



THE SINO-AMERICAN OPENING AND PAKISTAN: DIPLOMACY, MEDIATION,
AND STRATEGIC CONSEQUENCES, 1969–1972

Saima Yasmin¹, Muhammad Waqas²

¹ School of Historic Cultures & the School of Nationalities, Southwest University,
Chongqing, China

² Government College University Faisalabad, Faisalabad, Pakistan

1st author Email: saimayasmin2023@outlook.com

Corresponding author: Muhammad Waqas

Email: Waqasminhas076@gmail.com

Abstract

Accounts of the Sino-American opening often begin with Henry Kissinger's secret flight from Pakistan to Beijing in July 1971. The flight was dramatic, but it came after two years of private messages carried by President Yahya Khan and Ambassador Agha Hilaly. Pakistan gave Washington and Beijing a discreet way to test one another and arranged the trip that brought Kissinger and Zhou Enlai face to face. It did not shape the bargain they reached. This article traces the channel from Nixon's first approach to Yahya in 1969 through the Shanghai Communiqué in 1972, asking how Pakistan made contact possible, why the two powers trusted it, and what followed for Pakistan and South Asia. The opening grew from shifting calculations in Washington and Beijing, particularly their concern with the Soviet Union. Yet Washington's reliance on Yahya also affected its response to the crisis in East Pakistan. Nixon and Kissinger backed his government as violence escalated; their support did not preserve united Pakistan, and China did not intervene in the war. Pakistan gained prestige from its diplomatic role, but once direct U.S.–China contact was established, Islamabad no longer controlled the channel.

Keywords: Pakistan; China; United States; Yahya Khan; Kissinger; Nixon; Bangladesh; Cold War; mediation; 1971

Introduction

On July 15, 1971, President Richard Nixon announced that he would visit the People's Republic of China. The news followed a secret trip by Henry Kissinger, who had flown from Pakistan to Beijing two days earlier while the public was told that he was ill and resting in the hills. Newspaper coverage in the United States and Pakistan emphasized the surprise of Nixon's announcement and the hidden route through Islamabad (Dawn, 2021; Kilpatrick, 1971; Szulc, 1971; Time, 1971). The flight has become shorthand for Pakistan's part in the opening. It can also obscure the longer process behind it. Nixon first asked Yahya Khan to carry a message to Beijing in 1969, and Pakistan was one of several routes Washington explored. By 1971, however, Yahya and Ambassador Agha Hilaly had become the most useful channel for arranging direct contact (Aijazuddin, 2000; National Security Archive, 2002; U.S. Department of State, 2006a, 2006b).

The diplomacy unfolded as Yahya's government was suppressing the political movement in East Pakistan that had won the 1970 election. The March 1971 crackdown drove millions of refugees into India, strengthened Bengali resistance, and helped set the region on the path to war and Bangladesh's independence. Nixon and Kissinger weighed the value of access to Beijing as they considered how to deal with Yahya. Their support for him reflected that concern, as well as their suspicion of India and the Soviet Union; the channel mattered, but it cannot by itself explain every American decision (Bass, 2013; Price, 2024; Raghavan, 2013; Riaz, 2006; Warner, 2005). From Nixon's first approach to Yahya in 1969 through the Shanghai Communiqué of February 1972, three questions guide this account: how did Pakistan make direct contact possible, why did Washington and Beijing trust the channel, and what did it mean for Pakistan during the East Pakistan crisis? The answer is that

Pakistan was an effective intermediary, not the architect of rapprochement. Its officials carried messages and made Kissinger's trip possible; the larger strategic reasons for opening relations, and the terms of the bargain, belonged to Washington and Beijing. Full diplomatic normalization would wait until 1979.

Questions and analytical frame

"Mediation" can overstate Pakistan's part. A mediator usually helps adversaries negotiate terms or proposes solutions. Pakistan's role was narrower: it carried messages, vouched for their delivery, protected secrecy, and arranged access and transport. "Intermediary" or "backchannel facilitator" better describes the work. Pakistan was central to bringing the principals into direct contact; Kissinger and Zhou Enlai did the negotiating (Goh, 2005a, 2005b; Ross, 1995; U.S. Department of State, 2006a, 2006b). It helps to separate three stages that are often run together: transmitting messages, arranging the secret visit, and bargaining over Taiwan, Vietnam, the Soviet Union, the United Nations, and regional security. Pakistan carried the first two. It did not set the agenda for the third. Recognizing that distinction gives Pakistan its due without assigning it decisions made in Beijing and Washington.

The wider rivalry among Washington, Beijing, and Moscow shaped the opening, but a fixed "strategic triangle" cannot explain every choice. The Sino-Soviet split and the 1969 border clashes mattered; so did leaders' assumptions, domestic politics, and competing policy ideas. The documents are evidence of what officials believed and did, not a direct map of objective national interests (Chang, 1990; Garthoff, 1994; Goh, 2005b; Lüthi, 2008; Price, 2024). The argument rests mainly on U.S. diplomatic files, especially the *Foreign Relations of the United States* volumes on China and South Asia, alongside Aijazuddin's Pakistani document collections, public statements, memoirs, and contemporary reporting. These sources do not give every capital equal weight: American files reveal Washington's deliberations most fully, while Chinese views often come through U.S. summaries. Memoirs are useful for seeing how leaders later explained their choices; newspapers show what the public could know at the time (Aijazuddin, 2000, 2002; Haldeman, 1994; Kissinger, 1979; Nixon, 1978; U.S. Department of State, 2005a, 2005b, 2006a, 2006b).

Historiography and source base

The scholarship relevant to this story comes from three areas: U.S.–China rapprochement, Pakistan's security relationships, and the East Pakistan crisis. Bringing them together helps explain both why the Pakistani channel worked and why its value influenced Washington's policy toward Yahya.

Histories of U.S.–China relations place the opening in the longer breakdown of the communist bloc and the security tensions between Beijing and Moscow. Gordon Chang, Jian Chen, and Lorenz Lüthi trace that history; Evelyn Goh shows why the opening cannot be reduced to a simple balance-of-power move, pointing instead to the ideas and decisions that shaped its timing. Nancy Tucker and Robert Ross reconstruct the diplomats' work, while Warren Cohen, Allen Whiting, James Mann, Patrick Tyler, and Margaret MacMillan examine its wider setting and later political meaning (Chang, 1990; Chen, 2001; Cohen, 2010; Goh, 2005a, 2005b; Lüthi, 2008; MacMillan, 2007; Mann, 1999; Ross, 1995; Tucker, 2001; Tyler, 1999; Whiting, 1980). The Pakistan literature gives a different view of the channel: it was part of Islamabad's long effort to offset its vulnerability to India and keep several external partnerships open. Robert McMahon and Ayesha Jalal trace the roots of Pakistan's security outlook. Dennis Kux and Husain Haqqani describe the recurring strains in U.S.–Pakistan relations, while G. W. Choudhury, Abdul Sattar, and Andrew Small address Pakistan's ties with China and the wider region. Their work cautions against treating Yahya's diplomatic

service as a one-off episode detached from Pakistan's search for security and standing (Choudhury, 1974, 1976; Haqqani, 2013; Jalal, 1990; Kux, 2001; McMahon, 1994; Sattar, 2010; Small, 2015). Studies of 1971 ask how the China initiative shaped American policy during Pakistan's breakup. Richard Sisson and Leo Rose, along with Srinath Raghavan, reconstruct the conflict's political and military course. Gary Bass emphasizes the humanitarian record and Nixon's support for Yahya. Ali Riaz examines U.S. efforts to weaken the Bangladesh movement; Geoffrey Warner assesses the administration's policy and the dissolution of Pakistan. William Bundy, Jussi Hanhimäki, Christopher Van Hollen, and investigative writer Seymour Hersh offer broader accounts of Nixon-era policy and Kissinger's influence. They differ on which motive mattered most, but agree that Washington's view of the China opening shaped how it approached the crisis (Anderson, 1973; Bass, 2013; Bundy, 1998; Hanhimäki, 2004; Hersh, 1983; Oldenburg, 1980; Raghavan, 2013, 2018; Riaz, 2006; Sisson & Rose, 1990; Van Hollen, 1980; Warner, 2005).

Megan Price's study of recognition politics adds an important qualification: Nixon and Kissinger's geopolitical priorities were argued over and constructed during the crisis, rather than applied as a fixed script. Their views of détente and the China opening shaped policy toward Yahya and the question of recognizing Bangladesh. This article follows that insight by looking closely at how Pakistan's role as a conduit affected the choices in Washington (Price, 2024).

The documentary record is richest on American decision-making. The FRUS China volumes follow the message traffic and Kissinger's meetings with Zhou; the South Asia volumes reveal debate over pressure, recognition, and the use of force. The National Security Archive collection and Aijazuddin's documents help fill in the channel's sequence and logistics. Read together, they show what officials told one another and how they acted when the intermediary was also a government under international scrutiny (Aijazuddin, 2000, 2002; National Security Archive, 2002; U.S. Department of State, 2005a, 2005b, 2006a, 2006b).

The setting in 1969

When Nixon entered office in January 1969, Washington and Beijing had been estranged for two decades. The United States recognized the Republic of China on Taiwan, supported its United Nations position, and maintained forces in the western Pacific. Beijing regarded Taiwan as part of China and the U.S. presence as an obstacle to reunification. The Warsaw ambassadorial talks had not produced a dependable route for high-level contact; Vietnam, Taiwan, and mutual distrust made an overt presidential approach politically risky. The communist bloc was also divided. Ideological and security disputes between Beijing and Moscow culminated in armed clashes on Zhenbao Island in March 1969. China feared Soviet pressure and strategic encirclement; Washington saw a chance to alter the balance of power while retaining its existing commitments. Rapprochement grew from shared strategic opportunity, not from resolving the two countries' fundamental disagreements (Chang, 1990; Chen, 2001; Garthoff, 1994; Lüthi, 2008; Westad, 2005).

Nixon had long argued for dealing with the PRC, but he needed a private route to test Beijing's response without appearing to retreat on Taiwan. Kissinger favored a channel controlled by the White House, limiting leaks and bureaucratic resistance. Nixon's early exchanges with foreign leaders showed interest in ending China's isolation, alongside caution about a public initiative that might be rejected (Hanhimäki, 2004; Kissinger, 1979; U.S. Department of State, 2003, 2006b). The strategic incentives were not identical. Washington hoped contact with Beijing would improve its position in the Cold War and reduce the danger of a two-front confrontation, while Chinese leaders sought to loosen diplomatic isolation and manage the Soviet threat. Neither side needed to accept the other's position on Taiwan or

Vietnam to see value in a meeting. The possibility of limited cooperation, rather than ideological agreement, made a secret exploratory channel attractive (Chen, 2001; Goh, 2005a; Lüthi, 2008).

Pakistan was a plausible link because it maintained close relations with China while retaining ties to Washington through earlier security arrangements. The relationship was strained: U.S. arms restrictions during and after the 1965 war left Islamabad feeling abandoned, while Pakistan sought Beijing as a counterweight to India. These ties did not make Pakistan neutral; they made it a credible messenger to both capitals (Choudhury, 1976; Haqqani, 2013; Kux, 2001; McMahon, 1994; Sattar, 2010). During his 1969 Asia tour, Nixon privately asked Yahya in Lahore to convey Washington's interest in accommodation with Beijing. The administration had no settled plan and continued to explore Romania and contacts around the Warsaw talks. Pakistan was attractive, but not the sole route; Washington's alternatives and Beijing's willingness to engage shaped the channel's development (Aijazuddin, 2000; National Security Archive, 2002; U.S. Department of State, 2006b).

For Yahya, carrying messages could improve relations with Washington, preserve American aid, and strengthen Pakistan's standing with China. The opportunity offered strategic recognition, but the record establishes no specific U.S. promise in exchange for the channel. That distinction between expected gratitude and an explicit bargain is important to the later crisis (Aijazuddin, 2000, 2002; Kux, 2001; Kissinger, 1979; Nixon, 1978).

Pakistan's strategic position

Pakistan's foreign policy reflected both geography and domestic fragility. Its two wings were separated by Indian territory; East Pakistan had the larger population, but power remained concentrated in the western wing and military establishment. The Awami League's 1970 election victory and the failure to transfer power turned a constitutional crisis into armed conflict. The crisis exposed the limits of a state whose rulers relied on external ties to offset internal weakness (Choudhury, 1974; Jalal, 1990; Raghavan, 2013; Sisson & Rose, 1990). Yahya Khan's position combined military authority with personal diplomacy. As president and chief martial law administrator, he was able to make confidential commitments without the checks that might have attended a more open, parliamentary process. His personal relationship with Nixon and established access to Zhou Enlai gave him the ability to carry messages quickly. Pakistan's ambassador in Washington, Agha Hilaly, was another key actor. His meetings with Kissinger and the transmission of messages from Yahya helped preserve continuity when the president himself was not present. The channel thus depended on both leader-level trust and a small diplomatic network, rather than on formal institutional exchanges between foreign ministries (Aijazuddin, 2000; U.S. Department of State, 2006a, 2006b). That concentration made the route fast and discreet, but also personal: its reliability rested on Yahya's continued authority and Hilaly's access rather than a standing bilateral mechanism.

Pakistan sought to repair ties with Washington, retain American aid, and deepen its special relationship with China. Serving as a hub between the two powers gave Islamabad diplomatic relevance without requiring it to abandon either relationship. It was an extension of a wider strategy of seeking external partners to balance vulnerability to India (Haqqani, 2013; Kux, 2001; McMahon, 1994; Sattar, 2010; Small, 2015). This calculation should not be reduced to a cynical attempt by Yahya to exploit the East Pakistan crisis. The documentary record establishes the simultaneous existence of the backchannel and the repression; it does not establish that Yahya initiated the U.S.–China opening as a deliberate exchange for freedom of action in the east. Nor does it show that Washington explicitly promised to shield

his government in return. Some Pakistani officials may have expected greater American gratitude or support, and the White House did treat Yahya's service as a reason to avoid humiliating him. But the difference between an explicit bargain and a pattern of strategic deference is important. The latter is supported by the record; the former requires evidence that the published sources do not provide (Bass, 2013; Price, 2024; Raghavan, 2013; U.S. Department of State, 2005b).

Pakistan was not a disinterested mediator. It had a strong interest in countering India, and its foreign policy was closely tied to its security concerns. This limited its ability to act as a neutral broker in South Asia. Yet neutrality was not required for the specific channel to work. The United States and China wanted a reliable transmitter, not an impartial judge of their disputes. Pakistan's alignment with Beijing and its continuing relationship with Washington made it useful precisely because both sides could understand the incentives behind its actions. The channel was credible because it was trusted, not because Pakistan lacked interests of its own.

From messages to a secret mission

The early message exchanges through Pakistan were cautious and intermittent. Nixon's 1969 approach established that Washington was willing to consider a different relationship, but the Chinese response was not immediate. The administration continued to use other channels. When Yahya visited Washington in October 1970, Nixon again discussed the possibility of improved U.S.–China contacts and asked Pakistan to pass messages. Beijing's reply through Pakistan showed that China was prepared to explore a high-level discussion, although the two sides still needed to work out the location, participants, and terms. The Pakistani route had proved that it could carry a sensitive message, but the process still depended on both governments deciding to use it (Aijazuddin, 2000; National Security Archive, 2002; U.S. Department of State, 2006b, docs. 20, 26, 28).

By late 1970 and early 1971, the channel acquired greater urgency. Nixon's administration wanted to move beyond general signals and arrange a meeting with a senior Chinese representative. The Pakistani ambassador delivered Chinese communications to Kissinger, who answered through a similarly restricted process. At points, Washington asked Yahya to keep the content within an exceptionally small circle. The message exchanges were designed to protect the credibility of both governments: if the talks failed, neither would have to explain a public rejection; if they succeeded, leaders could announce the result on their own terms. This was the logic of a backchannel, and Pakistan was the carrier that gave it continuity (U.S. Department of State, 2006a, docs. 1–6; U.S. Department of State, 2006b, docs. 70, 124, 130).

Reliability depended on more than physical delivery. Each side needed confidence that a message reflected the sender's position, reached the intended recipient intact, and would not be leaked before a reply could be considered. Yahya's personal access to Zhou and Hilaly's working relationship with Kissinger supplied this chain of trust. Because the route was informal, its credibility depended on the reputations of the people handling it as much as on official procedure (Aijazuddin, 2000; U.S. Department of State, 2006a, 2006b). The United States continued to consider other routes. Romanian officials had communicated with both Washington and Beijing, and French contacts were later used for exchanges with Chinese representatives in Paris. The Warsaw channel also remained in the background. These parallel options indicate that the Nixon administration did not view Pakistan as the only possible intermediary. They also show that the channel's importance should be measured by its practical contribution, not by a claim that the opening could not have occurred without it. Pakistan had a comparative advantage: Yahya could speak directly with

Chinese leaders, and the route through Islamabad made it possible to arrange a private meeting with little public scrutiny. The other channels could help, but they did not replace that combination of political trust and logistical access at the decisive moment (Aijazuddin, 2000; Goh, 2005a; National Security Archive, 2002; U.S. Department of State, 2006a, 2006b).

In April 1971, the U.S. side received a Chinese message indicating that Beijing was prepared to receive an American envoy. The message came at a moment when Washington was also confronting the consequences of the March crackdown in East Pakistan. Reports from the U.S. consulate in Dacca described the scale of violence and the dangers of the political course Yahya's government had taken. The two strands of policy were therefore already intertwined. The administration was seeking the long-awaited Chinese response while simultaneously deciding whether and how to pressure its Pakistani intermediary. Kissinger's discussions with Nixon and Ambassador Joseph Farland show that the White House was reluctant to take steps that would damage Yahya's position before the China initiative had advanced. This was not a written bargain, but it was a policy connection (Bass, 2013; Riaz, 2006; U.S. Department of State, 2005b, docs. 59, 86–96; 2006a, docs. 6–7).

Kissinger's meeting with Farland in Palm Springs on May 7 focused on how to arrange a secret trip to China. The options included flying directly from Pakistan on a Pakistani plane or using another aircraft. The final plan required exacting secrecy, and Pakistan's facilities and leadership offered a practical solution. The secret channel had shifted from an exchange of paper messages to an operational plan for direct contact. This was a change in kind: Pakistan was no longer just transmitting proposals; it was helping stage the first face-to-face meeting between the national security adviser of the United States and China's premier in more than two decades (U.S. Department of State, 2006a, doc. 6; Aijazuddin, 2002).

The formal invitation from Zhou Enlai reached Washington through Yahya in June. Nixon sent a reply through the same route, confirming that Kissinger would come as a preliminary envoy and that a presidential visit could follow if the talks went well. The direct invitation mattered because it removed the main uncertainty: the United States was not sending an envoy into an empty or hostile opening. The Pakistani channel had given Beijing a way to make the offer privately and Washington a way to accept without public commitment. This was the channel's central diplomatic achievement before the famous flight: it turned ambiguity into an agreed meeting (U.S. Department of State, 2006b, docs. 132, 135; U.S. Department of State, 2006a, docs. 7–9).

Kissinger's July visit

Kissinger's public itinerary in July 1971 included stops in South Asia, but the China visit remained hidden. Pakistan's role was crucial in making the cover story credible. Yahya arranged for Kissinger to be reported as ill and resting in the hills while the U.S. official travelled to Beijing. Pakistani staff and American officials controlled the information flow, and the trip was kept secret from many officials in Washington as well as from the press. Contemporary reports later described the surprise, the cover story, and the unusual degree of secrecy. The episode demonstrated the practical value of an intermediary whose leadership could control access to both government and territory (Kilpatrick, 1971; Szulc, 1971; Time, 1971; U.S. Department of State, 2006a, docs. 7–9).

The meetings between Kissinger and Zhou were substantive, but Pakistan was not present as a negotiating party. They discussed the long history of U.S.–China hostility, Taiwan, the Vietnam War, the Soviet Union, Japan, Korea, and the possibility of Nixon's visit. The talks did not resolve these disputes. Their achievement was to establish a private

channel at the highest level and to define the practical steps required for a presidential visit. Kissinger and Zhou both understood that neither side could meet the other's major demands immediately. They instead worked on a framework that allowed them to continue talking without pretending to agree on Taiwan or Vietnam (MacMillan, 2007; Ross, 1995; U.S. Department of State, 2006b, docs. 142–151). On the South Asian situation, Zhou raised Beijing's concern about India's position and the danger to Pakistan. Kissinger later reported that China would stand by Pakistan if war came. This assurance strengthened Nixon and Kissinger's belief that the Chinese leadership saw the crisis as a test of the emerging relationship. But such statements were not equivalent to a commitment to intervene militarily. The record needs to be read carefully: Zhou's expressions of solidarity and concern were politically important, but China's subsequent conduct showed that it would not enter the war to reverse Pakistan's defeat. The White House's interpretation of Chinese support was part of its own strategic calculation; it should not be mistaken for a Chinese guarantee (Bass, 2013; Raghavan, 2013; U.S. Department of State, 2005b, doc. 99; 2006a, doc. 9).

Kissinger's July report to Nixon captured the significance of the trip for the administration. He described the conversations as among the most consequential of his government service and emphasized that China had agreed to receive Nixon before May 1972. The president's public announcement on July 15 presented the invitation as a major step toward a lasting peace. It deliberately made the secret visit visible only after the agreement was secure. The contrast between the hidden process and the public address was deliberate: secrecy protected negotiations, while timing let Nixon claim the initiative and prepare allies and domestic audiences (Nixon, 1971; Nixon Presidential Library and Museum, n.d.; Szulc, 1971; U.S. Department of State, 2006a, doc. 9; 2006b, docs. 142–143).

For Pakistan, the successful mission brought a new kind of diplomatic standing. The country had demonstrated that it could connect two major powers that lacked formal relations and could arrange a high-stakes visit without a public leak. The international press quickly emphasized Yahya's role, though the exact extent of his personal involvement was difficult to know at the time. A 1971 *Dawn* report, preserved in the newspaper's later archive, illustrates how the news appeared in Pakistan: Nixon's announcement was reported as a surprise and as a development in which Pakistan's role was central to the secret route. The American newspaper coverage, by contrast, emphasized the diplomatic achievement and Kissinger's secrecy. These reports reveal how the operation was presented publicly, while the declassified records explain the actual chain of messages (Dawn, 2021; Collier, 1971; Kilpatrick, 1971; Szulc, 1971; The New York Times, 1971).

The July trip also marked the point at which Pakistan's role began to narrow. The backchannel continued to carry some communications, but Washington and Beijing developed direct contacts through Kissinger's later trips, Chinese representatives in Paris, and eventually the presidential summit. Pakistan remained a valued ally and interlocutor, but it no longer monopolized the channel. In that sense, the successful mediation was self-limiting: once the two sides trusted direct communication, the intermediary's centrality declined. That is common to backchannel diplomacy, where the facilitator can be essential in creating a relationship but less important after the relationship becomes routine (Aijazuddin, 2000; Goh, 2005a; U.S. Department of State, 2006a, docs. 10–25).

East Pakistan and the cost of strategic access

The channel's political value became most visible as the crisis in East Pakistan deepened. The Awami League's victory in the December 1970 election created a constitutional mandate for a transfer of power. Yahya's postponement of the National Assembly and the military operation beginning on March 25, 1971, destroyed the prospects

for a negotiated transition in the near term. Violence produced a vast flow of refugees into India, strengthened the Bengali resistance, and raised the risk of war between India and Pakistan. The United States had humanitarian, diplomatic, and strategic reasons to press for a political settlement. Instead, the administration's response was shaped by its desire to keep Yahya cooperative and by its fear that a rupture would damage the China initiative (Bass, 2013; Choudhury, 1974; Raghavan, 2013; Sisson & Rose, 1990).

The American consulate in Dacca, led by Consul General Archer Blood, sent unusually forceful reports about the violence and the political consequences of the crackdown. Blood and other diplomats argued that U.S. silence would compromise American credibility and that the military government's actions could not be treated as an internal matter with no foreign-policy consequences. The dissent telegram that became known as the "Blood Telegram" expressed anger at the policy of non-condemnation. The documents show not only disagreement over facts but also conflict over what should count as relevant evidence. The White House privileged geopolitical concerns and distrust of India, while many diplomats believed that the violence itself demanded a stronger response (Bass, 2013; Power, 2002; Riaz, 2006; U.S. Department of State, 2005b, docs. 25, 28, 45, 59).

The new China channel affected how Nixon and Kissinger evaluated the political cost of pressuring Yahya. During internal meetings, Kissinger argued that Pakistan's cooperation remained necessary while the opening was being established. The White House worried that if Washington appeared to abandon Pakistan in the middle of a crisis, Beijing would doubt the reliability of a new American relationship. Nixon agreed that the United States should not take actions that would humiliate Yahya or seem to aid India. This reasoning did not arise in a vacuum. Nixon's personal hostility toward Indira Gandhi and a broader suspicion that India was aligned with the Soviet Union also shaped policy. The China opening amplified existing preferences and fears; it was one important factor among several, not a complete explanation (Bass, 2013; Bundy, 1998; Hanhimäki, 2004; Raghavan, 2013; U.S. Department of State, 2005b, docs. 86–96).

Sequence alone cannot prove that there was a bargain. The record contains no clear written agreement that Washington would tolerate the crackdown in exchange for Yahya's messages. It does contain direct evidence that Nixon and Kissinger saw Yahya's role as useful and that they thought carefully about how Chinese leaders would interpret American policy toward Pakistan. They worried about losing access, credibility, or leverage. Those calculations shaped the treatment of Yahya even without a formal quid pro quo. Historians differ over the relative weight of strategic logic, personal attitudes, bureaucratic control, and racialized or ideological assumptions. Warner stresses the geopolitical calculations; Bass places special weight on the moral consequences; Price emphasizes how the White House constructed the crisis through its chosen strategic framework. These are not mutually exclusive explanations (Bass, 2013; Price, 2024; Warner, 2005).

The administration had tools short of a public rupture: it could condition assistance, press for a transfer of power, or make continued cooperation contingent on visible steps toward a political settlement. The White House was concerned that forceful pressure would weaken Yahya, increase Indian leverage, and cast doubt on Washington's reliability to Beijing. That reasoning narrowed the policy choices it was willing to consider, even though no single document framed restraint as payment for the channel (Bass, 2013; Raghavan, 2013; U.S. Department of State, 2005b). Nixon and Kissinger's policy also involved efforts to influence the shape of a possible political settlement. Kissinger advised Pakistani officials to separate the refugee issue from the question of East Pakistan's political status and to demonstrate that the government was trying to address the humanitarian emergency. The

administration hoped that such steps would reduce the risk of Indian intervention and preserve the state of Pakistan. But by then, the military crackdown had made the political demands of East Pakistan inseparable from the refugee crisis. A strategy that focused on optics and border arrangements could not address the underlying failure to transfer power. Pakistan's domestic crisis was not simply an external-relations problem, and the U.S. approach underestimated the depth of Bengali rejection of military rule (Raghavan, 2013; Riaz, 2006; Sisson & Rose, 1990; U.S. Department of State, 2005b, docs. 109, 137).

The U.S. government was divided. The State Department, the U.S. consulate in Dacca, and some other officials favored greater pressure, while the White House kept decision-making close to Nixon and Kissinger. This centralization made it easier to protect the secret channel, but it also reduced the influence of officials who were reporting conditions on the ground. The same institutional structure that helped the opening move quickly limited internal challenge to the administration's South Asia policy. William Bundy's account of Nixon-era foreign policy and Hanhimäki's reassessment of Kissinger both point to the consequences of personalized diplomacy. In the East Pakistan crisis, secrecy was not only a method of communicating with China; it became part of a policy process that concentrated authority in a small circle (Bundy, 1998; Hanhimäki, 2004; Kissinger, 1979; U.S. Department of State, 2005b).

There was also a public and reputational dimension. Contemporary journalism began to report the U.S. tilt and to speculate about the administration's motivations. Jack Anderson's leaked material and the later "Anderson papers" exposed the disparity between private White House views and public explanations. News accounts did not have access to the complete diplomatic record, but they established that the policy was contested and that the administration's support for Yahya could not be presented as routine alliance management. Later scholarship has shown that this dissent was not merely a disagreement over tone; it involved real questions about U.S. influence, complicity, and the relationship between strategic access and human suffering (Anderson, 1973; Bass, 2013; Riaz, 2006).

The war and the limits of Chinese support

The crisis eventually became a war between India and Pakistan. India had taken in millions of refugees and supported the Bengali resistance, while Pakistan's political and military leaders increasingly framed Indian involvement as an existential threat. The Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation, signed on August 9, 1971, heightened American and Pakistani concerns about the strategic balance. Washington saw the treaty as a warning that India had strengthened its position and Moscow had gained influence. India's leaders, by contrast, viewed the treaty as a source of security while seeking to prevent a wider war. The treaty did not cause the conflict, but it changed the calculations in Washington, Islamabad, New Delhi, and Beijing (Government of India & Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 1971; Raghavan, 2013; U.S. Department of State, 2005b, docs. 116–117).

The crisis also exposed how U.S.–China coordination would operate. Nixon and Kissinger became concerned that China might intervene on Pakistan's side and that the Soviet Union might then threaten China. The administration used diplomatic messages to reassure Beijing about the U.S. position in the event of a Soviet move. These exchanges reveal that the opening was no longer only about arranging a presidential visit; it had begun to create expectations about strategic consultation. Still, the United States and China did not become formal allies. Each side was testing whether the other could be trusted in a crisis, while retaining the freedom to pursue its own interests (Goh, 2005b; Garthoff, 1994; U.S. Department of State, 2005b, docs. 251, 256, 266; 2006a).

When war began in December 1971, the Nixon administration moved toward Pakistan diplomatically and militarily. It pressed for a ceasefire, supported Pakistan's position in international forums, and ordered the aircraft carrier *Enterprise* into the Bay of Bengal. This action was intended to signal opposition to further Indian advances, though it did not reverse the military outcome in East Pakistan. The administration also tried to bring China into the crisis and encouraged signals of support for Pakistan. In the end, China did not enter the war. India's decisive victory in the east and the surrender of Pakistani forces created Bangladesh, while West Pakistan remained intact. U.S. policy did not prevent the loss of East Pakistan, and Chinese solidarity did not translate into direct military intervention (Bass, 2013; Raghavan, 2013; U.S. Department of State, 2005b; Warner, 2005).

Why did China refrain from intervening? The available evidence points to several considerations. Beijing had spoken in support of Pakistan, but intervention risked a conflict with India backed by the Soviet Union. The Indo-Soviet treaty had increased the danger of escalation, and the rapid military collapse in the east limited what China could achieve. China may also have judged that direct intervention was not in its interest when its priority was to secure a new relationship with the United States and manage its border with the Soviet Union. The claim that China was prepared to fight for Pakistan should therefore be treated as a political assurance, not as a settled operational commitment. The Nixon administration's interpretation of the assurance mattered for its decisions, but Chinese behavior provides the clearest evidence of the assurance's limits (Chen, 2001; Lüthi, 2008; Raghavan, 2013; U.S. Department of State, 2006a, 2006b).

The American "tilt" also failed to produce the outcome that its advocates sought. The White House hoped to prevent Pakistan's disintegration, deter India from taking additional territory in the west, and protect the strategic relationship with China. The western wing survived, but East Pakistan became Bangladesh, India's military objectives in the east were achieved, and the U.S. naval deployment did not change the battlefield. Nixon and Kissinger could later argue that they had limited the consequences or prevented further escalation, but the more ambitious purpose of preserving united Pakistan was not met. Nor did the crisis create a formal U.S.–China alliance. The policy generated a serious moral and diplomatic cost without giving Washington control over the regional outcome (Bass, 2013; Sisson & Rose, 1990; U.S. Department of State, 2005b; Warner, 2005).

From backchannel to summit

After the July trip, the United States and China continued the process through direct exchanges. Kissinger made a second visit in October 1971, and further meetings followed in Paris and Beijing. By then, the Pakistani channel was only one part of a larger diplomatic architecture. The United States sought to clarify the terms of Nixon's trip and to avoid surprise over its policy toward the United Nations. China, meanwhile, was about to replace Taiwan's delegation as the representative of China at the United Nations. General Assembly Resolution 2758, adopted on October 25, 1971, restored the PRC's rights and recognized its representatives as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations. This shift enhanced Beijing's international standing just months before Nixon's visit (United Nations General Assembly, 1971; U.S. Department of State, 2006a, 2006b).

The November and December exchanges took place against the continuing South Asian war. The United States and China discussed the crisis and each side's interests, but the channel no longer depended on Pakistan as the exclusive go-between. Kissinger and Chinese representatives could meet in Paris, and Washington and Beijing established procedures for transmitting messages directly. This shift reduced Pakistan's control over access even as the relationship it had helped initiate became more consequential. The intermediary had helped

create trust, but direct diplomacy displaced the need for the intermediary once both governments were willing to speak to each other (Aijazuddin, 2000; U.S. Department of State, 2006a, 2006b).

Nixon's visit to China from February 21 to 28, 1972, formalized the political breakthrough. The Shanghai Communiqué acknowledged that there were profound differences between the two countries, especially over Taiwan, while stating areas of shared interest and creating a basis for future exchanges. It was not a peace treaty, a formal alliance, or a full normalization of diplomatic relations. Its significance lay in the public recognition that the two governments could negotiate and manage disagreement rather than treating one another as permanently illegitimate. Nixon's trip completed the public phase of a process that had begun through secret messages, but it did not settle the principal disputes (Kissinger, 1982; MacMillan, 2007; Nixon, 1978; United States of America & People's Republic of China, 1972; U.S. Department of State, 2006a, docs. 196–206).

The communiqué's careful wording captured the limits of the breakthrough. It recorded the two sides' sharply different positions on Taiwan, affirmed principles of peaceful coexistence, and stated that neither should seek hegemony in the Asia-Pacific. Its importance lay in establishing a public framework for continued contact despite unresolved disputes, not in delivering a settled regional order (United States of America & People's Republic of China, 1972).

Pakistan's role during the summit was important but no longer central. Nixon's visit was not routed through Islamabad; the planning and negotiation had moved into direct channels. The earlier collaboration with Yahya remained part of the story and increased Pakistan's prestige, but the major powers now set their own agenda. This is one reason why the 1972 outcome should not be described as the culmination of Pakistani mediation alone. Pakistan enabled the opening and provided the route for Kissinger's first trip. The relationship that followed was negotiated by Washington and Beijing, with the future of Pakistan as one issue among many, not as the organizing principle of their talks (Aijazuddin, 2000; Goh, 2005a; U.S. Department of State, 2006b).

The process also demonstrates the limits of presidential diplomacy. Nixon's visit produced a public declaration and a framework for continued engagement, but formal diplomatic recognition took seven more years. Taiwan remained unresolved, U.S. relations with Taipei continued, and the Vietnam War remained a major point of disagreement. Kissinger's later account of the opening emphasizes the strategic vision of the administration, while Nixon's memoir casts the visit as a central achievement of his presidency. Those memoirs reveal how each man wanted the episode to be remembered, but they should be balanced against the communiqué and the contemporaneous records, which show both the breakthrough and its unfinished character (Kissinger, 1979, 1982, 2011; Nixon, 1978; Ross, 1995).

Strategic consequences

For Pakistan, the opening brought diplomatic prestige. Yahya had become the leader able to connect Washington and Beijing, and his government could claim a prominent role in a Cold War turning point. That service strengthened Pakistan's visibility in both capitals. It did not, however, amount to a guarantee of U.S. protection. Washington supported Pakistan during the 1971 war and signaled against further Indian advances, but did not prevent East Pakistan's separation. Yahya's position collapsed after defeat, and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto took power in December (Aijazuddin, 2000; Kux, 2001; Raghavan, 2013; Sattar, 2010). Pakistan's prestige was therefore real but time-bound. As direct U.S.–China communication expanded, Islamabad lost its control over access even as its reputation as a useful intermediary endured.

The contradiction became visible in 1971: Washington valued Yahya's diplomatic service, but its policy could not prevent Pakistan's military defeat or the political separation of its eastern wing. Pakistan emerged with international attention, not a veto over major-power choices (Aijazuddin, 2000; Kux, 2001; Raghavan, 2013; Warner, 2005).

The crisis also reinforced Pakistan's reliance on China. Islamabad had long cultivated Beijing as a counterweight to India, and the 1971 opening increased Pakistan's value as a diplomatic conduit. China's political support did not become military intervention, but it strengthened the relationship's symbolic and strategic importance. The opening was one episode in that partnership, not the sole cause of its later depth (Choudhury, 1976; Haqqani, 2013; Small, 2015). For Washington, direct contact with Beijing expanded strategic options and reduced the risk of miscalculation. The opening gave the United States room to maneuver with Moscow, although scholars dispute how directly the "China card" advanced détente. It created a channel that could be used; it did not give Washington control over Chinese policy or resolve Taiwan, Vietnam, or other disputes (Garthoff, 1994; Goh, 2005b; Hanhimäki, 2004; Westad, 2005).

The opening also changed how Washington could manage uncertainty. Before 1971, the United States had few reliable ways to interpret Chinese intentions at the highest level. Direct access made it easier to signal and clarify positions, including during the South Asian war, but it did not guarantee agreement or prevent miscalculation. The crisis demonstrated that new communication could coexist with divergent regional priorities: Washington and Beijing exchanged views about Pakistan without acting as allies or sharing a common plan for the war (Goh, 2005b; Ross, 1995; U.S. Department of State, 2005b, 2006a).

For China, engagement reduced diplomatic isolation and gave Beijing a new route to influence the international order. The United States had not abandoned Taiwan, but Nixon's visit recognized the PRC as a power Washington could no longer exclude. General Assembly Resolution 2758 later that year further shifted international representation toward Beijing. China gained options while retaining freedom to disagree with Washington (Chang, 1990; Chen, 2001; Lüthi, 2008; United Nations General Assembly, 1971). South Asia experienced the opening as a source of uncertainty. India viewed the Nixon administration's tilt toward Pakistan with suspicion, while the Indo-Soviet treaty strengthened New Delhi's security position. The crisis showed how global maneuvering could shape Washington's policy without determining local outcomes: Bangladesh emerged through the political conflict, Bengali resistance, Indian decisions, and Pakistan's military defeat, not from the Sino-American opening alone (Government of India & Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 1971; Raghavan, 2013, 2018; Sisson & Rose, 1990).

The moral cost for the United States was substantial. Concern about access to Beijing contributed to Nixon and Kissinger's reluctance to confront Yahya forcefully while American diplomats reported mass violence and the destruction of an electoral mandate. This was not a documented trade of silence for messages. It was a set of choices that gave Pakistan's strategic utility heavy weight, discounted warnings, marginalized dissent, and publicly supported a government responsible for severe abuses (Bass, 2013; Power, 2002; Riaz, 2006). The opening was therefore both a diplomatic success and a case in which strategic access narrowed the administration's response to a human and political crisis. Pakistan's external value rose as Yahya's domestic legitimacy collapsed. That divergence did not preserve the state or bring Chinese intervention; it exposed the limits of the leverage that access could create.

What Pakistan's mediation accomplished

Pakistan's contribution is easiest to see in the access it provided, the trust it earned, and the arrangements it made; its influence over the outcome was much smaller. Yahya and Hilaly delivered messages to leaders without diplomatic relations; Islamabad provided a credible, discreet route; and Pakistani officials helped make Kissinger's first Beijing visit possible. On those terms, the channel was highly effective. Its limits were equally clear: Pakistan did not set the Shanghai Communiqué's terms, settle Taiwan, compel Chinese intervention in 1971, or persuade Washington to preserve united Pakistan.

The channel worked because both governments were ready to talk. Without Beijing's readiness to receive an envoy and Washington's willingness to take political risks, Pakistani messages would not have produced a meeting. Pakistan lowered the cost of the first step; it did not create the underlying reasons for engagement (Goh, 2005a, 2005b; Ross, 1995; Tucker, 2001). The lasting achievement was the communication process itself. It established that the two governments could communicate confidentially, test proposals, and move from a secret meeting to a public summit without first resolving their deepest disagreements. Pakistan helped create that procedure. Once it worked, its success reduced the need for Pakistan to remain the gatekeeper: the channel transferred trust to direct diplomacy and made itself less central (Goh, 2005a; MacMillan, 2007; U.S. Department of State, 2006a, 2006b).

Nor was Pakistan an impartial broker. It sought Chinese support against India and valued its U.S. ties. The parties knew those interests; Pakistan's credibility came from reliable delivery and access, not neutrality. Once Washington and Beijing could communicate directly, Islamabad's control over the channel declined. The case shows how an intermediary can shape the opening of a diplomatic relationship without controlling the negotiations or the decisions that follow (Haqqani, 2013; Kux, 2001; Small, 2015).

Conclusion

Between 1969 and 1972, Pakistan performed a rare diplomatic service. Yahya Khan and Agha Hilaly carried sensitive messages between governments without diplomatic relations, while Pakistani officials arranged the cover and logistics for Kissinger's July 1971 visit. The channel helped convert tentative interest into a meeting and then a presidential visit.

Pakistan was an intermediary and facilitator, not the author of the Sino-American bargain. The impetus came from changing calculations in Washington and Beijing, shaped by the Sino-Soviet split, Vietnam, Taiwan, and the choices of national leaders. Pakistan made contact easier; it did not determine what the powers agreed to or how they acted in South Asia. The East Pakistan crisis revealed the cost of treating access as a strategic priority. Nixon and Kissinger's dependence on Yahya's channel reinforced their reluctance to alienate him as reports from Dacca described violence and the destruction of an electoral mandate. The record shows a connection between Pakistan's diplomatic value and U.S. support, but no formal quid pro quo. China's assurances did not lead to intervention, and the American tilt did not prevent Bangladesh's independence.

By February 1972, the channel no longer depended on Pakistan. The Shanghai Communiqué marked a major shift, though core disputes remained; formal relations followed in 1979. Islamabad gained prestige and closer ties with Beijing, but no U.S. guarantee. Pakistan's role shows how an intermediary can open talks without controlling what the major powers decide next.



References

- Aijazuddin, F. S. (2000). *From a head, through a head, to a head: The secret channel between the US and China through Pakistan*. Oxford University Press.
- Aijazuddin, F. S. (Ed.). (2002). *The White House and Pakistan: Secret declassified documents, 1969–1974*. Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, J. (1973). *The Anderson papers*. Random House.
- Bass, G. J. (2013). *The Blood Telegram: Nixon, Kissinger, and a forgotten genocide*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Bundy, W. P. (1998). *A tangled web: The making of foreign policy in the Nixon presidency*. Hill and Wang.
- Chang, G. H. (1990). *Friends and enemies: The United States, China, and the Soviet Union, 1948–1972*. Stanford University Press.
- Chen, J. (2001). *Mao's China and the Cold War*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Choudhury, G. W. (1974). *The last days of united Pakistan*. Indiana University Press.
- Choudhury, G. W. (1976). Reflections on Sino-Pakistan relations. *Pacific Community*, 7(2), 248–270.
- Cohen, W. I. (2010). *America's response to China: A history of Sino-American relations* (5th ed.). Columbia University Press.
- Collier, B. L. (1971, November 14). The road to Peking, or, How does this Kissinger do it? *The New York Times Magazine*.
- Dawn. (2021, July 17). From the past pages of Dawn: 1971: Fifty years ago: Nixon to visit China. *Dawn*. <https://www.dawn.com/news/1635546>
- Garthoff, R. L. (1994). *Détente and confrontation: American-Soviet relations from Nixon to Reagan* (Rev. ed.). Brookings Institution Press.
- Goh, E. (2005a). *Constructing the U.S. rapprochement with China, 1961–1974: From “red menace” to “tacit ally”*. Cambridge University Press.
- Goh, E. (2005b). Nixon, Kissinger, and the “Soviet card” in the U.S. opening to China, 1971–1974. *Diplomatic History*, 29(3), 475–502. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7709.2005.00500.x>
- Government of India, & Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. (1971, August 9). *Treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation between the Government of India and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*. Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India. <https://www.mea.gov.in/bilateral-documents.htm?dtl%2F5139%2FTreaty+of=>
- Haldeman, H. R. (1994). *The Haldeman diaries: Inside the Nixon White House*. G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Hanhimäki, J. M. (2004). *The flawed architect: Henry Kissinger and American foreign policy*. Oxford University Press.
- Haqqani, H. (2013). *Magnificent delusions: Pakistan, the United States, and an epic history of misunderstanding*. PublicAffairs.
- Hersh, S. M. (1983). *The price of power: Kissinger in the Nixon White House*. Summit Books.
- Jalal, A. (1990). *The state of martial rule: The origins of Pakistan's political economy of defence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kilpatrick, C. (1971, July 16). Groundwork laid by Kissinger, Chou in secret meeting. *The Washington Post*.
- Kissinger, H. A. (1979). *White House years*. Little, Brown.
- Kissinger, H. A. (1982). *Years of upheaval*. Little, Brown.



- Kissinger, H. A. (2011). *On China*. Penguin Press.
- Kux, D. (2001). *The United States and Pakistan, 1947–2000: Disenchanted allies*. Woodrow Wilson Center Press; Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lüthi, L. M. (2008). *The Sino-Soviet split: Cold War in the Communist world*. Princeton University Press.
- MacMillan, M. (2007). *Nixon and Mao: The week that changed the world*. Random House.
- Mann, J. (1999). *About face: A history of America's curious relationship with China, from Nixon to Clinton*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- McMahon, R. J. (1994). *The Cold War on the periphery: The United States, India, and Pakistan*. Columbia University Press.
- National Security Archive. (2002). *Kissinger's secret trip to China* (Electronic Briefing Book No. 66). The George Washington University. <https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB66/>
- Nixon Presidential Library and Museum. (n.d.). *Nixon's trip to China: White House tape excerpts*. National Archives and Records Administration. <https://www.nixonlibrary.gov/nixons-trip-china>
- Nixon, R. M. (1978). *RN: The memoirs of Richard Nixon*. Grosset & Dunlap.
- Nixon, R. M. (1971, July 15). Remarks to the nation announcing acceptance of an invitation to visit the People's Republic of China. *The American Presidency Project*. <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-the-nation-announcing-acceptance-invitation-visit-the-peoples-republic-china>
- Oldenburg, P. (1980). The breakup of Pakistan. In L. I. Rudolph & S. H. Rudolph (Eds.), *The regional imperative: The administration of U.S. foreign policy toward South Asian states under Presidents Johnson and Nixon* (pp. 143–169). Humanities Press.
- Power, S. (2002). *"A problem from hell": America and the age of genocide*. Basic Books.
- Price, M. (2024). The politics of state recognition: Norms, geopolitics, and the East Pakistan crisis. *Global Studies Quarterly*, 4(2), ksae043. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isagsq/ksae043>
- Raghavan, S. (2013). *1971: A global history of the creation of Bangladesh*. Harvard University Press.
- Raghavan, S. (2018). *The most dangerous place: A history of the United States in South Asia*. Allen Lane.
- Riaz, A. (2006). Beyond the "tilt": U.S. initiatives to dissipate the Bangladesh movement in 1971. *History Compass*, 4(1), 8–25. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1478-0542.2005.00169.x>
- Ross, R. S. (1995). *Negotiating cooperation: The United States and China, 1969–1989*. Stanford University Press.
- Sattar, A. (2010). *Pakistan's foreign policy, 1947–2009: A concise history* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Sisson, R., & Rose, L. E. (1990). *War and secession: Pakistan, India, and the creation of Bangladesh*. University of California Press.
- Small, A. (2015). *The China-Pakistan axis: Asia's new geopolitics*. Oxford University Press.
- Szulc, T. (1971, July 16). Kissinger visit capped 2-year effort. *The New York Times*, p. 3.
- The New York Times. (1971, July 16). Transcript of Nixon TV address to nation. *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Time. (1971, July 26). The nation: The secret voyage of Henry K. Time. <https://time.com/archive/6814715/the-nation-the-secret-voyage-of-henry-k/>



- Tucker, N. B. (2001). *China confidential: American diplomats and Sino-American relations, 1945–1996*. Columbia University Press.
- Tyler, P. (1999). *A great wall: Six presidents and China: An investigative history*. PublicAffairs.
- United Nations General Assembly. (1971, October 25). *Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations* (A/RES/2758[XXVI]). United Nations Digital Library. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/192054>
- United States of America, & People's Republic of China. (1972, February 27). *Joint communiqué of the United States of America and the People's Republic of China* (Shanghai Communiqué). USC U.S.-China Institute. <https://china.usc.edu/node/19896>
- U.S. Department of State. (2003). *Foreign relations of the United States, 1969–1976* (Vol. I, Foundations of foreign policy, 1969–1972). Office of the Historian. <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76v01>
- U.S. Department of State. (2005a). *Foreign relations of the United States, 1969–1976* (Vol. E-7, Documents on South Asia, 1969–1972). Office of the Historian. <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76ve07>
- U.S. Department of State. (2005b). *Foreign relations of the United States, 1969–1976* (Vol. XI, South Asia crisis, 1971). Government Printing Office. <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76v11>
- U.S. Department of State. (2006a). *Foreign relations of the United States, 1969–1976* (Vol. E-13, Documents on China, 1969–1972). Office of the Historian. <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76ve13>
- U.S. Department of State. (2006b). *Foreign relations of the United States, 1969–1976* (Vol. XVII, China, 1969–1972). Government Printing Office. <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76v17>
- Van Hollen, C. (1980). The tilt policy revisited: Nixon-Kissinger geopolitics and South Asia. In L. I. Rudolph & S. H. Rudolph (Eds.), *The regional imperative: The administration of U.S. foreign policy toward South Asian states under Presidents Johnson and Nixon* (pp. 125–142). Humanities Press.
- Warner, G. (2005). Nixon, Kissinger, and the breakup of Pakistan, 1971. *International Affairs*, 81(5), 1097–1118. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2005.00504.x>
- Westad, O. A. (2005). *The global Cold War: Third World interventions and the making of our times*. Cambridge University Press.
- Whiting, A. S. (1980). Sino-American détente. *The China Quarterly*, 82, 334–341.