives sought in many cases. The balance of nuclear power has placed a premium on negotiation rather than confrontation."[279] According to Nixon, negotiation with "our adversaries," which now includes the People's Republic, is required "in the nuclear age" in order to maintain the balance of power. Nixon goes on to clarify his stance on negotiation, "We will regard our Communist adversaries first and foremost as nations pursuing their own interests…just as we follow our own interests…. Specific agreements, and the structure of peace they help build, will come from a realistic accommodation of conflicting interests."[280] Realism again guides Nixon's line of thought. He regards America's "Communist adversaries" as "first and foremost" "nations pursuing their own interests" as America similarly follows its "own interests." This places nation-states as the primary actors in U.S. foreign policy, a central theme in realist discourse. Nixon's opinion that specific agreements with Communist nations will come from "realistic accommodations of conflicting interests" is quite realistic, rather than idealistic, in tone. Nixon concludes his thoughts on U.S. policy towards China by saying, "United States policy is not likely soon to have much impact on China's behavior, let alone its ideological

outlook. But it is certainly in our interest, and in the interest of peace and stability in Asia and the world, that we take what steps we can toward improved practical relations with Peking."[281] Again, the nation-state, rather than peoples, serves as the subject of Nixon's discourse. Nixon also cites national and global "interests" as supporting change in policy towards China. Nixon's solution is also the antithesis of idealism; admitting that U.S. policy is "not likely soon" to have an impact on Chinese behavior, steps must be taken by the United States to "improve practical relations" with China. By referring to how the advent of a nuclear China threatens the established international order and balance of power and by offering a solution of negotiation grounded in the practical realities of international relations, Nixon's policy towards China in his first annual report engages in a discourse of realism.

Nixon's Second Annual Report to Congress and its position on U.S. policy towards China also relies upon realist discourse. In his introduction, Nixon says:

> In the last 20 years, the nature of the Communist challenge has been transformed. The Stalinist bloc has fragmented into competing centers of doctrine and power. One of the deepest conflicts in the world today is between Communist China and the Soviet Union…. These developments complicate the patterns of diplomacy, presenting both new problems and new prospects.[282]

Nixon's quotation reveals realism's concern with order, stability, and the balance of power. The "nature of the Communist challenge" has been "transformed" as the Communist bloc has fragmented into "competing centers of doctrine and power." Moreover, the rise of conflict between Communist China and the Soviet Union "complicates the patterns" of U.S. diplomacy. This reference to the Sino-Soviet split is an example of the U.S. efforts of "triangular diplomacy," which was driven by balance of power considerations.[283] The deepening split between China and the Soviet Union ("one of the deepest conflicts") along with the emergence of China as a global power—with its growing population and emergent nuclear program—

presented the Nixon administration with an opportunity to pursue diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China which, by serving as a counterweight to the Soviets, would provide additional leverage for extracting concessions from Moscow.[284] Later, Nixon announces his intention to diplomatically engage with the People's Republic, "We are prepared to establish a dialogue with Peking…. The evolution of our dialogue with Peking cannot be at the expense of international order or our own commitments."[285] Although offering the establishment of diplomatic relations with China, Nixon qualifies his offer through explicit references to realist considerations; dialogue with Peking will take place but only if it does not come at the "expense of international order or our own commitments." Referring to a potential U.S.-Sino relationship, Nixon says, "For the United States the development of a relationship with Peking embodies precisely the challenges of this decade: to deal with, and resolve, the vestiges of post-war period that continue to influence our relationship, and to create a balanced international structure in which all nations will have a stake."[286] Again, balance of power considerations inform Nixon's discourse. Relations with China "embody precisely" the challenges facing the world in the coming decade, namely how to "create a balanced international structure in which all nations will have a stake." Balance of power considerations and a concern for maintaining global order are ever-present in Nixon's Second Annual Report to Congress. Both annual reports demonstrate how realism, as a set of ideas and a mode of symbolic action, informed Nixon's policies towards the People's Republic of China.

Conclusion

In 1967, former vice president Richard Nixon revealed to the readers of *Foreign Affairs* his thoughts on the issue of China in U.S. foreign policy. Having been a staunch anti-Communist for the better part of two decades, many in the foreign policy establishment would

like predict that Nixon would advocate the continuation of confrontational U.S. policies towards "Red China." Surprisingly, yet skillfully, Nixon suggested that an eventual change in policy towards China was necessary for the achievement of America's long-term interests. In "Asia After Vietnam," Nixon temporally created the possibility of changing U.S. policy towards China. Nixon argued for the continuation of current U.S. policies towards China by citing their various "threatening" actions while simultaneously arguing for an immediate recognition of China's growing importance in world affairs and the subsequent change in policy that would be required to deal with the People's Republic over the long-term. In so doing, Nixon effectively maintained his anti-Communist credentials in the eyes of the foreign policy establishment—the readers of *Foreign Affairs*—while also laying the foundation for the change in U.S. policy towards China during his first-term as president.

Soon after becoming president, Nixon began to address U.S. policy towards China in two annual foreign policy reports that were offered to Congress and presented to the American public. In both reports, Nixon drew upon different, yet complementary, rhetorical strategies in order to start the process of reconsidering U.S. policy towards China. Speaking under the assumption that nation-states are the primary actors in international affairs, Nixon's annual reports sought to maintain international order, secure the balance of power, and deal with the "complicating" factor of China's growing military power. Moreover, Nixon's openness to eventual dialogue with Peking was ultimately realist, not idealist; the United States would pursue relations with China only if doing so served to secure U.S. national interests of global stability and the preservation of the balance of power in the global system. Instead, Nixon relied upon quantitative assessments and valuations when suggesting an eventual change in policy towards the People's Republic. Nixon's annual reports listed a variety of quantitative goals; the

construction of a durable, lasting framework for peace, the maintenance of international order and stability, the global rather than national benefits of peace, and the impossibility of achieving any of such goals absent peacefully integrating the 750 million Chinese citizens into the international system. Each of Nixon's foreign policy goals, including those regarding China, was largely crafted in quantitative terms, demonstrating how loci communes, more specifically loci of quantity, are used by public actors in particular situations in order to guide others in their deliberations over practical affairs.

Although seemingly conservative in nature, the shift in Nixon's discourse towards China was significant. No one could have ever predicted that the Republican "hatchet man" on China policy in the 1950s would take a leadership role in suggesting the strategic importance of an eventual change in diplomatic strategy towards the People's Republic of China. Yet the nature of Nixon's discursive shift was made politically tolerable, in part, because of Nixon's anti-Communist, anti-China credentials; it gave him the credibility, the ethos, necessary to make such a change in policy even possible, even in light of likely Republican opposition. According to Robert Newman, "It is precisely because Nixon could not be easily outflanked on the right that he was able to reverse China policy and get away with it."[287] The fact that Nixon temporally created the conditions for an eventual change in policy towards China, enumerated the quantitative benefits of changing U.S. policy, and articulated the stabilizing and balance of power benefits that would result from such a policy only made it easier to start to reverse U.S. policy towards China and "get away with it." Yet Nixon did not just merely get away with changing U.S. policy on China; the president created the conditions for long-term peaceful cooperation by rehumanizing the Chinese in the eyes of the nation, and the world, in highly ritualized settings.

Chapter 4

Nixon's Diplomatic Surprise: The Ritual Rehumanization of China

Introduction

Beginning in 1967 in the pages of *Foreign Affairs,* Nixon laid the rhetorical groundwork for an eventual change in U.S. diplomatic policy towards the nation so-often referred to as "Red China." Nixon continued to pave the way for such a policy change when revealing his "Annual Reports on Foreign Policy" to the U.S. Congress in 1970 and 1971. Aside from the foreign policy establishment and members of Congress, most Americans remained largely unaware of Nixon's true desire to transform U.S. diplomatic strategy towards the People's Republic of China. A few months after Nixon's second annual report, the American public was made aware that "a major development" to "build a lasting peace in the world" was on the political horizon.

On July 15, 1971, President Richard Nixon made an announcement to a nationwide television audience that surprised many: he revealed his intention to visit the People's Republic of China in order to normalize diplomatic relations between the two countries. The public response to the announcement was positive; powerful Democratic and Republican leaders in the Congress endorsed Nixon's move towards rapprochement.[288] Moreover, public opinion polling indicated that two-thirds of the American public viewed Nixon's intention to visit China positively while only 20 percent opposed the visit.[289] Abroad, Nixon's announcement surprised many, including Taiwan and the Soviet Union, but ultimately, much of the international community rallied to support the diplomatic effort.[290] Seven months later, President Nixon eventually arrived in the People's Republic of China and his one-week visit remains one of the most historic diplomatic engagements in United States history. Nixon himself referred to his

week-long diplomatic venture into the People's Republic as "the week that changed the world."[291]

The announcement and the resulting visit to the People's Republic of China repudiated twenty years of hostile rhetoric and policies undertaken by the United States government, many spearheaded by Richard Nixon himself. Nixon's reversal of U.S. policy, as well as his own public rhetoric, towards the People's Republic was and continues to this day to be considered a timely diplomatic move. Denise Bostdorff comments on the significance of Nixon's change in tone and policy, "Richard Nixon shocked much of the world on July 15, 1971, when he announced he was going to China. The president who had built his career on being a hard-line anti-Communist not only would visit the PRC in February 1972, but also would shake Chou En-lai's hand and offer a toast to Mao himself."[292] Moreover, Evelyn Goh notes that Nixon's public rapprochement with China "ended more than twenty years of Sino-American hostility and represented the most significant strategic shift of the Cold War era."[293] Historian Margaret MacMillan similarly describes Nixon's visit to the People's Republic and the resulting improvement of relations as "an earthquake in the Cold War landscape."[294] Nixon's public rhetoric towards the People's Republic of China, starting on July 15, 1971 and ending on February 28, 1972, serves as the rhetorical artifact(s) at the heart of this chapter's analysis.

This critical effort is not the first rhetorical analysis of Nixon's rhetoric towards the People's Republic of China, nor will it likely be the last. Previous rhetorical analyses effectively shed light on the various ways that Nixon thematically signaled an eventual change in policy toward China; they also effectively contextualized the domestic political risks that Nixon undertook in visiting China.[295] However, these efforts chose not to analyze the most significant rhetorical artifact(s) regarding Nixon's rhetoric towards China; the discourses surrounding his

actual visit to the People's Republic. In an attempt to supplement the scholarship spearheaded by Robert Newman and Denise Bostdorff, the discourses of Nixon's announcement and the visit itself will serve as the focus of the resulting rhetorical analysis.

In addition to extending and updating rhetorical scholarship to include Nixon's visit to China, this chapter also seeks to supplement emerging rhetorical theory related to U.S. foreign policy by using the discourses surrounding Nixon's visit to China as a historical case study. This move is invaluable for scholars of American war rhetoric, American public address, and rhetorical critics and theorists alike. The discourses surrounding Nixon's pursuit of peaceful, diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China serve as indispensible artifacts in the articulation and construction of what Robert Ivie calls rehumanizing rituals,[296] those rhetorical practices that serve as an "antidote" and a corrective to the visions of dehumanization and destruction that permeate contemporary foreign policy discourses. While the preceding chapters reveal how Nixon's discursive history towards China constitute a historic example of demonizing rituals of redemption that characterize a "rhetoric of evil,"[297] this rhetorical analysis also reveals how the public addresses surrounding the visit rehumanize the People's Republic within ritualized, diplomatic settings. More importantly, selected photographs—visual texts—taken during Nixon's visit not only serve as tangible, historic examples rehumanizing rituals, but demonstrate how the American public, along with the world, was able to literally "see" Nixon personify and humanize the People's Republic of China. An examination of the discursive transformation of Nixon's China rhetoric from those privileging ideological considerations of good and evil to those privileging cooperation, peace, and understanding offers tremendous insight into how rhetoricians can analyze, encourage and participate in the formation of a

constructive, US-Sino relationship, as well as other diplomatic relationships, in the present and for the future.

This chapter will begin by underscoring the importance of communication, especially ritualized communication, to the field of diplomacy. It will then proceed to contextualize the importance of ritual to not only diplomacy, but more importantly, diplomatic efforts to promote peacebuilding. The rhetorical analysis will then move to demonstrate how Nixon's public addresses towards the People's Republic of China represents a historic example of how public actors can rehumanize nations in ritualized settings. The rhetorical analysis will then argue that Ivie's conceptualization of rehumanizing ritual can be extended and improved upon by looking at how the visual artifacts surrounding Nixon's visit ritually rehumanized the People's Republic of China.

The Role of Ritual in Diplomatic Communication

It is a truism to say that diplomacy is inextricably linked to communication. Both observers of and participants in diplomatic situations argue that communication plays an instrumental role in diplomacy.[298] At its core, diplomacy is communication between rulers or governments.[299] The association between diplomacy with communication is long-held; ancient Greeks conceptualized Hermes, the messenger god, as the deity of language and diplomacy.[300] The Amarna Letters, a collection of cuneiform tablets dating back to fourteenth century B.C., is considered one of the earliest records of diplomatic communication; the letters had several references to Egypt's need for intelligence to maintain control of its empire.[301] Moreover, resident ambassadors emerged during the Renaissance period not only to gather information about but also to send messages to neighboring Italian city-states.[302] The connection between communication and diplomacy is unmistakable.

Similarly, the process of diplomacy is tied heavily to ritualized practices. In fact, David Kertzer asserts that "diplomacy without ritual is inconceivable."[303] As Christer Jonsson and Martin Hall note, "the institutionalization of diplomacy entails the ritualization of diplomatic communication."[304] In many cases, ritual is simply defined as symbolic behavior, socially standardized and repetitive, that requires interpretation.[305] Various disciplines, including the field of rhetorical studies, confirm the link between communication and ritual. Kertzer intones that "ritual can be seen as a form of rhetoric, the propagation of a message through a complex symbolic performance."[306] Others attest to the communicative impact of ritual through its symbolic nature.[307] Robert Ivie's definition of ritual also reveals its symbolic nature, "Rituals are dramatic performances that can draw upon verbal and nonverbal symbols jointly to enact and thereby reconstruct political motives with sufficient ambiguity to accommodate a diversity of otherwise conflicted identities and interpretations."[308] Kertzer highlights the interconnections between symbolic communication and ritual, "we communicate through symbols, and one of the more important ways in which such symbolic understandings are communicated is through ritual."[309] Rituals are forms of symbolic communication that play a vital role in the practice of diplomacy.

Ritual also plays a vital role in diplomatic efforts to promote peace through the transformation of identity. Lisa Schirch argues, "Rituals can be used to encourage and mark the creation of shared identities for people in conflict. Formal ceremonies can mark new identities that groups develop through negotiation, mediation, or other peace-building processes."[310] This question of identity is important, for according to Schirch, the "transformation of identity is necessary for peacebuilding."[311] The words used in ritual also can serve as "powerful means" of creating new, more peaceful realities.[312] Realizing the peaceful potential inherent in ritual,

Schirch intones, "clearly, the power of symbolic acts must be harnessed by those building peace in a terrorized world."[313] This sentiment regarding ritual's peacebuilding potential is also shared by rhetorical theorist Robert Ivie.

Ivie's recent rhetorical scholarship offers "rehumanizing rituals" as alternatives to the proliferation and saturation of demonizing caricatures within contemporary U.S. foreign policy discourses, especially relating to the war on terrorism. He describes the stubbornness with which a "rhetoric of evil" permeates discussions of national security and how it subordinates aspirations for peace, "The stubborn question of security, which always confounds and often preempts or subsumes and subordinates any immediate aspiration for peace, is itself provoked by a rhetoric of evil, which envelopes all considerations of safety and well-being in a swirl of fear and hatred."[314] The violent consequences of the U.S.'s current rhetorical trajectory emerge as "U.S. war culture feeds on self-induced and overinflated expressions of national peril that transcend particular situations and transform specific exigencies into ritualized pretexts for violence."[315] Manichean distinctions between good and evil continue to structure American political discourse and news coverage.[316] The articulation of these distinctions, ever-present in U.S. war culture, "suffuses and distorts every reason, every calculation, every perception, and every dimension of motivation for choosing armed hostility over diplomacy and peace."[317] The perpetuation of demonizing caricatures of America's enemies has distrubing implications, "the face of evil colonizes judgment, neutralizes arguments for pragmatic alternatives, and diminishes deference to ethical constraints."[318]

Although specific to the Bush administration's war on terrorism, Ivie's work reveals the large-scale consequences of this kind of enemy creation. The process of perceiving or labeling one as "enemy" necessarily produces a threat.[319] In this process, "the more fearful and sinister

the image we paint of our enemy, the greater our corresponding sensation of endangerment and the stronger our need for redemption through vicarious sacrifice."[320] Simply naming an enemy can be a sufficient cause for war.[321] An example of Nixon's public rhetoric towards the People's Republic of China in 1960 epitomizes this type of enemy creation:

> But whatever we may think of our strength today, America can never stand pat…because we are confronted with an enemy, ruthless, fanatical, and as that enemy is dedicated to conquering the world by any means, including the use of force…America, whether it is a small war or a big war, will have the ultimate power that no one, Mr. Khrushchev, Mr. Mao Tse-tung, or any other enemy of peace, will dare start anything.[322]

Nixon creates this sense of endangerment; Nixon's quotation labels Mao Tse-tung as "an enemy of peace," an enemy "ruthless" and "fanatical," "dedicated to conquering the world by any means." Nixon simultaneously creates the need for redemption, calling on America to "never stand pat" and to demonstrate the "ultimate power" so that enemies such as Mao never "dare start anything." Nixon's rhetorical creation of the People's Republic of China as enemy is further elucidated in Chapter 2. Mirroring contemporary discourses in U.S. war culture, Congressman and Vice President Nixon's rhetoric towards the People's Republic of China resembled a rhetoric of evil characterized by the demonic representation of one's enemy.

Viewing the continuation of ritualized enemy creation and the violent, redemptive actions that such a process portends as unacceptable, Ivie offers the theoretical concept of "rehumanizing ritual" as his solution. The first step towards moving away from ritualized enemy creation "is to make enemies less evil and thereby reduce the blinding drive for redemption…to a lower level of intensity so that the nation's collective capacity for tolerance, restraint, and genuine problem solving might improve."[323] Rhetorically rehumanizing one's enemy can privilege modes of peacemaking over warfare in that "…rhetoric persuades to peacemaking over warfare—assuages fear and self-loathing rather than overstating danger and projecting hate—most immediately by

rehumanizing the hellish caricature of the enemy and thereby addressing by indirection the haunting question of redemption."[324] Ivie continues, "Rehumanizing rituals can cast a potent symbolic spell to counteract the ubiquitous gravitational pull of vilifying rituals."[325] Such rehumanzing rituals potentially represent the most appropriate means of challenging the enemy creation endemic to contemporary U.S. war culture.

Ivie's work on rehumanizing ritual is both timely and novel; it accurately the describes the extent to which vilifying ritualized practices inundate contemporary war discourses and it persuasively presents a possible way to counter-balance such discourses within the public sphere. However, Ivie's theorization of rehumanizing ritual needs further elucidation and extension. The following sections aim to achieve both goals. In order to further "flesh out" the theoretical concept of rehumanizing ritual, this analysis argues that the public addresses surrounding Nixon's visit to the People's Republic demonstrate *how* enemies can be rehumanized in ritualized settings. Additionally, the concept is supplemented through an analysis of the visual artifacts, or texts that accompanied Nixon's visit to China. Although Ivie recognizes the importance of visual performance to the process of enacting rehumanizing rituals, he chooses not to analyze the transformative potential of being able to see how enemies can be rehumanized in ritual settings. An analysis of a selection of photographs taken during Nixon's week-long trip to the People's Republic serves as a visual demonstration of *how* public actors can begin to ritually rehumanize rather than ritually vilify in diplomatic settings, a demonstration that strengthens the theoretical foundations of rehumanizing rituals.

The Textual Rehumanization of "Communist China" in Ritual Settings

President Richard Nixon's decision to normalize diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China serves as a historical example of how U.S. public officials can counteract the

processes of enemy creation by rehumanizing old foes within ritualized settings. Nixon initiated the process of rehumanizing the Chinese "enemy" when engaging in the ritualized tradition of publically addressing a national television audience of his intention to normalize relations with the People's Republic on July 15, 1971.[326] Nixon begins his public address, "I have requested this television time tonight to announce a major development in our efforts to build a lasting peace in the world." Immediately, Nixon attributes his announcement of his intention to visit China with global significance, arguing that it represents "a major development" in efforts to achieve lasting, global peace. Nixon then proceeds to specify the subject of this major announcement, "…there can be no stable and enduring peace without the participation of the People's Republic of China and its 750 million people. That is why I have undertaken initiatives in several areas to open the door for more normal relations between our two countries."[327] Nixon begins to rehumanize China. First, rather than labeling China as "Red China" or "Communist China" as had so often been the case in his past public rhetoric, Nixon conveys respect by using the proper name of "The People's Republic of China." Moreover, rather than referring to China as being ruled or dominated by its Communist leadership, again as he so often did, Nixon refers to the People's Republic as being represented by its "750 million people." Nixon also attributes significance to the People's Republic when describing the importance of their participation in the world community in stark terms ("there can be no stable and enduring peace without…"). In the first 3 sentences of his announcement, Nixon confers respect upon the People's Republic of China, calls for the participation of its 750 million people in the global community, and attributes supreme significance to China's role in U.S. efforts to build global peace.

The remaining portions of Nixon's announcement continue the process of rehumanizing the People's Republic. Reading an announcement that was being issued simultaneously in Peking, Nixon says, "Knowing of President Nixon's expressed desire to visit the People's Republic of China, Premier Chou Enlai…has extended an invitation to President Nixon to visit China at an appropriate date before May 1972. President Nixon has accepted the invitation with pleasure."[328] The process of requesting and extending invitations is a friendly, human enterprise; just as friends would invite other friends over for dinner or for any other social occasion, the Chinese leadership extended an offer of invitation to visit China to President Nixon. Moreover, Nixon's response to the Premier's invitation further attributes human qualities upon the People's Republic; Nixon "accepted the invitation with great pleasure," resembling how friends happily accept each other's invitations. Nixon explicitly invokes friendship when referring to his desire to seek a new relationship with China, "Our action in seeking a new relationship with the People's Republic of China will not be at the expense of our old friends. It is not directed against any other nation. We seek friendly relations with all nations. Any nation can be our friend without being any other nation's enemy."[329] Although clearly a message of reassurance to U.S. allies in Asia, Nixon's quotation expresses the U.S.'s intention to seek "friendly relations" with any nation, including the People's Republic of China. In Nixon's mind, any nation, including China, "can be" America's "friend without being any other nation's enemy." The theme of friendship conveys Nixon's desire to humanize the "new" U.S.-Sino relationship.

Nixon continues to humanize America's relationship with China at the conclusion of the announcement. Nixon says:

> I have taken this action because of my profound conviction that all nations will gain from a reduction of tensions and a better relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of China. It is in this spirit that I will undertake

> what I deeply hope will become a journey for peace, peace not just for our generation but for future generations on this earth we share together.[330]

Nixon's expression of his profound, personal conviction again attributes significance to the People's Republic of China to the global community. Moreover, Nixon uses the term relationship, instead of relations, is more human and personal in nature; people have relationships, nations maintain relations. Nixon's use of a journey metaphor when referring to his trip to China also personalizes the People's Republic. His journey is one of peace for "future generations on this earth that we share together." The phrase "we share together" personalizes U.S. relations with China; Nixon's journey for peace can only succeed if "we," China and the United States, "share" or cooperate, "together." The People's Republic of China emerges as a future friend, possessing human characteristics and abilities, in Nixon's announcement of his intention to visit China.

Prior to his state visit, President Nixon again humanizing the People's Republic of China in a ritualized setting. On February 17, 1972, Nixon commented on his goals for his trip to China in the highly ritualized setting of a "departure ceremony" on the South Lawn of the White House.[331] The president says, "But as Premier Chou En-lai said in a toast that he proposed to Dr. Kissinger and the members of the advance group in October, the American people are a great people. The Chinese people are a great people."[332] As opposed to the realist lens that he employed in his annual addresses that stressed how nation-states are the basis of international relations, Nixon's quotation places the "people" of America and China as the basis of the bilateral relationship. Viewing the relationship as people-centered, rather than state-centered, personifies the People's Republic of China. Later, Nixon responds to the differences between the U.S. and China, "…what we must do is to find a way to see that we can have differences without being enemies in war. If we can make progress toward that goal on this trip, the world

will be a much safer world and the chance particularly for all of those young children over there to grow up in a world of peace will be infinitely greater."[333] Nixon's use of personal pronouns is most striking; the repeated use of "we" to describe the United States and China underscores the personal relationship between the two countries. Nixon also expressly rejects viewing China as an enemy, pleading that both sides should "find a way to see that we can have differences without being enemies in war." Nixon also provides a human face to the People's Republic when expressing hope that "all of those young children over there" in China are able "to grow up in a world of peace." In a departure ceremony on the South Lawn of the White House, Nixon attributes greatness to the Chinese people, personifies the People's Republic through the use of personal pronouns, and expresses a concern for the young children of China, all of which help to rehumanize Nixon's former enemy.

Nixon continues the process of rehumanizing the Chinese "enemy" while offering a toast at a banquet being held in his honor in Peking on February 21, 1972. Nixon's addresses those attending the banquet:

> Mr. Prime Minister and all of your distinguished guests this evening: On behalf of all of your American guests, I wish to thank you for the incomparable hospitality for which the Chinese people are justly famous throughout the world. I particularly want to pay tribute, not only to those who prepared the magnificent dinner, but also to those who have provided the splendid music. Never have I heard American music played better in a foreign land. Mr. Prime Minister, I wish to thank you for your very gracious and eloquent remarks.[334]

Engaging in a strategy of ingratiation, Nixon lavishes praise upon the Chinese "people" and the Chinese Prime Minister. He refers to those in attendance as "distinguished guests." He expresses thanks for the "incomparable hospitality" for which the Chinese are "justly famous" throughout the world. He pays tribute to those who prepared the "magnificent dinner" and those who provided the "splendid American music" "never played better in a foreign land." The high

praise given by Nixon to the Chinese people is an extreme sign of respect, respect unexpected of an enemy. The Chinese "people" are portrayed as accomplished, distinguished, skillful, even hospitable, traits one would never attribute to a diabolical foe. The nature of Nixon's praise is usually reserved for one's friends, not one's former enemies. Even Nixon's thanks of the prime minister attributes human qualities of graciousness and eloquence to the Chinese leadership. Nixon later says:

> So, let us, in these next 5 days, start a long march together, not in lockstep, but on different roads leading to the same goal, the goal of building a world structure of peace and justice in which all may stand together with equal dignity and in which each nation, large or small, has a right to determine its own form of government, free of outside interference or domination. The world watches. The world listens. The world waits to see what we will do.[335]

Again, Nixon repeatedly uses the pronoun "we" and "us" to convey the personal connection between the United States and China. Nixon also animates and personifies the People's Republic through his metaphor of a long march; let "us," the United States and China "march together" towards the goal of a world structure of peace and justice. The world, along with the United States and China, is personified through sensory description; it "watches," it "listens," it "waits to see what we will do."

Nixon explicitly calls into question the process of enemy creation during the toast, "There is no reason for us to be enemies. Neither of us seeks the territory of the other; neither of us seeks domination over the other; neither of us seeks to stretch out our hands and rule the world."[336] Nixon's use of parallel structure only serves to underscore the extent to which the United States and China should no longer view each other as enemies. As opposed to Congressman or Vice President Nixon who viewed "Red China" as an aggressive adversary, President Nixon rebukes such claims. No longer does the People's Republic seek domination or

territory. In fact, Nixon's quotation personifies China as cooperative; no longer does it "stretch out" its "hands" to rule the world. Nixon concludes his toast:

> Chairman Mao has written, "So many deeds cry out to be done, and always urgently. The world rolls on. Time passes. Ten thousand years are too long. Seize the day, seize the hour." This is the hour, this is the day for our two peoples to rise to the heights of greatness which can build a new and a better world. In that spirit, I ask all of you present to join me in raising your glasses to Chairman Mao, to Prime Minister Chou, and to the friendship of the Chinese and American people which can lead to friendship and peace for all people in the world.[337]

Again, Nixon praises the Chinese by quoting their leader, Mao Tse-tung. Reinterpreting Mao's quotation, Nixon argues that "this is the hour, this is the day" that "our two peoples" rise to the "heights of greatness" in order to "build" a new and better world. Nixon's use of asyndeton creates a sense of urgency whereby the "peoples" of each nation should strive to great heights. Moreover, Nixon's building metaphor animates both the United States and the Chinese, as both peoples possess the abilities to build "a new and better world." Nixon's concludes by raising his glass to the Chinese leadership, signifying the new "friendship" of the Chinese and American people. This explicit description of the U.S.-Sino relationship as one of "friendship" stands in polar opposition to Vice President Nixon's earlier demonization of the fanatical, ruthless Chinese enemy.

While speaking in front of the Great Wall, President Nixon furthers the process of ritually rehumanizing the People's Republic of China. In a ritualized exchange with reporters at the Great Wall of China on February 24, 1972, Nixon says, "I can only say to the media, who, like myself, have never seen the Great Wall before, that it exceeds all expectations. When one stands there and sees the Wall…you would have to conclude that this is a great wall and that it had to be build by a great people."[338] Nixon continues, "A people who could have built a wall like this certain have a great past to be proud of and a people who have this kind of a past must also have

a great future."[339] In both quotations, Nixon refers to the Chinese "people" who built the Great Wall, not to the Communist government or the Chinese nation-state. Moreover, Nixon expresses admiration for and gives praise to the "great people" who built it. Not only do the Chinese people "have a great past to be proud of" but they "must also have a great future." The attribution of pride and greatness to their accomplishments only serves to rehumanize the Chinese people. Nixon also says, "My hope is that in the future…many Americans…will be able to see this Wall, that they will think back as I think back to the history of this great people, and they will have the opportunity, as we have had an opportunity, to know the Chinese people, and know them better."[340] Nixon's expression of hope personifies the Chinese and the relationship between American and Chinese people. It reflects his desire to see Americans get to "know" the Chinese people "better."

In another toast, this one honoring Chinese Premier Chou En-lai, Nixon personifies the People's Republic of China rather than demonizing it. On February 25, 1972, Nixon employs a strategy of ingratiation resembling the first toast, "It is a great privilege while we are guests in your country to be able to welcome you and the Chinese who are present here as our guests this evening. On behalf of Mrs. Nixon and all of the members of our official party, I want to express our deep appreciation for the boundless and gracious hospitality which you have extended to us."[341] Nixon's expression of appreciation for the "boundless and gracious hospitality" at the banquet personifies the Chinese as courteous friends rather than as ruthless foes. Nixon also refers to the Great Wall, "As I walked along the Wall, I thought of the sacrifices that went into building it; I thought of what it showed about the determination of the Chinese people…I thought about the fact that the Wall tells us that China has a great history and that the people who built this wonder of the world also have a great future."[342] Yet again, Nixon assigns human

attributes of greatness and determination to the Chinese people for their efforts to build the Great Wall. Moreover, Nixon imagines the human "sacrifices" that went into building the wall. Nixon later cites his ultimate goal for the United States and China:

> In these past 4 days we have begun the long process of removing that wall between us. We began our talks recognizing that we have great differences, but we are determined that those differences not prevent us from living together in peace. You believe deeply in your system, and we believe just as deeply in our system. It is not our common beliefs that have brought us together here, but our common interests and our common hopes, the interest that each of us has to maintain our independence and the security of our peoples and the hope that each of us has to build a new world order in which nations and peoples with different systems and different values can live together in peace, respecting one another while disagreeing with one another, letting history rather than the battlefield be the judge of their different ideas.[343]

Nixon displays a similar strategy of using personal pronouns to animate the People's Republic as well as emphasizing the security of the American and Chinese "peoples" rather than the realist considerations of stability and national security. More importantly, Nixon reveals his hope that despite their differences, both the United States and China can "live together in peace." This phraseology breathes life into the People's Republic, a nation Nixon believes and hopes is capable of living together in peace with the United States.

Upon arriving back to the United States on February 28, 1972, Nixon concluded his week-long trip to the People's Republic by extending the process of ritually rehumanizing China. An extended bridge building metaphor inundates most of Nixon's commentary regarding his trip. Nixon says, "As a result of this trip we have started the long process of building a bridge across that gulf, and even now we have something better than the mere absence of war."[344] Later, Nixon remarks, "In our talks [with the leaders of the People's Republic] …we both realized that a bridge of understanding that spans almost 12,000 miles and 22 years of hostility can't be built in one week of discussions. But we have agreed to begin to build that bridge, recognizing that

our work will require years of patient effort."[345] In both quotations, Nixon's use of first-person pronouns provides subjectivity to the Chinese in the bridge building effort. China, along with the United States, possesses the human agency, the ability, to agree and build the "bridge of understanding" between the two nations. Nixon also comments on the gifts given to the Chinese while undertaking the trip, "One of the gifts that we left behind in Hangchow was a planted sapling of the American redwood tree. As all Californians know, and as most Americans know, redwoods grow from saplings into the giants of the forest. But the process is not one of days or even years; it is a process of centuries."[346] The act of gift-giving is highly ritualized in many societies throughout the world and usually takes place among friends and/or family. Nixon's giving of the redwood sapling as a gift signifies the nature of the U.S.-China relationship: a relationship between friends, not enemies.

President Richard Nixon's public addresses regarding his visit to the People's Republic of China signified a drastic and significant change in U.S. diplomatic policy. More importantly, Nixon's public discourse changed the way in which the United States conceptualized the U.S.-Sino relationship. Robert Ivie's recent scholarship regarding rehumanizing ritual offers tremendous insight regarding how to reconceptualize U.S. diplomatic relationships in ways that emphasize peace rather than hostility. Unfortunately, no examples of rehumanizing rituals, contemporary or otherwise, are enumerated that might be able to serve as models for the future. Fortunately, Nixon's public discourse towards the People's Republic of China serves as a viable case study; engaging in public rhetoric in highly ritualized settings, Nixon addressed the nation and the world in ways that rehumanized the Chinese people. As opposed to the demonized, diabolical caricature of "Red China" that dominated Nixon's public rhetoric for twenty years, a

personified image of an accomplished, cooperative, and friendly Chinese partner emerged in Nixon's public addresses surrounding his visit to the People's Republic.

The Ritual/Visual Embodiment of a Rehumanized China

While Nixon's public addresses regarding his trip to China help "flesh out" Ivie's theoretical concept of rehumanizing ritual, alone they only can create a sense of what rehumanizing rituals "read like." Perhaps the most important question to ask when reading Ivie's work is "what does a rehumanizing ritual look like?" While his public addresses alone are insufficient, Nixon's trip to the People's Republic remains an invaluable resource in conceptualizing tangible examples of rehumanizing rituals. The images surrounding Nixon's visit to China represent potentially transformative rhetorical artifacts, especially when viewed as real-world examples of the practice of ritual rehumanization. A visual analysis of a selection of public photographs taken during Nixon's week-long trip to the People's Republic serves as a demonstration of *how* public actors can ritually rehumanize nations within diplomatic settings, which serves to improve upon the foundations of Ivie's theoretical concept.

Textual analysis alone is often inadequate when trying to explain the significance of particular events that take place within the public sphere. Lester Olson, Cara Finnegan, and Diane Hope observe that the "contemporary U.S. public sphere seems dominated by visual images, visual artifacts, visual performances, and other commands to 'look'."[347] As opposed to the traditional rhetorical practice of focusing on the power of the written word, increased attention has been devoted to the rhetoric of the image, or what is being called "visual rhetoric."[348] Such images are inevitably rhetorical; they function to persuade. [349] As such, the study of visual rhetoric "is of vital importance for students of communication interested in understanding the dynamics of public persuasion."[350] Robert Hariman and John Lucaites assert

that the field of visual rhetoric refers to "a large body of visual and material practices, from architecture to cartography and from interior design to public memorials."[351] Olson, Finnegan, and Hope define visual rhetoric as "those symbolic actions enacted primarily through visual means, made meaningful through culturally derived ways of looking and seeing and endeavoring to influence diverse publics."[352] Photography and photojournalism play an instrumental role in public culture. Lucaites and Hariman intone:

> Its freezing of a critical moment in time intensifies the journalistic experience, focusing the viewer's attention on a particular enactment of the tensions that define the public culture. But more than this, it does so ritualistically, as it repetitively conjures images of what is unsayable…in print discourses otherwise defining the public culture.[353]

Olson, Finnegan, and Hope concur, "communication technologies, including photography…are used to produce, reproduce, and circulate visual images in order to influence publics."[354] Photographs can even change how Americans imagine their political world by forcing a psychic transformation of the citizenry that ruptures imagined conceptions of identity and reality.[355] Yet the power of the image isn't merely limited to the field of photography; it also plays a vital role in the formation of policy. As David Perlmutter explains, "Indeed, it has become almost assumed wisdom that a picture…can trigger the emotional reaction of world opinion and force the hand of policy makers."[356] The anecdotal evidence and admission of this phenomenon are widespread and made by key opinion-makers and shapers of policy.[357] The rhetoric of the image has and will continue to play a vital role in public discourse.

The rhetorical nature of ritual is also inextricably tied to the power of the *un*spoken word. As Lisa Schirch argues, "ritual communicates through symbols, senses, and heightened emotions rather than relying heavily on the use of words. In ritual humans learn by doing. There is a preference for nonverbal communication using bodies, senses, and emotions rather than words or

rational thought."[358] Even political rituals rely heavily upon the power of the image. The U.S. president, in particular, plays a central role in the power of the image in today's visual culture. David Kertzer argues that the president is the country's "premier ritual actor and symbol manipulator."[359] As a result, many rhetorical scholars have argued that the field of presidential rhetoric has taken a visual turn.[360] Many images link the president to sites, rituals, and occasions that simultaneously serve as markers of culture, power and authority.[361] Images can facilitate a president's ability to enact such roles as world leader, peacemaker, commander-and-chief, among others.[362] Presidents often use visual drama in order to signal developments in diplomatic policy; presidential state visits can "rhetorically inspire a heartened sense of goodwill, create suspense, calm political animosities, and clarify political agon."[363] The significance of the image within ritualized political practices is unmistakable.

Ivie himself recognizes the rising influence of image-based practices in U.S. war culture. War is ritualized in America's contemporary media culture, "War is ritualistically memorialized in any number of public media from carefully staged and regularly televised presidential encomiums to towering statues in central parks and around capitals throughout the land…. The motive for war is staged and rehearsed daily in multitudinous forms and ubiquitous settings."[364] The transformative potential of rehumanizing rituals also seems reliant on the power of image-based practices, "At the moment…ritual's performative power in film or elsewhere is severely underutilized for peace-building purposes and largely diverted to war-valorizing applications."[365] Ivie is well-aware of the transformative power of the image in "prudential" ritualized practices, yet he chooses not to offer any specific guidance as to what such "prudential" images would look like. What is offered are intangible, unspecific ways of engaging in rehumanizing ritual. One way resolves around storytelling, which "can be made to serve as a ritualizing practice for

rehumanizing adversaries and enemies on both sides of the divide."[366] Certain commemorative rhetorics, or stories, can be "remembered" in different ways, in ways that could "become strategic rites of humanization and cultural resources for reconciliation." Another way of performing rehumanizing ritual is even more poorly defined. Concluding his essay, Ivie says:

> Humans, living within language and defined through symbolic action, may hope to reform their identities and relations to one another by means of tragicomic narratives and ritual dramas—that is, by inventing humanizing narratives and rites of reconciliation to remediate demonizing images of adversaries and deifying rituals of redemptive violence.[367]

Ivie effectively reveals the rhetorical nature of rehumanizing rituals, yet fails to clarify *how* to "invent humanizing narratives and rites of reconciliation." In the abstract, the concept of rehumanizing ritual seems novel and valid; when viewed more closely, however, no tangible or real-world examples are presented where such rehumanizing rituals have or presently take place. Yet concrete examples of such transformative rehumanizing rituals exist. The images surrounding Nixon's visit to China represent historic, yet still salient, examples.

Three famous photographic images taken during Nixon's historic visit to the People's Republic represent how rehumanizing rituals of peacebuilding, such as those conceptualized by Ivie, take place within the public sphere. Nixon's handshake with Mao Tse-tung, his toast with Premier Chou En-lai, and his visit to China's Great wall stand out as exemplary images; they were circulated widely at the time and are now in the public domain, available for nearly everyone on early to view and inspect. More importantly, each photograph embodies the concept of rehumanizing ritual. As Lisa Schirch states, "ritual gives physical form to an individual's lived experience, cultures, values, and identities." The performative nature of rituals, in fact, can even place what "ought to be" in tension with what "currently is."[368] It is within such tension where ritual's transformative potential emerges; ritual can "give birth to new

worldviews…it transforms a vision of the world."[369] Schirch articulates the transformative nature of peacebuilding rituals of rehumanization in visual terms, "peacebuilding is an educational process; it requires people to learn new ways of seeing the world."[370] Peacebuilding rituals of rehumanization, those called upon by Ivie and those described by Schirch, allow us to visualize, to literally see, a different world, a world of peaceful relations as opposed to a world of conflict. Each photograph analyzed serve as tangible, visual demonstrations of what rehumanizing rituals can and should look like.

The first photograph is of a toast between President Nixon and Premier Chou En-lai at a banquet held on February 25, 1972.[371] The photograph represents an example of what is called "dinner diplomacy." Schirch reveals the transformative and humanizing potential inherent in such rituals, "In dinner diplomacy, participants do more than simply eat food to nourish their bodies or enjoy the pleasures of dancing. These acts become symbolic because the participants themselves are unusual. They come from opposing sides of a conflict. Eating and dancing take on new meanings when they are done in the company of enemies."[372] Dinner rituals play an especially important role within Chinese culture. R.W. Apple illuminates the continued importance Chinese attribute to such rituals:

> By no means least dangerous were the potential dinner-table pitfalls, like those that confronted the American guest of honor last night at the Great Hall of the People in Beijing. The formal banquet is a Chinese institution, and at its end lies an inevitable and obligatory round of toasts with the sorghum-based firewater known as maotai…But drink it visitors must, and it wouldn't do to gag in the presence of one's host. Richard Nixon knocked maotais back with Zhou En-lai on his historic trip in 1972… "Ganbei," the Chinese say -- bottoms up, more or less. They mean the glass, not you.[373]

Schirch argues that this "dinner diplomacy" suggests a positive, if not friendly, relationship between the participants, "In peacebuilding settings, eating together is a symbolic social drama, one that says 'These people are in a relationship with each other' and possibly, 'These people get

along well enough to eat together'."[374] Schirch also explains how eating together in these ritual situations can symbolically transform identities and overcome the process of enemy creation, "the symbolic acts of eating…were essential to the success of transforming the participants' understanding of themselves, their 'enemies,' and the conflict as a whole." [375] Nixon and Chou En-lai's participation in the ritual of "dinner diplomacy" enables each side to view the other in less antagonistic and more cooperative ways.

Figure 1: President Nixon with Premier Chou En-Lai/Richard Nixon Library

A close reading of this "dinner diplomacy" image also reveals how ritualized performances can humanize, rather than dehumanize, another individual or group. The image clearly reveals Nixon and Chou En-lai making a toast, raising each of their glasses towards the other in a celebratory fashion. The bringing together of the glasses also symbolizes the coming together of the two nations, a signification of the building a bridge of interpersonal relations between Nixon and the Chinese premier. Nixon and Chou En-lai both express enthusiasm towards one another, with both of them smiling towards the other while making the toast. Both men also sport similar hairstyles, their hair dark and slicked back over their head. Both men are

the same size in the image, suggesting both sides have an equal role to play in the relationship. The enthusiasm that both men show towards the other, the metaphorical coming together of both nations via the celebratory toast, and the symbolic message that sharing dinner sends to others represent the visual ways in which particular ritualized performances can humanize others.

The second photograph is of President Nixon, along with Mrs. Nixon, standing alongside a group of people at the Great Wall of China.[376] According to Keith Erickson, "Ceremonies and rituals enacted at state-erected structures, monuments, and memorials…articulate cherished principles, cultural recollections, and ideological values that define, soothe, and unify witnesses in a form of primitive mystification."[377] The Great Wall of China is a cultural treasure in the People's Republic. Nixon himself referred to it in his public rhetoric as a "wonder of the world" that symbolizes the "greatness" of the Chinese people. Nixon's participation in the ritualized photo-op at the Great Wall serves to articulate principles of togetherness as well as to unify the viewing international public around the symbolic importance of the visit itself. The image simultaneously conveys the greatness espoused by Nixon and the overcoming of "walls" that separate peoples around the world.

Figure 2: President and Mrs. Nixon visit the Great Wall of China and the Ming tombs/Richard Nixon Library

A close reading of the image reveals its symbolic and humanizing import. Although Nixon is at the forefront of the image, he is surrounded by large numbers of people, American and Chinese alike. This creates a sense of mutual interdependence between the peoples of the United States and China. Yet the Great Wall remains behind Nixon, continuing towards the sky; it symbolizes the supreme accomplishments of the Chinese people. The people surrounding Nixon also symbolize the emerging international system; although Nixon represents the centrality of U.S. influence in global affairs, he, representing the United States, is increasingly constrained and influenced by the "millions of people" in places like China and throughout the world. The crowd surrounding Nixon appears to be composed of people of all ages, mirroring Nixon's discourse about the need to secure peace for current and future generations. Many, if not all, of the people in the image, including President Nixon, are smiling, conveying a sense of enthusiasm toward the prospect of friendly Sino-American relations. The style of dress among the participants is also quite similar, with the exception of Mrs. Nixon. In strange twist of fate, the first lady is wearing a bright red overcoat; her sporting the colors of "Red China" can be read to signify a metaphorical willingness on the part of Americans to accept aspects and ideals of Chinese culture. Perhaps most significantly, Nixon, the first lady, and the crowd of people are standing together, seemingly blocking the wall. Nixon and the crowd composed of Americans and Chinese alike appear to be walking across the wall, transcending the differences that Nixon believed walls have come to symbolize. Nixon's ritualized photo-op at the Great Wall serves to rehumanize the Chinese, revealing the enthusiasm and the interconnectedness between American and the "great" Chinese people.

The third and final photograph is of President Nixon shaking hands with the Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, Mao Tse-tung.[378] According to Jonsson and Hall, types of body

language constitute important aspects of diplomatic communication.[379] A type of diplomatic body language is the handshake, which is commonly used as a metaphor for the quality of inter-state relations, "transferring the language of personal relations to the international arena."[380] Lisa Schirch explains how handshake rituals can communicate the formation of new, friendly relations, "the handshake is a symbolic form of communication that has come to represent or symbolize friendship."[381] The handshake takes on an even greater symbolic import when undertaken by the president. Perlmutter underscores the symbolic, visual import of presidential action in foreign affairs, "Of all of the actors, the president traditionally has the greatest power to influence, direct or perpetuate American foreign policy…. His every action is a 'visbyte'…to many inside and outside the country, he physically embodies the nation."[382] Nonverbal, presidential forms of ritual communication such as the handshake represent perhaps the most effective means of signifying the formation of a new relationship between nations.

A close reading of the photograph of the handshake ritual confirms the visual representation of a new relationship of friendship between the United States and China. The handshake between Nixon and Mao represents the metaphorical "bridge building" between the two nations of which Nixon so often spoke in his public addresses. Using Schirch's words, the handshake "might physically symbolize a transformation of a conflict that may not be able to occur on a purely intellectual level."[383] Additionally, both leaders are animated and smiling, conveying an enthusiasm not only for their personal meeting but at the prospect of more cooperative relations between their two countries. They are also standing face to face, looking nearly eye to eye, signifying the existence of a fairly, coequal relationship. Neither figure dominates the scene of the image, perhaps symbolizing Nixon's words that "neither of us" seeks to dominate the other. Yet, the photograph also symbolizes the differences between the two

nations. The different shades/colors of the suits and the unoccupied space between and above each leader represent the differences between the two nations, the "gulf" between them over issues of belief and ideology. Despite such differences, the ritualized handshake indicates that both men, both countries, are newfound friends able to find "common ground."

Figure 3: President Nixon meets with China's Communist Party Leader, Mao Tse-Tung/Richard Nixon Library

Conclusion

Rhetorical scholarship regarding President Nixon and the People's Republic of China has been, at times, novel and informative. Robert Newman's piece in the 1970's effectively explained the political context surrounding Nixon's decision to travel to China and illuminated the "China myths" that laid at the center of Republican opposition to Nixon's decision.[384] More recently, Denise Bostdorff beautifully analyzed Nixon's signals of an impending policy change towards China, beginning from Nixon's time as a congressman up until his announcement of his intention to visit the People's Republic in July of 1971. Unfortunately, both Newman and Bostdorff overlooked the most important rhetorical artifacts regarding Nixon and China: the

primary materials that emerged between July 1971 and February 1972. These primary materials—Nixon's public addresses and the visual images capturing the visit itself—continue to serve as invaluable tools from which to rhetorically analyze Nixon's public rhetoric regarding the country he once labeled as his Communist foe. This chapter has filled the gap in current rhetorical scholarship by taking a closer look at the rhetorical strategies Nixon employed as he embarked on a new diplomatic relationship with the world's most populous nation.

In addition to updating rhetorical scholarship regarding Nixon and China, this chapter sought to improve upon Robert Ivie's recent work regarding the theoretical concept of rehumanizing ritual. Disturbed by the prevalence of demonizing caricatures of enemies in U.S. foreign policy rhetoric, namely regarding the war on terrorism, Ivie suggested the prudential adoption of rehumanzing rituals as an "antidote," a corrective, to the violence-inducing rituals of redemption that characterize the popular discourses of America. A novel and insightful approach to contemporary war rhetoric, Ivie's project chose not to elucidate what types of rehumanizing rituals could emerge in today's world, let alone what such rituals would resemble. Using Ivie's conceptualization as a building block, this chapter argued that Nixon's visit to China represents a historical, yet salient, real-world example of an abandonment of "demonizing rituals of dehumanization" and a "prudential narrative and rite of rehumanization."[385]

As Lisa Schirch notes, "the words used in ritual are a powerful means of creating a new reality." As such, this chapter closely inspected the words present in Nixon's public addresses regarding his visit to the People's Republic. Presented to a national or international television audience, often in ritualized settings, Nixon's public addresses served as a powerful means of creating a new reality, a reality that recognized the human characteristics of the People's Republic of China and the 750 million people who inhabited the country in 1972. Nixon's words

animated the People's Republic of China, transforming a previously diabolical and ruthless enemy into a nation composed of human beings and leaders not only willing but anxious to start a more personal and friendly relationship with the United States. Nixon's public addresses represent an invaluable case study for *how* public actors can begin the process of rehumanizing others, including other nations, within ritual settings.

Olson, Finnegan, and Hope reveal the importance of context when studying visual images, "To study visual rhetoric…means not to study images and artifacts in isolation from larger textual or performance contexts in which an audience might encounter them, but rather in precise relation to those contexts that give them shape and meaning."[386] In addition to a textual analysis of how Nixon was able to rehumanize the People's Republic of China, this chapter engaged in a visual analysis of three photographs capturing major moments in Nixon's visit to China. Placing the photographs in their verbal and performative contexts, the analysis revealed how Nixon's visit embodied a ritual of rehumanization towards China. According to Lisa Schirch, ritual does not merely allow people to "talk" about peace; rather, ritual allows people to "be peace, to act out peace."[387] The images of Nixon's visit to China—his toast with Premier Chou En-lai, his standing at the Great Wall of China alongside American and Chinese people, and his handshake with Chairman Mao Tse-tung—embody Ivie's notion of rehumanizing ritual. The images of Nixon performing in ritual contexts are forms of symbolic action—of rhetoric—that move "toward a positive peace strategically activated and maintained in regular and widespread rites of reconciliation that work to rehumanize the nation's adversaries and thereby moderate its nervous desire and excessive appetite for redemptive violence."[388] Nixon, once the staunchest anti-Communist who saw China as the cause of many of the world's problems, slowly began to lay the groundwork for an eventual change in policy, based upon strategic necessity,

towards the People's Republic of China. Soon afterwards, in the eyes of the entire world to see and hear, Nixon took the largest step in securing his legacy as a premier statesman: he embarked on a week-long trip to the People's Republic of China, a week "that changed the world."

Chapter 5

The Historical/Rhetorical Significance of Nixon's China Rhetoric: Past, Present, and Future

Introduction

Any attempt, rhetorical or otherwise, to assess the U.S.-China relationship should focus on groundbreaking moment in contemporary Sino-American ties: Nixon's historic visit to the People's Republic. Such a focus would permit a more thorough assessment of the U.S.-China relationship, a valuable commodity given the importance of both nations in contemporary world affairs. As Margaret MacMillan states, "to understand" the U.S.-P.R.C. relationship, "we need to go back to 1972, to the moment when it started anew."[389] This thesis project has gone back to 1972, and beyond, in order to more fully understand the U.S.-China diplomatic relationship, the complexities that it encompasses, and the significance Nixon's change in policy on U.S. diplomatic strategy.

This project initially sought to supplement existing rhetorical scholarship regarding U.S. China policy, Richard Nixon, and emerging rhetorical concepts in the field of diplomatic policy by placing Nixon's public discourse of China under critical inspection. This chapter will articulate how this study has supplemented existing scholarship regarding Nixon and China, especially Denise Bostdorff and Robert Newman, who served as the trailblazers for rhetorical scholarship regarding U.S. diplomatic policy towards China. The chapter will then outline the limitations of this thesis project, revealing how additional scholarship can and should be undertake to further analyze the diplomatic surprise that was Nixon's visit to China. Lastly, the chapter will look ahead, hypothesizing what an analysis of Nixon's discourses towards the People's Republic can tell us about the current and future state of U.S.-China relations as well as other pressing diplomatic matters of U.S. and global concern.

Supplementing Existing Scholarship

This study has updated rhetorical scholarship regarding the Sino-American diplomatic relationship. This analysis places Nixon's China policy as its critical focus. Both Denise Bostdorff and Robert Newman produced important insights into U.S. policy towards China, each with a distinctive rhetorical approach one could call their own. Newman's analysis of the "China myths" surrounding Nixon's visit effectively revealed the difficult political task that Nixon had to face when choosing to change U.S. policy towards China. Although deciding not to analyze Nixon's actual texts regarding China, Newman's analysis of the historical-political context surrounding Nixon's visit underscored how the myths surrounding China that pervaded the Republican establishment at the time represented a significant rhetorical obstacle to Nixon's change in policy. The insights provided by Newman help to reveal the rhetorical significance of Nixon's monumental diplomatic act.

Denise Bostdorff's recent work on Nixon and China comprehensively and impressively argues that Nixon's announcement of his intention to change U.S. policy towards China should not be seen as much of a "diplomatic surprise" as many have and continue to view it. Rather, through a close inspection of Nixon's discourses between 1952 until his announcement in July 1971, Bostdorff reveals how Nixon discursively "predicted" or signaled his eventual change in U.S. policy. By focusing on Nixon's public hedging strategies and the foreign policy reports regarding U.S. policy towards China that were largely out of the public eye, Bostdorff eloquently reveals how Nixon was able to signal his intentions of changing U.S. policy without drawing the same degree of scrutiny from potentially obstructionist critics that nationally televised addresses might have brought. As Bostdorff herself acknowledges, such longitudinal rhetorical analyses

can offer a way of understanding how political leaders like President Nixon deal with the inevitable changes in policy that they must adopt over their careers.

This study aims to extend and update previous scholarship regarding U.S. policy towards China in a variety of ways. First, the study analyses the primary texts, verbal and visual, surrounding Nixon's groundbreaking visit to the People's Republic. This addition of textual artifacts is important in gaining a greater understanding of the progression of Nixon's China rhetoric as well as the significance of his decision to alter U.S. diplomatic policy towards the People's Republic. Earlier efforts by Bostdorff analyzed Nixon's primary texts, but only up until his announcement of his intention to visit China in 1972. Bostdorff chose not to analyze the text of Nixon's 1971 announcement; nor were Nixon's public addresses immediately prior to, during, and returning from his trip to the People's Republic. Likewise, Newman's analysis of the "China myths" surrounding U.S. policy towards China effectively reveals the extent to which certain myths about China permeated the arguments and opinions of opponents of Nixon's trip to China, namely among his Republican allies. Yet no primary texts regarding Nixon and China were analyzed. More importantly, the primary texts surrounding Nixon's visit avoided critical inspection. Ronald Carpenter argues for the importance of studying the primary sources unique to particular events, "I am categorical: pertinence of some primary source material leaps off the page with its relevance for rhetorical critics willing to go beyond reading discourse alone."[390] This project engages in the study of the Nixon's visit to China—historically significant event—from a rhetorical perspective.

In addition to studying the primary texts of Nixon's visit to China, this project supplements Bostdorff and Newman's work by examining the different primary texts that encompass the rhetorical progression of Nixon's discourse to China. This project analyzes many

of the same texts that Bostdorff's analysis analyzed, especially those during Nixon's time as a fervent anti-Communist congressman and as the Republican nominee for president during the 1960 election. However, this study supplements Bostdorff's work on Nixon's rhetorical progression by placing a greater emphasis on Nixon's comments towards China during the now-famous 1960 presidential debates with John F. Kennedy. This allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the extent of Nixon's anti-Communist/anti-China rhetoric, which consequently enables better understanding of the significance of Nixon's rhetorical turnaround as well as the methodical approach in which such a turnaround took place in Nixon's public rhetoric. While Bostdorff's analysis highlights the presence of civil-religious concepts such as prophetic dualism in Nixon's public pronouncements, it did not reveal the extent to which such concepts inundated Nixon's views towards Communist China. This project, in particular, underscores the extent to which civil-religious discourse and anti-Communist ideology were inextricably linked during the heights of the Cold War, including Nixon's stints as congressman, senator, and vice president. Newman's analysis focuses primarily on the political context of Nixon's visit to China, with some discussion regarding the lasting historical legacy of "China myths" within Republican circles. However, Newman's work chose not to discuss of the kinds of "China myths" that undergirded Nixon's public rhetoric towards China as a congressman and prospective presidential candidate. Inspecting these artifacts thickens the analysis provided by Bostdorff and Newman while simultaneously bringing to light other important arguments and strategies in Nixon's China rhetoric.

Another important supplement to earlier rhetorical scholarship about U.S-China policy embedded within this project is an analysis of the visual images associated with Nixon's visit. The "visual turn" that has taken place within the discipline of rhetorical studies and the

importance—cultural and political—of visual artifacts in public discourse are important developments that rhetorical critics should acknowledge; this project acknowledges and reflects these important developments. Neither Bostdorff nor Newman inspects the visual images surrounding Nixon's trip to the People's Republic, which minimizes the extent to which one can understand the trips rhetorical significance. The text of Nixon's announcement recognizes that a nationally (and globally) televised audience was about to see the first step in a changed U.S. policy towards Nixon. The images that accompanied Nixon's visit to the People's Republic were likewise seen by millions of American viewers, a fact Nixon was well aware of at the time. The images chosen for critical inspection, which are in the public domain, represent the literal embodiment of Nixon's change in policy towards China. The viewing public could now "see" the new relationship between the United States and China. Rather than a relationship dominated by hostilities and confrontational rhetoric, the American public was now able to visualize a Sino-American relationship characterized by cooperation and mutual understanding. These images show how former enemies can, literally, become friends. Any comprehensive analysis of the rhetorical significance of Nixon's change in policy towards China requires an evaluation of the widely-circulated images unique to the visit: Nixon's toast with Chou En-lai, his handshake with Chairman Mao, and his visit to the Great Wall of China. This visual analysis reveals to an even greater extent the rhetorical significance of Nixon's China rhetoric.

This critical project has also updated rhetorical scholarship with regard to Richard Nixon. As mentioned in chapter one, much has been written about the rhetorical impact of Richard Nixon, ranging from his infamous "Checkers" speech to his policies on Vietnam to his resignation from the highest political office in the United States. However, far less has been written about Nixon's diplomatic exploits, especially his most famous diplomatic endeavor: his

visit to the People's Republic of China. This project builds upon the work of Condit, Newman, Wander and others regarding Richard Nixon by bringing China back into the scholastic conversation. Although Nixon remains a controversial, if not a destructive, political figure in the landscape of presidential rhetoric and public address, he nonetheless produced significant, positive change in U.S. diplomatic policy and in U.S. policy towards China that should not be overlooked or minimized. While ideological criticisms of Nixon's public rhetoric have and will continue to surface in the field of rhetorical scholarship, rhetorical critics of the former president would do well to acknowledge what is perhaps Nixon's greatest rhetorical achievement: his articulation and embodiment of a change in U.S. diplomatic policy towards the People's Republic of China.

In addition to supplementing rhetorical scholarship regarding Richard Nixon and U.S. policy towards China, this project also attempted to flesh out and extend a recent and potentially powerful rhetorical concept espoused by Robert Ivie. Recognizing the transformative potential of Ivie's rehumanizing ritual to contemporary foreign affairs, this project argues that Nixon's discourses towards China during 1971 and 1972 represent a tangible, real-world example of the ritual rehumanization of one's former enemy. A closer look at the discourse reveals how Nixon refused to demonize China, as he once did, but instead began to animate "Red China" and attribute human characteristics of accomplishment and greatness to the People's Republic within ritualized settings. Additionally, this project argues that the images of Nixon during his visit allowed the American public to visualize Nixon start a new, friendlier relationship with China. The ritualized images of Nixon shaking hands with Chairman Mao, sharing a toast with Premier Chou En-lai, and standing among many at the Great Wall of China represent the embodiment of a new relationship among friends rather than an atmosphere of hostility between enemies. The

visual element of Nixon's public discourse enables a better understanding of not only the transformative potential of Ivie's theoretical concept, but also demonstrates how rehumanizing rituals should look like in the future.

Limitations of the Study

This analysis of Nixon's China rhetoric, however, is not without limitations. The first limitation is the choice not to view Nixon's actions towards China as an example of what Goodnight and Olson refer to as an instance of "social controversy." Kathryn M. Olson and G. Thomas Goodnight define social controversy and its related loci:

> A social controversy is an extended rhetorical engagement that critiques, resituates, and develops communication practices bridging the public and personal spheres. The loci of such controversy include participation in governance, distribution and use of economic resources and opportunities, assumption of personal and collective identities and risks, redress of common grievances, assignments of rights and obligations, and the processes of social justice.[391]

Although Nixon's China rhetoric does not fit neatly under the Goodnight and Olson's operational definition of social controversy, it clearly represents an instance of social controversy. As Newman's essay illuminated, Nixon's decision to diplomatically engage China was not without political risk. The vast majority of Republicans viewed with hostility the People's Republic of China and viewed any effort at changing U.S. policy towards China as appeasement.[392] The vociferousness of Republican opposition, Nixon's political power base, represented a significant rhetorical obstacle, as Bostdorff accurately argues. While Bostdorff also informs us that the American public supported Nixon's move at the time, one could easily surmise that public support for such a major change in foreign policy was far from overwhelming. Nixon's own public pronouncements served as the largest source of controversy surrounding the change in policy towards China. While some have argued that only Nixon could have initiated such a change in policy due to his anti-Communist credentials, one could

reasonably argue that the accusation of being a "flip-flopper" on the issue of China meant that Nixon's decision to change U.S. policy towards China was fraught with political risk. The effectiveness with which the Bush administration was able to label John Kerry as a flip-flopper during the 2004 presidential election campaign only testifies to the political consequences of Nixon's flip-flop on China. Although rhetorically effective and attracting political support domestically and abroad, Nixon's change in policy towards China represented a source of social and political controversy and should be analyzed as such.

Another limitation of this critical project revolves around the choice to inspect and analyze a limited number of visual images surrounding Nixon's visit. While the three photographs were widely circulated and have come to embody the essence of Nixon's journey to the People's Republic, there are many more images that have even more to say about the newfound relationship espoused by Nixon in his public rhetoric towards China. A closer inspection of the images beyond this paper not only would underscore the extent to which Nixon ritually rehumanized the People's Republic of China, but might also highlight other rhetorically significant strategies that offer additional insights regarding Richard Nixon, U.S. China policy, or diplomatic communication at large. Similarly, one could attempt a "close reading" of each photograph presented in this paper in order to fully reveal the rhetorical significant of each image. While this project "read" each photograph, illuminating how each served to ritually animate and humanize the former Chinese enemy, a closer inspection of each photograph could reveal to an even greater extent how Nixon was able to transform the U.S.-China relationship. This project drew upon each images as additional forms of evidence—visual evidence—of how Nixon's public discourse allowed the American and world public to "see" a cooperative and friendly China instead of an aggressive, dehumanized, diabolical Chinese enemy. A closer

reading of each image—perhaps by looking at form, color, body positions, among other characteristics—could prove fruitful in further articulating the ways in which Nixon was able to rehumanize the People's Republic of China. Similarly, one could analyze the images of Nixon in China from a media effects perspective. To what extent did these images circulate throughout the United States and the world? How were the images portrayed by the mass media? What responses did the American public have when "seeing" Nixon's handshake with Chairman Mao? A closer look how such photographs were circulated in and were commented upon by the mass media represents a potentially constructive enterprise for future rhetorical scholarship.

What Nixon's China Rhetoric Portends for the Future

The overarching goal of this project is to provide a more comprehensive assessment of the current and future state(s) U.S.-China relations by travelling back to the most significant development in the Sino-American relationship: Nixon's decision to normalize diplomatic relations and to visit the People's Republic of China. This historical/rhetorical analysis of Nixon's transformation of the Republican's most notorious anti-Communist/anti-China spokesman to an enthusiastic supporter of diplomatic rapprochement with China reveals the inherent complexity and fluidity of U.S. policy towards China and overall U.S.-China relations. Unfortunately, the diplomatic groundwork laid by Nixon remains shaky, thanks in large part to a series of significant issues that have and continue to cause tension between the two nations. The Tiananmen Square protests and China's abhorrent, violent response not only triggered global condemnation, but severe economic and political sanctions from the U.S., which exacerbated diplomatic tensions between the U.S. and China. Non-governmental organizations within the United States have and continue to raise the issue of human rights and religious freedom in China, which serve as irritants to the Sino-American relationship. The 2001 "spyplane" incident,

which involved a U.S. intelligence plane crashing into a Chinese fighter jet, stoked Chinese suspicions of containment and encirclement on the part of the United States. Chinese intellectual property violations regarding U.S. software products, currency manipulation, the dumping of low-cost manufactured goods like steel, and Chinese purchases of U.S. Treasury bills are merely a few of the controversial issues that add tension to the U.S.-China relationship. As seen in both historic and contemporary discourses, across both sides of the domestic political spectrum, there remain powerful political actors within the United States that have and continue to demonize the People's Republic in ways that too closely resemble Congressman and Vice President Nixon's discourses towards "Red China." From liberal complaints of China's economic policy and human rights abuses to conservative fears of China's military buildup and saber-rattling towards Taiwan, China has become, and will likely remain, a convenient scapegoat for many of America's fears.[393] As Doug Bandow puts it, "The potential exists for a perfect political storm over China."[394] An awareness of the rhetorical complexities inherent in the Sino-American relationship as well as the significance of Nixon's visit might enable public actors and rhetorical critics to call attention to the potential consequences of demonizing the People's Republic of China and to the potential solutions that can serve as peaceful alternatives to the adoption of hostile policies towards an increasingly geo-strategically significant nation.

The rhetorical scapegoating of China in American public discourse is a disturbing trend with potentially catastrophic consequences. Regardless of differences of belief or ideology, which even President Nixon conceded was inevitable between the United States and China, "there is no more important long-term relationship" than the Sino-American relationship.[395] In fact, Walter Russell Mead of the Council on Foreign relations argues, "The key political question of the twenty-first century is, 'How does the U.S.-China relationship develop?'"[396] Bandow

insightfully highlights the importance of maintaining health U.S.-China ties in the face of the inevitable challenges of the future, "U.S.-China diplomatic relations passed the thirty-year mark last fall. The relationship has survived great challenges and is likely to face even greater ones in the future. But despite inevitable differences between the two nations, much depends upon strengthening their ties."[397] Henry Kissinger, Nixon's right-hand man on questions of national security and who spearheaded Nixon's rapprochement with China, offers insight on the global importance of avoiding confrontational approaches, drawn from the Cold War playbook, towards the People's Republic of China:

> To make this effort work, American leaders must resist the siren call of a containment policy drawn from the Cold War playbook. China must guard against a policy aimed at reducing alleged American hegemonic designs and the temptation to create an Asian bloc to that end. America and China should not repeat the process that, a century ago, moved Britain and Germany from friendship to a confrontation that drained both societies in a global war. The ultimate victims of such an evolution would be global issues, such as energy, the environment, nuclear proliferation and climate change, which will require a common vision of the future.[398]

Heeding Kissinger's sage advice, American public officials and rhetorical critics must resist the "siren call" of confrontational, dehumanizing representations towards the People's Republic of China and urge the adoption of diplomatic strategies that view China as a potential friend and partner rather than an obstinate foe. The "ultimate victims" of a return to Cold War-type Sino-American hostilities would be globally significant issues such as energy security, environmental protection, and nuclear nonproliferation, issues that President Nixon so eloquently pointed out nearly forty years ago will require a "common vision," shared between the United States and China, for the future. Rhetorical critics would do well to remember the peaceful benefits resulting from cooperative, ritualized diplomatic approaches like those employed by Nixon during his monumental trip to the People's Republic of China.

Conclusion

Rhetorical critics can play a role in helping to redefine how nations conceive other nations, especially nations once or currently considered as "enemy." Ivie's recent work is but the latest example. Recent diplomatic events only underscore the importance of how public actors conceptualize a nation's enemies in foreign policy discourse. In 2006, the Bush administration reversed diplomatic course and restored full diplomatic relations with Libya and its leader Muammar al-Qaddafi.[399] Although Libya differs greatly from China in terms of its global significance, the change in policy by the terrorism-obsessed Bush administration represented a diplomatic shock in ways similar to Nixon's actions towards China. One important difference, however, between the diplomatic strategies of the Bush and Nixon administrations revolves around presence or absence of rehumanizing rituals. Nixon explicitly rehumanized the Chinese in ritual situations in order to make the Sino-American relationship politically palatable and visible to the American public. Bush chose not to ritually rehumanize the former state-sponsor of terror, electing only to initiate a change in policy in order to persuade Syria to revoke its weapons of mass destruction capabilities. Comparisons between Nixon's diplomatic and rhetorical strategies to other historical examples of changes in diplomatic policy could prove fruitful for future scholarship regarding U.S. diplomatic policy and the search for peaceful diplomatic alternatives to conflict.

Current controversies regarding to Obama administration also point to the importance of analyzing the rhetorical strategies inherent in U.S. diplomacy. President Obama was elected primarily on a promise of change, namely a promise to change the policies and rhetoric of the Bush administration. This promise of change also extends to the field of diplomacy. Obama has indicated his intention to change U.S. foreign policy in ways that differ greatly from the Bush

administration. From ceasing to refer to U.S. counter-terrorism activities as the "war on terrorism" to withdrawing from the war in Iraq, Obama's professed change in U.S. foreign policy demands critical inspection. One can see the connections between the images of Nixon shaking hands with Chairman Mao and the recent images of President Obama shaking hands with Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez and rhetorically analyze the similarities, the differences, and the various rhetorical strategies involved in each ritualized, diplomatic performance.

Such analysis can also prove fruitful with regard to future diplomatic policy controversies. Ivie's recent work, along with this critical project, can provide a template for how cooperative, peaceful diplomatic rituals and strategies should look like in order to be effective, politically or strategically. The insights provided by this analysis of Nixon's China rhetoric can serve as an important element in how to describe and evaluate future diplomatic actions undertaken by the Obama administration. Iran's nuclear weapons program, North Korea's nuclear intransigence, the festering Arab-Israeli conflict, the genocide in Darfur: each has been highlighted by the Obama administration as diplomatic priorities, yet each issue remains largely unresolved diplomatically, with potentially dangerous consequences for national and global security. Using Nixon's visit to China as an exemplary example of what productive, prudential forms of diplomacy should look and sound like, rhetorical critics can more effectively judge whether or not future diplomatic initiatives by the Obama administration—and future administrations—will succeed or fail in fostering more cooperative international relations with regard to the world's major diplomatic issues. Given the prominence of foreign policy considerations in today's world, the rising tendencies towards hostility, violence and war-making in contemporary affairs, and the urgent need to formulate cooperative means of negotiating international crises, the discourses surrounding Nixon's pursuit of peaceful, diplomatic relations

with the People's Republic of China represent important tools in how rhetorical critics can judge current and future U.S. diplomatic efforts.

Perhaps the most significant contribution of Nixon's visit to China to the field of rhetorical studies is how the images surrounding the visit enable—individuals, America, the world—the imagination of cooperative approaches to diplomacy. Robert Asen highlights the crucial link between our imagining of others, including other nations, and the resulting attitudes and actions we take towards them, "the politics of representation produces consequences—both for those representing and those represented. Our attitude toward and treatment of others depends crucially on how we imagine others."[400] As Davi Johnson notes, visual modes of communication are "vital to this process of imagination."[401] A critical analysis of the texts surrounding Nixon's visit to China demonstrates that such politics of representation can, in fact, produce positive consequences in the real world of diplomatic relations. As seen in the Nixon's public addresses as well as the selection of photographs that were analyzed, the United States' attitude toward and treatment of the Chinese depended crucially on how Nixon "imagined" the People's Republic in China. More importantly, the historical progression Nixon's China rhetoric demonstrates how we can imagine others, either interpersonally or diplomatically, in ways that create the conditions for peaceful cooperation as well as ways that risk hostile confrontation. For the sake of national and global interests, Nixon's "diplomatic surprise" offers tremendous insight regarding how to construct and judge U.S. diplomatic strategy. In fact, Nixon's rhetoric during his visit to the People's Republic serves as an effective example of how we can imagine others in productive ways, even in the face of decades of confrontational, hostile rhetoric and policies towards those same "others."

Endnotes

[1] Richard M. Nixon, "Remarks to the Nation Announcing Acceptance of an Invitation to Visit the People's Republic of China," July 15, 1971, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=3079 (accessed December 2, 2007).
[2] Margaret MacMillan, *Nixon and Mao: the Week that Changed the World* (New York: Random House, 2007), xxi.
[3] Denise Bostdorff, "The Evolution of a Diplomatic Surprise: Richard M. Nixon's Rhetoric on China, 1952-July 15, 1971." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 5, no. 1 (2002): 49.
[4] Evelyn Goh, "Nixon, Kissinger, and the Soviet Card in the U.S. Opening to China, 1971-1974," *Diplomatic History*, 29, no. 3 (2005): 475.
[5] MacMillan, xvii.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Robert Ivie, "Fighting Terror by Rite of Redemption and Reconciliation,." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 10, no. 2 (2007): 237.
[8] Ibid, 222.
[9] Stephen Depoe, "Space and the 1960 Presidential Campaign: Kennedy, Nixon, and 'Public Time'," *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 55, no. 2(1991): 215-233.
[10] W. L. Benoit, "Richard M. Nixon's rhetorical strategies in his public statements on Watergate," *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 47 (1982): 192-211.
[11] Celeste Condit, "Nixon's 'Fund': Time as Ideological Resource in the Checker's Speech," in *Texts in Context*, ed. Michael Leff and Fred J. Kauffeld (Davis, CA: Hermagoras, 1989), 219-242.
[12] Celeste Condit, "Richard Milhous Nixon: Partisan Political Persuader," in *American Orators of the Twentieth Century*, ed. Halford Ryan and Bernard Duffy (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1987), 323-330.
[13] Forbes Hill, "Conventional Wisdom-Traditional Form: The President's Message of November 3, 1969," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58 (1972): 373-386; Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "Conventional Wisdom—Traditional Form: A Rejoinder," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58 (1972): 451-454; Robert Newman, "Under the Veneer: Nixon's Vietnam Speech of November 3, 1969," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 56 (1970): 168-178; H.G. Stelzner, "The Quest Story and Nixon's November 3, 1969 Address," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 57 (1971):163-172; Philip Wander and Steven Jenkins, "Rhetoric, Society, and the Critical Response," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58, no. 4 (1972): 441-450.
[14] Depoe, 215-233.
[15] Carol Jablonski, "Richard Nixon's Irish Wake: A Case of Generic Transference," *Central States Speech Journal*, 30, no. 2 (1979): 164-173.
[16] Edwin Black, "The Invention of Nixon," in *Beyond the Rhetorical Presidency*, ed. Martin Medhurst (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 1996), 104-121; Hal Bochin, *Richard Nixon: Rhetorical Strategist* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1990).
[17] Robert Asen, "Nixon's Welfare Reform: Enacting Historical Contradictions of Poverty Discourses," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 4 (2001): 261-279.
[18] Robert Newman, "Lethal Rhetoric: The Selling of China Myths," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 61, no. 2 (1975): 113-128.
[19] Ronald H. Carpenter, "A Disciplinary History of Rhetorical History: Retrospect and Prospect," in *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, ed. K. J. Turner (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1998), 225.
[20] Bostdorff, "The Evolution of a Diplomatic Surprise," 31-56.
[21] Philip Wander, "The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, no. 4 (1984): 339-361.
[22] Richard M. Nixon, "Excerpts of Remarks of the Vice President of the United States, SS 'Hope' Dedication, Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, CA," September 13, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25361 (accessed February 4, 2009); Richard M. Nixon, "Speech by the Vice President at the American Legion Convention, Miami, FL," October 18, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=25398&st=china&st1= (accessed February 4, 2009); Richard M. Nixon, "Speech by the Vice President on 'Nixon Tonight,' CBS-TV, New York, NY," November 2, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25263 (accessed February 4, 2009).
[23] Richard M. Nixon, "Asia After Viet Nam," *Foreign Affairs*, October (1967): 111-125.
[24] Richard M. Nixon, "First Annual Report to the Congress on United States Foreign Policy" February 18, 1970, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=2835&st=nixon&st1=first+annual+report (accessed February 4,

2009); Richard M. Nixon, "Second Annual Report to the Congress on United States Foreign Policy," February 25, 1971, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=3324&st=china&st1= (accessed February 4, 2009).
[25] MacMillan, xvii.
[26] Kathleen J. Turner, "Rhetorical History as Social Construction: The Challenge and the Promise," in *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, ed. K. J. Turner (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1998), 2.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Ibid, 2-3.
[29] Ibid.
[30] David Zarefsky, "Four Senses of Rhetorical History," in *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, ed. K. J. Turner, 29, (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1998).
[31] Ibid.
[32] Zarefsky, 30.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Carpenter, 233.
[35] Newman, "Lethal Rhetoric," 128.
[36] Wander, 344.
[37] Wander, 342.
[38] Richard M. Nixon, "Presidential Debate Broadcast from New York and Los Angeles," October 13, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=29402 (accessed February 1, 2009).
[39] Nixon, "Speech by the Vice President at the American Legion Convention," n. pag.
[40] Wander, 342.
[41] G. Thomas Goodnight, "Public discourse," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 4, no. 4 (1987): 429.
[42] Ibid.
[43] Goodnight, 431.
[44] Nixon, "Asia After Viet Nam," 122.
[45] Francis A. Beer and Robert Hariman, "Realism and Rhetoric in International Relations," in *Post-Realism: The Rhetorical Turn in International Relations*, ed. Francis A. Beer and Robert Hariman (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1996): 3.
[46] Depoe, 217.
[47] C. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*, (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969), 85.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Depoe, 217.
[50] Ibid.
[51] Nixon, "Asia After Viet Nam," 121.
[52] Richard M. Nixon, "Toasts of the President and Premier Chou En-lai of the People's Republic of China at a banquet honoring the President in Peking," February 21, 1972, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=3748&st=&st1 (accessed December 2, 2007).
[53] John Lucaites and Robert Hariman, "Visual Rhetoric, Photojournalism, and Democratic Public Culture," *Rhetoric Review*, 20 (2001): 37.
[54] Lucaites and Hariman, "Visual Rhetoric," 41.
[55] Robert Asen, "Imagining in the public sphere," *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 35, no. 4 (2002): 354.
[56] Hal W. Bochin, *Richard Nixon: Rhetorical Strategist* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990), 9.
[57] Ibid.
[58] Mark O. Hatfield, *Vice Presidents of the United States: 1789-1993* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997), 434.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Ibid
[62] Bochin, 23.
[63] Hatfield, 434.
[64] Bochin, 9; Hatfield, 434.
[65] Bochin, 9.
[66] Ibid.

[67] Ibid, 26.
[68] Ibid, 9, 26.
[69] Ibid, 27.
[70] Ibid, 30.
[71] Ibid, 25.
[72] Ibid.
[73] Stephen E. Ambrose, *Nixon: The Education of a Politician: 1913-1962* (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1987), 213.
[74] Leon Hadar, "From the China Lobby to the Israel Lobby: Rent-seeking in US Foreign Policy," *Antiwar.com*, April 13, 2006, http://www.antiwar.com/hadar/?articleid=8845 (accessed June 1, 2009).
[75] Bochin, 25-26.
[76] Ambrose, 214.
[77] Jeffrey Record, "Perils of Reasoning by Historical Analogy: Munich, Vietnam and American use of Force Since 1945," *Occasional Paper* No. 4, March 1998, http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/cst/csat4.pdf (accessed May 1, 2009).
[78] Bochin, 30.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Hatfield, 435.
[81] Bochin, 31.
[82] Hatfield, 435.
[83] Ambrose, 240.
[84] Ibid.
[85] Ibid, 228.
[86] Ibid, 241.
[87] Ibid, 248.
[88] Ibid, 249.
[89] Hatfield, 435.
[90] Ibid.
[91] Ibid, 435-436.
[92] Hatfield, 436.
[93] Ibid.
[94] Ambrose, 319; Hatfield, 440.
[95] Hatfield, 440.
[96] Ibid.
[97] Ibid.
[98] Ibid.
[99] Ibid, 436-438.
[100] Ibid, 438-439.
[101] Ibid.
[102] Ibid.
[103] Ibid, 439.
[104] Robert N. Bellah, "Civil Religion in America," *Daedelus*, Winter 1967, http://robertbellah.com/articles_5.htm (accessed February 2, 2009).
[105] Ibid.
[106] Ibid.
[107] Cynthia Toolin, "American Civil Religion from 1789 to 1981: A Content Analysis of Presidential Inaugural Addresses," *Review of Religious Research*, 25, no. 1 (1983): 39.
[108] Roderick P. Hart, *The Political Pulpit* (West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press, 1997), 10.
[109] Colleen J. Shogan, *The Moral Rhetoric of American Presidents* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2006), 12.
[110] Hart, 9.
[111] Ibid, 10.
[112] Roberta L. Coles, "Manifest Destiny Adapted for 1990's War Discourse: Mission and Destiny Intertwined," *Sociology of Religion*, 63, no. 4 (2002): 403.

[113] Ibid.
[114] Hart, 12.
[115] Ibid.
[116] Thomas Aiello, Constructing 'Godless Communism': Religion, Politics, and Popular Culture, 1954-1960," *Americana: The Journal of American Popular Culture*, 4, no. 1 (2005): n.pag., http://americanpopularculture.com/journal/articles/spring_2005/aiello.htm (accessed June 8, 2009).
[117] Hart, 12.
[118] Ibid.
[119] Richard M. Nixon, "Address Accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Republican National Convention in Chicago," July 28, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25974 (accessed June 10, 2009).
[120] Richard M. Nixon, "Remarks of Vice President Nixon, Civil Auditorium, Albuquerque, NM," October 11, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25344 (accessed April 28, 2009).
[121] Hart, 86.
[122] Northrop Frye, "Myth, Fiction, and Displacement," *Daedelus*, 90, no. 3 (1961): 587.
[123] Ibid, 597.
[124] Denise M. Bostdorff, *The Presidency and the Rhetoric of Foreign Crisis* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1993), 176.
[125] Ibid, 177.
[126] Jeff D. Bass and Richard Cherwitz, "Imperial Mission and Manifest Destiny: A Case Study of Political Myth in Rhetorical Discourse," *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 43 (1978): 214.
[127] Walter L. Hixson, *The Myth of American Diplomacy: National Identity and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 10.
[128] Bostdorff, 186.
[129] Frye, 599.
[130] Bass and Cherwitz, 215.
[131] Ibid, 216.
[132] Ibid, 216-217.
[133] Ibid, 216.
[134] Ibid, 217.
[135] Ibid, 217.
[136] Ibid, 217.
[137] Richard M. Nixon, "Remarks by the Vice President at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Magazine Publishers Association, Commodore Hotel, New York, NY." September 28, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25492 (accessed February 17, 2009).
[138] Richard M. Nixon, "Remarks of the Vice President at Fordham University, Bronx Gym, Bronx, NY," October 5, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25310 (accessed April 28, 2009).
[139] Hixson, 10.
[140] Frederick Merk, *Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History: A Reinterpretation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), 3.
[141] Bostdorff, *The Presidency*, 177, 185.
[142] Ibid, 177.
[143] Ibid, 216.
[144] Ibid, 185.
[145] Nixon, "Address Accepting the Presidential Nomination," n. pag.
[146] Nixon, "Remarks of Vice President Nixon, Civil Auditorium," n. pag.
[147] Richard M. Nixon, "Presidential Candidates Debates: Presidential Debate in New York," October 21, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=29403 (accessed April 28, 2009).
[148] Bostdorff, *The Presidency*, 216.
[149] Richard M. Nixon, "Presidential Debate Broadcast from New York and Los Angeles," n. pag.
[150] Richard M. Nixon, "Presidential Candidates Debates: Presidential Debate in Washington, DC." October 7, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=29401 (accessed April 28, 2009).
[151] Merk, 261.
[152] Conrad Cherry, "Preface to the Revised and Updated Edition," in *God's New Israel: Religious Interpretations of American Destiny*, ed. Conrad Cherry (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), ix.

[153] Bellah, n. pag.
[154] Toolin, 41.
[155] Cherry, 1.
[156] Bostdorff, *The Presidency*, 186.
[157] Richard M. Nixon, "Remarks of Vice President Nixon, Allen County Court House, Fort Wayne, IN," September 21, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25417 (accessed April 28, 2009).
[158] Nixon, "Remarks of the Vice President at Fordham University," n. pag.
[159] Richard M. Nixon, "Partial Transcript of the Remarks of the Vice President, City Hall, Beverly Hills, CA," October 14, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25366 (accessed April 28, 2009).
[160] Nixon, "Presidential Candidates Debates: Presidential Debate in New York," n. pag.
[161] Wander, 339-361.
[162] Ibid, 343.
[163] Ibid.
[164] Ibid, 342.
[165] Kenneth S. Zagacki, "Constitutive Rhetoric Reconsidered: Constitutive Paradoxes in G. W. Bush's Iraq War Speeches," *Western Journal of Communication*, 71, no. 4 (2007): 272-273.
[166] Wander, 342.
[167] Ibid, 344.
[168] Zagacki, 273.
[169] Wander, 353.
[170] Zagacki, 279.
[171] Wander, 353.
[172] Bostdorff, *The Presidency*, 176.
[173] Wander, 343.
[174] Zagacki, 289.
[175] Robert L. Ivie, "Images of Savagery in American Justifications for War," *Communication Monographs*, 47 (1980): 281.
[176] Ibid, 284.
[177] Ibid, 288.
[178] Ibid, 281.
[179] Wander, 342.
[180] Richard M. Nixon, "TV Press Conference of Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Honolulu, HI," August 3, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25273 (accessed April 28, 2009).
[181] Nixon, "Partial Transcript of the Remarks of the Vice President, City Hall, Beverly Hills, CA," n. pag.
[182] Richard M. Nixon, "Speech by the Vice President at the American Legion Convention," n. pag.
[183] Nixon, "Remarks by the Vice President at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Magazine Publishers Association," n. pag.
[184] Nixon, "Remarks by the Vice President at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Magazine Publishers Association," n. pag.
[185] Nixon, "Remarks of Vice President Nixon, Allen County Court House," n. pag.
[186] Nixon, "Remarks by the Vice President at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Magazine Publishers Association," n. pag.
[187] Nixon, "Presidential Candidates Debates: Presidential Debate in Washington, DC," n. pag.
[188] Nixon, "Remarks of Vice President Nixon, Civil Auditorium," n. pag.
[189] Nixon, "Remarks of Vice President Nixon, Civil Auditorium," n. pag.
[190] Nixon, "Presidential Candidates Debates: Presidential Debate Broadcast from New York and Los Angeles," n. pag.
[191] Coles, 421.
[192] Wander, 341.
[193] Richard M. Nixon, "Message to the Congress Transmitting the First Annual Report on United States Foreign Policy," February 18, 1970, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?=2824 (accessed June 30, 2009).
[194] J. Robert Cox, "Loci Communes and Thoreau's Arguments for Wilderness in 'Walking'," *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 46, no. 1 (1980): 1.
[195] Hatfield, 445.

[196] Ibid.
[197] Ibid.
[198] Ibid.
[199] Charles O. Jones, *Passages to the Presidency: from Campaigning to Governing* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 1998), 24.
[200] Ibid.
[201] Ibid.
[202] Ibid.
[203] Ibid.
[204] Ibid.
[205] Ibid.
[206] Ibid.
[207] Hatfield, 445; Jones 28.
[208] Jones, 28.
[209] Ibid.
[210] Ibid.
[211] Depoe, 216.
[212] Robert Hariman, "Time and the Reconstitution of Gradualism in King's Address: A Response to Cox," in *Texts in Context: Critical Dialogues on Significant Episodes in American Political Rhetoric*, ed. Michael C. Leff and Fred J. Kauffield (Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1989), 205.
[213] Bruce E. Gronbeck, "Rhetorical Timing in Public Communication," *Central States Speech Journal*, 25 (1974): 86.
[214] Depoe, 218.
[215] Depoe, 217.
[216] Ibid.
[217] Ibid.
[218] Goodnight, 429.
[219] Depoe, 216.
[220] Goodnight, 431.
[221] Depoe, 216.
[222] Ibid, 218.
[223] Ibid, 229.
[224] J. Robert Cox, "The Fulfillment of Time: King's 'I Have a Dream' Speech (August 28, 1963)," in *Texts in Context: Critical Dialogues on Significant Episodes in American Political Rhetoric*, ed. Michael C. Leff and Fred J. Kauffield (Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1989), 182.
[225] Nixon, "Asia After Viet Nam," 113.
[226] Ibid, 119.
[227] Ibid, 121.
[228] Ibid, 123.
[229] Ibid, 121.
[230] Ibid, 123.
[231] Cox, "Loci Communes," 1.
[232] Barbara Warnick, "Argument Schemes and the Construction of Social Reality: John F. Kennedy's Address to the Houston Ministerial Association," *Communication Quarterly*, 44, no. 2 (1996): 193.
[233] Ibid, 193.
[234] Cox, "Loci Communes," 1-2.
[235] Ibid, 2-3.
[236] Kathryn M. Olson, "Rethinking Loci Communes and Burkean Transcendence: Rhetorical Leadership While Contesting Change in the Takeover Struggle Between Airtran and Midwest Airlines," *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 23, no. 1 (2009): 41.
[237] Cox, "Loci Communes," 3.
[238] Ibid, 4.
[239] Ibid, 3.
[240] Olson, 36.

[241] Ibid, 40.
[242] Cox, "Loci Communes," 5-6.
[243] Olson, 40.
[244] Cox, "Loci Communes," 7.
[245] Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 83.
[246] Ibid, 83-84.
[247] Olson, 41.
[248] Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 85.
[249] Ibid.
[250] Olson, 45.
[251] Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 85-86.
[252] Ibid, 87.
[253] Nixon, "First Annual Report to the Congress," n. pag.
[254] Ibid.
[255] Ibid.
[256] Ibid.
[257] Ibid.
[258] Richard M. Nixon, "Second Annual Report to the Congress," n. pag.
[259] Ibid.
[260] Ibid.
[261] Michael Leff, "Commonplaces and Argumentation in Cicero and Quintilian," *Argumentation,* 10 (1996): 445.
[262] Ibid.
[263] Beer and Hariman, "Realism and Rhetoric in International Relations," 1.
[264] Ibid.
[265] Beer and Hariman, 3.
[266] Ibid..
[267] Ibid, 10.
[268] U.S. Department of State, "Foreign relations of the United States, 1969-1976, Volume 1: foundations of foreign policy, 1969-1972," http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ho/frus/nixon/i/21100.htm (accessed October 25, 2007).
[269] Ibid.
[270] Ibid.
[271] Ibid.
[272] Robert Hariman, "Henry Kissinger: Realism's Rational Actor," in *Post-Realism: The Rhetorical Turn in International Relations*, ed. Francis A. Beer and Robert Hariman (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1996), 40.
[273] Hariman, "Henry Kissinger," 43.
[274] Ibid.
[275] Hariman, "Henry Kissinger," 40; U.S. Department of State, n. pag.
[276] Hariman, "Henry Kissinger," 44.
[277] Nixon, "First Annual Report," n. pag.
[278] Ibid.
[279] Ibid.
[280] Ibid.
[281] Ibid.
[282] Ibid.
[283] U.S. Department of State, n. pag.
[284] Ibid.
[285] Nixon, "Second Annual Report," n. pag.
[286] Ibid.
[287] Newman, "Lethal Rhetoric," 128.
[288] Bostdorff, "The Evolution of a Diplomatic Surprise," 32.
[289] Ibid.
[290] Ibid.
[291] MacMillan, xxi.

[292] Bostdorff, "The Evolution of a Diplomatic Surprise,"49.
[293] Goh, 475.
[294] MacMillan, xvii.
[295] Bostdorff, "The Evolution of a Diplomatic Surprise," 31; Newman, "Lethal Rhetoric," 113-128.
[296] Robert Ivie, "Fighting Terror," 237.
[297] Ibid, 222.
[298] Christer Jonsson and Martin Hall, "Communication: An Essential Aspect of Diplomacy," *International Studies Perspectives*, 4 (2003): 195.
[299] Ibid, 203.
[300] Ibid, 196.
[301] Ibid, 197.
[302] Ibid.
[303] David I. Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics, and Power* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988), 104.
[304] Jonsson and Hall, 204.
[305] Kertzer, 9; Lisa Schirch, *Ritual and Symbol in Peacebuilding* (Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 2005), 16-17.
[306] Kertzer, 101.
[307] Schirch, 2.
[308] Ivie, "Fighting Terror," 238.
[309] Kertzer, 12.
[310] Schirch, 129.
[311] Ibid, 124.
[312] Ibid, 86.
[313] Ibid, 4.
[314] Ivie, "Fighting Terror," 222.
[315] Ibid.
[316] Ibid, 223.
[317] Ibid, 226.
[318] Ibid.
[319] Ibid, 228.
[320] Ibid, 226.
[321] Ibid.
[322] Nixon, "Speech by the Vice President at the American Legion Convention," n. pag.
[323] Ivie, "Fighting Terror," 236.
[324] Ibid, 237.
[325] Ibid, 238.
[326] Richard M. Nixon, "Remarks to the Nation Announcing Acceptance of an Invitation to Visit the People's Republic of China," n. pag.
[327] Ibid.
[328] Ibid.
[329] Ibid.
[330] Ibid.
[331] Richard M. Nixon, "Remarks on Departure From the White House for a State Visit to the People's Republic of China," February 17, 1972, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=3746 (accessed April 28, 2009).
[332] Ibid.
[333] Ibid.
[334] Richard M. Nixon, "Toasts of the President and Premier Chou En-lai," n. pag.
[335] Ibid.
[336] Ibid.
[337] Ibid.
[338] Richard M. Nixon, "Exchange with Reporters at the Great Wall of China," February 24, 1972, http://presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=3749 (accessed April 28, 2009).
[339] Ibid.
[340] Ibid.

[341] Richard M. Nixon, "Toasts of the President and Premier Chou En-lai of China at a Banquet Honoring the Premier in Peking," February 25, 1972, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=3751 (accessed April 28, 2009).
[342] Ibid.
[343] Ibid.
[344] Richard M. Nixon, "Remarks at Andrews Air Force Base on Returning From the People's Republic of China," February 28, 1972, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=3756 (accessed April 28, 2009).
[345] Ibid.
[346] Ibid.
[347] Lester C. Olson, Cara A. Finnegan, and Diane S. Hope, "Visual Rhetoric in Communication: Continuing Questions and Contemporary Issues," in *Visual Rhetoric: A Reader in Communication and American Culture*, eds. Lester C. Olson, Cara A. Finnegan, and Diane S. Hope (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing, 2008), 1.
[348] Roland Barthes, "The Rhetoric of the Image," *Image, Music, Text*, trans. Stephen Heath (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977), 32-51; Lucaites and Hariman, 37.
[349] Olson, Finnegan, and Hope, 1.
[350] Ibid, 2.
[351] Lucaites and Hariman, 37.
[352] Olson, Finnegan, and Hope, 3.
[353] Lucaites and Hariman, 41.
[354] Olson, Finnegan, and Hope, 4.
[355] Davi Johnson, "Martin Luther King Jr.'s 1963 Birmingham Campaign as Image Event," *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 10, no. 1 (2007): 8.
[356] David D. Perlmutter, *Photojournalism and Foreign Policy: Icons of Outrage in International Crises* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998), xiii.
[357] Ibid, 6.
[358] Schirch, 2.
[359] Kertzer, 90.
[360] Keith V. Erickson, "Presidential Rhetoric's Visual Turn: Performance Fragments and the Politics of Illusionism," *Communication Monographs*, 67, no. 2 (2000): 139.
[361] Ibid, 141.
[362] Ibid, 143.
[363] Ibid, 146.
[364] Ivie, "Fighting Terror,"239.
[365] Ibid.
[366] Ibid, 241.
[367] Ibid, 242.
[368] Ibid, 239.
[369] Schirch, 99.
[370] Ibid, 94.
[371] Richard Nixon Library, "President Nixon with Premier Chou En-Lai," February 25, 2009, http://www.nixonlibrary.gov/forresearchers/find/av/photo/images/C8555-09A.jpg (accessed May 1, 2009).
[372] Schirch, 5.
[373] R.W. Apple, "Diplomacy by other means: getting stinko on kerosene," *The New York Times*, June 28, 1998, http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9A05E1DC173FF93BA15755C0A96E958260&sec=&spon=&pagewanted=1 (accessed November 28, 2007).
[374] Schirch, 139.
[375] Ibid, 5.
[376] Richard Nixon Library, "President and Mrs. Nixon visit the Great Wall of China and the Ming tombs," The National Archives, February 24, 2009, http://arcweb.archives.gov/arc/action/ShowFullRecord?tab=showFullDescriptionTabs/digital&%24submitId=1&%24showFullDescriptionTabs.selectedPaneId=details&%24resultsDetailPageModel.pageSize=1&%24resultsDetailPageModel.search=true&%24showArchivalDescriptionsTabs.selectedPaneId=&%24highlight=false&%24digiSummaryPageModel.targetModel=true&%24digiDetailPageModel.currentPage=0&%24resultsPartitionPageModel.search=true&%24resultsPartitionPageModel.targetModel=true&%24resultsSummaryPageModel.pageSize=10&%24resultsSu

mmaryPageModel.targetModel=true&%24searchId=1&%24partitionIndex=0&%24sort=RELEVANCE_ASC&%24digiDetailPageModel.resultPageModel=true&%24resultsDetailPageModel.currentPage=2 (accessed May 1, 2009).
[377] Erickson, 144.
[378] Richard Nixon Library, "President Nixon meets with China's Communist Party Leader, Mao Tse-Tung," The National Archives, February 29, 1972, http://arcweb.archives.gov/arc/action/ShowFullRecord?%24submitId=1&%24locationFilter.detailId=0&%24showFullDescriptionTabs.selectedPaneId=digital&%24resultsDetailPageModel.pageSize=1&%24resultsDetailPageModel.search=true&%24showArchivalDescriptionsTabs.selectedPaneId=&%24highlight=false&%24digiSummaryPageModel.targetModel=true&%24digiDetailPageModel.currentPage=0&%24resultsPartitionPageModel.search=true&%24resultsPartitionPageModel.targetModel=true&%24resultsSummaryPageModel.pageSize=10&%24resultsSummaryPageModel.targetModel=true&%24searchId=3&%24partitionIndex=0&%24locationFilter.name=locationFilter&%24sort=RELEVANCE_ASC&%24digiDetailPageModel.resultPageModel=true&%24resultsDetailPageModel.currentPage=1&initpagemodel=on&mn=digiDetailPageModel&goto=0&detail=digiViewModel/1 (accessed May 1, 2009).
[379] Jonsson and Hall, 201.
[380] Ibid.
[381] Schirch, 17.
[382] Perlmutter, 6.
[383] Schirch, 86.
[384] Newman, "Lethal Rhetoric," 113-128.
[385] Ivie, 239.
[386] Olson, Finnegan, and Hope, 2.
[387] Schirch, 102.
[388] Ivie, "Fighting Terror," 240.
[389] MacMillan, xxii.
[390] Carpenter, 233.
[391] Kathryn Olson and Thomas Goodnight, "Entanglements of Consumption, Cruelty, Privacy, and Fashion: the Social Controversy over Fur," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80 (1994): 249
[392] Newman, 113-128.
[393] Doug Bandow, "Balancing Beijing," *The National Interest*, February 24, 2009, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=20906 (accessed May 21, 2009).
[394] Ibid.
[395] Ibid.
[396] Walter Russell Mead and Bernard Gwertzman, "A Warning That Stimulus Plan Could Undermine U.S. Foreign Policy," *Council on Foreign Relations*, February 3, 2009, http://www.cfr.org/publication/18445/warning_that_stimulus_plan_could_undermine_us_foreign_policy.html (accessed February 6, 2009).
[397] Bandow, n. pag.
[398] Henry Kissinger, "Forging a New Agenda with China," *Realclearworld.com*, August 19, 2009, http://www.realclearworld.com/articles/2009/08/19/forging_a_new_agenda_with_china_97076.html (accessed August 20, 2009).
[399] "Obama Shakes Hands With Libya's Qaddafi," *Fox News*, July 9, 2009, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2009/07/09/obama-shakes-hands-libyas-qaddafi/ (accessed August 31, 2009).
[400] Asen, "Imagining in the Public Sphere," 354.
[401] Johnson, 8.

References

Aiello, Thomas. "Constructing 'Godless Communism': Religion, Politics, and Popular Culture, 1954-1960." *Americana: The Journal of American Popular Culture*, 4, no. 1 (2005): http://americanpopularculture.com/journal/articles/spring_2005/aiello.htm.

Ambrose, Stephen E. *Nixon: The Education of a Politician: 1913-1962*. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1987.

Apple, R.W. "Diplomacy by Other Means: Getting Stinko on Kerosene." *The New York Times*, June 28, 1998, http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9A05E1DC173FF93BA15755C0A96E958260&sec=&spon=&pagewanted=1.

Asen, Robert. "Nixon's Welfare Reform: Enacting Historical Contradictions of Poverty Discourses." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 4 (2001): 261-279.

Asen, Robert. "Imagining in the Public Sphere." *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 35, no. 4 (2002): 345-367.

Bandow, Doug. "Balancing Beijing." *The National Interest*, February 24, 2009, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=20906.

Barthes, Roland. "The Rhetoric of the Image." *Image, Music, Text*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.

Bass, Jeff D. and Cherwitz, Richard. "Imperial Mission and Manifest Destiny: A Case Study of Political Myth in Rhetorical Discourse." *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 43 (1978): 213-232,

Beer, Francis A. and Hariman, Robert. "Realism and Rhetoric in International Relations." In *Post-Realism: The Rhetorical Turn in International Relations*, edited by Francis A. Beer and Robert Hariman, 1-34. Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1996.

Bellah, Robert N. "Civil Religion in America." *Daedelus*, Winter (1997): http://robertbellah.com/articles_5.htm.

Benoit, W.L. "Richard M. Nixon's rhetorical strategies in his public statements on Watergate." *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 47 (1982): 192-211.

Black, Edwin. "The Invention of Nixon." In *Beyond the Rhetorical Presidency*, edited by Martin Medhurst, 104-121. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 1996.

Bochin, Hal. *Richard Nixon: Rhetorical Strategist*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1990.

Bostdorff, Denise M. "The Evolution of a Diplomatic Surprise: Richard M. Nixon's Rhetoric on China, 1952-July 15, 1971." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 5, no. 1 (2002): 31-56.

Bostdorff, Denise M. *The Presidency and the Rhetoric of Foreign Crisis*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1993.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. "Conventional wisdom—traditional form: A Rejoinder." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58 (1972): 451-454.

Carpenter, Ronald H. "A Disciplinary History of Rhetorical History: Retrospect and Prospect." In *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, edited by Kathleen J. Turner, 221-242. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1998.

Cherry, Conrad. "Preface to the Revised and Updated Edition." In *God's New Israel: Religious Interpretations of American Destiny*, edited by Conrad Cherry, ix-x. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.

Coles, Roberta L. "Manifest Destiny Adapted for 1990's War Discourse: Mission and Destiny Intertwined." *Sociology of Religion*, 63, no. 4 (2002): 403-426

Condit, Celeste. "Nixon's 'Fund': Time as Ideological Resource in the Checker's Speech." In *Texts in Context*, edited by Michael Leff and Fred J. Kauffeld, 219-242. Davis, CA: Hermagoras, 1989.

Condit, Celeste. "Richard Milhous Nixon: Partisan Political Persuader." In *American Orators of the Twentieth Century*, edited by Halford Ryan and Bernard Duffy, 323-330. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1987.

Cox, J. Robert. "Loci Communes and Thoreau's Arguments for Wilderness in 'Walking." *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 46, no. 1 (1980): 1-16.

Cox, J. Robert. "The Fulfillment of Time: King's 'I Have a Dream' Speech (August 28, 1963)," In *Texts in Context: Critical Dialogues on Significant Episodes in American Political Rhetoric*, edited by Michael C. Leff and Fred J. Kauffield, 181-204. Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1989.

Depoe, Stephen. "Space and the 1960 Presidential Campaign: Kennedy, Nixon, and 'Public Time'." *Western Journal of Speech Communication,* 55, no. 2(1991): 215-233.

Erickson, Keith V. "Presidential Rhetoric's Visual Turn: Performance Fragments and the Politics of Illusionism." *Communication Monographs*, 67, no. 2 (2000): 138-157.

Frye, Northrop. "Myth, Fiction, and Displacement," *Daedelus*, 90, no. 3 (1961): 587-605.

Goh, Evelyn. "Nixon, Kissinger, and the Soviet Card in the U.S. opening to China, 1971-1974." *Diplomatic History,* 29, no. 3 (2005): 475-502.

Goodnight, G. Thomas. "Public discourse." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication,* 4, no. 4 (1987): 428-432.

Gronbeck, Bruce E. "Rhetorical Timing in Public Communication," *Central States Speech Journal*, 25 (1974): 84-94.

Hadar, Leon. "From the China Lobby to the Israel Lobby: Rent-seeking in US Foreign Policy." Antiwar.com, April 13, 2006, http://www.antiwar.com/hadar/?articleid=8845.

Hariman, Robert. "Time and the Reconstitution of Gradualism in King's Address: A Response to Cox." In *Texts in Context: Critical Dialogues on Significant Episodes in American Political Rhetoric*, edited by Michael C. Leff and Fred J. Kauffield, 205-217. Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1989.

Hariman, Robert. "Henry Kissinger: Realism's Rational Actor." In *Post-Realism: The Rhetorical Turn in International Relations*, edited by Francis A. Beer and Robert Hariman, 35-53. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1996.

Hart, Roderick P. *The Political Pulpit*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1997.

Hatfield, Mark O. *Vice Presidents of the United States: 1798-1993*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997.

Hill, Forbes. "Conventional wisdom-traditional form: The President's Message of November 3, 1969." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58 (1972): 373-386.

Hixson, Walter L. *The Myth of American Diplomacy: National Identity and U.S. Foreign Policy.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.

Ivie, Robert. "Fighting Terror by Rite of Redemption and Reconciliation." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 10, no. 2 (2007): 221-248.

Ivie, Robert. "Images of Savagery in American Justifications for War," *Communication Monographs,* 47 (1980): 279-294.

Jablonski, Carol. "Richard Nixon's Irish Wake: A Case of Generic Transference." *Central States Speech Journal*, 30, no. 2 (1979): 164-173.

Johnson, Davi. "Martin Luther King Jr.'s 1963 Birmingham Campaign as Image Event." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 10, no. 1 (2007): 1-25.

Jones, Charles O. *Passages to the Presidency: from Campaigning to Governing*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 1998.

Jonsson, Christer and Hall, Martin. "Communication: An Essential Aspect of Diplomacy." *International Studies Perspectives*, 4 (2003): 195-210.

Kertzer, David I. *Ritual, Politics, and Power*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988.

Kissinger, Henry. "Forging a New Agenda with China." *Realclearworld.com*, August 19, 2009, http://www.realclearworld.com/articles/2009/08/19/forging_a_new_agenda_with_china_97076.html.

Leff, Michael. "Commonplaces and Argumentation in Cicero and Quintilian." *Argumentation*, 10 (1996): 445-452

Lucaites, John and Hariman, Robert. "Visual Rhetoric, Photojournalism, and Democratic Public Culture," *Rhetoric Review*, 20 (2001): 37-42.

MacMillan, Margaret. *Nixon and Mao: the Week that Changed the World*. New York: Random House, 2007.

Mead, Walter Russell and Gwertzman, Bernard. "A Warning That Stimulus Plan Could Undermine U.S. Foreign Policy." *Council on Foreign Relations*, February 3, 2009, http://www.cfr.org/publication/18445/warning_that_stimulus_plan_could_undermine_us_foreign_policy.html.

Merk, Frederick. *Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History: A Reinterpretation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Newman, Robert. "Lethal Rhetoric: The Selling of China Myths." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 61, no 2 (1975): 113-128.

Newman, Robert. "Under the veneer: Nixon's Vietnam speech of November 3, 1969." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 56 (1970): 168-178.

Nixon, Richard M. "Address Accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Republican National Convention in Chicago," July 28, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25974.

Nixon, Richard M. "Asia After Viet Nam." *Foreign Affairs*, October (1967): 111-125.

Nixon, Richard M. "Excerpts of Remarks of the Vice President of the United States, SS 'Hope' Dedication, Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, CA," September 13, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25361.

Nixon, Richard M. “Exchange with Reporters at the Great Wall of China,” February 24, 1972, http://presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=3749.

Nixon, Richard M. “First Annual Report to the Congress on United States Foreign Policy,” February 18, 1970, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=2835&st=nixon&st1=first+annual+report.

Nixon, Richard M. “Partial Transcript of the Remarks of the Vice President, City Hall, Beverly Hills, CA,” October 14, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25366.

Nixon, Richard. M. “Presidential Debate Broadcast from New York and Los Angeles,” October 13, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=29402.

Nixon, Richard M. “Presidential Candidates Debates: Presidential Debate in New York,” October 21, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=29403.

Nixon, Richard M. “Presidential Candidates Debates: Presidential Debate in Washington, DC.” October 7, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=29401.

Nixon, Richard M. "Remarks to the Nation Announcing Acceptance of an Invitation to Visit the People's Republic of China,” July 15, 1971, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=3079.

Nixon, Richard M. “Remarks of Vice President Nixon, Allen County Court House, Fort Wayne, IN,” September 21, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25417.

Nixon, Richard M. “Remarks of Vice President Nixon, Civil Auditorium, Albuquerque, NM,” October 11, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25344.

Nixon, Richard M. “Remarks by the Vice President at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Magazine Publishers Association, Commodore Hotel, New York, NY,” September 28, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25492.

Nixon, Richard M. “Remarks of the Vice President at Fordham University, Bronx Gym, Bronx, NY,” October 5, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25310.

Nixon, Richard M. “Remarks on Departure From the White House for a State Visit to the People's Republic of China,” February 17, 1972, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=3746.

Nixon, Richard M. “Remarks at Andrews Air Force Base on Returning From the People's Republic of China,” February 28, 1972, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=3756.

Nixon, Richard M. "Second Annual Report to the Congress on United States Foreign Policy," February 25, 1971, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=3324&st=china&st1=.

Nixon, Richard M. "Speech by the Vice President at the American Legion Convention, Miami, FL," October 18, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=25398&st=china&st1=.

Nixon, Richard M. "Speech by the Vice President on 'Nixon Tonight,' CBS-TV, New York, NY," November 2, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25263.

Nixon, Richard M. "Toasts of the President and Premier Chou En-lai of the People's Republic of China at a banquet honoring the President in Peking," February 21, 1972, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=3748&st=&st1.

Nixon, Richard M. "Toasts of the President and Premier Chou En-lai of China at a Banquet Honoring the Premier in Peking," February 25, 1972, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=3751.

Nixon, Richard M. "TV Press Conference of Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Honolulu, HI," August 3, 1960, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=25273.

"Obama Shakes Hands With Libya's Qaddafi," *Fox News*, July 9, 2009, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2009/07/09/obama-shakes-hands-libyas-qaddafi/.

Olson, Kathryn and Goodnight, G. Thomas. "Entanglements of Consumption, Cruelty, Privacy, and Fashion: the Social Controversy over Fur." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80 (1994): 249-276.

Olson, Kathryn M. "Rethinking Loci Communes and Burkean Transcendence: Rhetorical Leadership While Contesting Change in the Takeover Struggle Between Airtran and Midwest Airlines." *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 23, no. 1 (2009): 28-60.

Olson, Lester C., Finnegan, Cara A. and Hope, Diane S. "Visual Rhetoric in Communication: Continuing Questions and Contemporary Issues." In *Visual Rhetoric: A Reader in Communication and American Culture*, edited by Lester C. Olson, Cara A. Finnegan, and Diane S. Hope, 1-14. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing, 2008.

Perelman, Chaim. & Olbrechts-Tyteca, Lucie. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.

Perlmutter, David D. *Photojournalism and Foreign Policy: Icons of Outrage in International Crises*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998.

Record, Jeffrey. "Perils of Reasoning by Historical Analogy: Munich, Vietnam and American use of Force Since 1945." *Occasional Paper*, 4 (1998): http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/cst/csat4.pdf.

Richard Nixon Library, "President and Mrs. Nixon visit the Great Wall of China and the Ming tombs," The National Archives, February 24, 2009, http://arcweb.archives.gov/arc/action/ShowFullRecord?tab=showFullDescriptionTabs/digital&%24submitId=1&%24showFullDescriptionTabs.selectedPaneId=details&%24resultsDetailPageModel.pageSize=1&%24resultsDetailPageModel.search=true&%24showArchivalDescriptionsTabs.selectedPaneId=&%24highlight=false&%24digiSummaryPageModel.targetModel=true&%24digiDetailPageModel.currentPage=0&%24resultsPartitionPageModel.search=true&%24resultsPartitionPageModel.targetModel=true&%24resultsSummaryPageModel.pageSize=10&%24resultsSummaryPageModel.targetModel=true&%24searchId=1&%24partitionIndex=0&%24sort=RELEVANCE_ASC&%24digiDetailPageModel.resultPageModel=true&%24resultsDetailPageModel.currentPage=2.

Richard Nixon Library, "President Nixon meets with China's Communist Party Leader, Mao Tse-Tung," The National Archives, February 29, 1972, http://arcweb.archives.gov/arc/action/ShowFullRecord?%24submitId=1&%24locationFilter.detailId=0&%24showFullDescriptionTabs.selectedPaneId=digital&%24resultsDetailPageModel.pageSize=1&%24resultsDetailPageModel.search=true&%24showArchivalDescriptionsTabs.selectedPaneId=&%24highlight=false&%24digiSummaryPageModel.targetModel=true&%24digiDetailPageModel.currentPage=0&%24resultsPartitionPageModel.search=true&%24resultsPartitionPageModel.targetModel=true&%24resultsSummaryPageModel.pageSize=10&%24resultsSummaryPageModel.targetModel=true&%24searchId=3&%24partitionIndex=0&%24locationFilter.name=locationFilter&%24sort=RELEVANCE_ASC&%24digiDetailPageModel.resultPageModel=true&%24resultsDetailPageModel.currentPage=1&initpagemodel=on&mn=digiDetailPageModel&goto=0&detail=digiViewModel/1.

Richard Nixon Library, "President Nixon with Premier Chou En-Lai," February 25, 2009, http://www.nixonlibrary.gov/forresearchers/find/av/photo/images/C8555-09A.jpg.

Schirch, Lisa. *Ritual and Symbol in Peacebuilding*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 2005.

Shogan, Colleen J. *The Moral Rhetoric of American Presidents*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2006.

Stelzner, H.G. "The quest story and Nixon's November 3, 1969 address." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 57 (1971): 163-172.

Toolin, Cynthia. "American Civil Religion from 1789 to 1981: A Content Analysis of Presidential Inaugural Addresses." *Review of Religious Research*, 25, no. 1 (1983): 39-48.

Turner, Kathleen J. “Rhetorical History as Social Construction: The Challenge and the Promise.” In *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases,* edited by Kathleen J. Turner, 1-15. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1998.

U.S. Department of State. “Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1976, Volume 1: Foundations of Foreign Policy, 1969-1972,” http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ho/frus/nixon/i/21100.htm.

Wander, Philip. “The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy.” *The Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 70, no. 4 (1984): 339-361.

Wander, Philip and Jenkins, Steven. “Rhetoric, society, and the critical response.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 58, no. 4 (1972): 441-450.

Warnick, Barbara. “Argument Schemes and the Construction of Social Reality: John F. Kennedy's Address to the Houston Ministerial Association.” *Communication Quarterly*, 44, no. 2 (1996): 183-196.

Zagacki, Kenneth S. “Constitutive Rhetoric Reconsidered: Constitutive Paradoxes in G. W. Bush’s Iraq War Speeches.” *Western Journal of Communication*, 71, no. 4 (2007): 272-293.

Zarefsky, David. “Four Senses of Rhetorical History.” In *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, edited by Kathleen J. Turner, 19-32. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1998.