

THE SECURITY Council

study stress the need for "unilateral action" by the U.S. in taking the initiative in the proposed far-reaching policy change.

"Since the present Chinese Communist leadership has a vested interest in having the U.S. appear to the world at large and to its own people as implacably hostile," says the paper, "we cannot now expect it to cooperate with U.S. efforts toward the ends outlined above. That being so, we must place primary reliance on U.S. actions, which are unilateral, in the sense of not necessarily requiring a Chinese Communist response, for example:

"Avoiding unnecessary provocations; pursuing informal negotiation with Communist China on specific matters of mutual concern, as needs emerge and opportunity affords; seeking to develop a course regarding the U.N. membership question which would make Communist China's non-inclusion appear to be the result of Peking's unwillingness to accept reasonable conditions, rather than U.S. intransigence."

The U.S. does not recognize the Peking regime, but has maintained informed contact with it through ambassador-level meetings that have been in progress since 1955, when they were started by the Eisenhower Administration. Since 1961, these periodic meetings have been held in Warsaw; the last one in March.

They have produced no known results.

Discussion by private individuals of a possible new policy toward Red China was characterized as "most desirable" by special White House assistant McGeorge Bundy in a letter to Charles Porter, former Oregon Representative and co-chairman of the Committee for a Review of our China Policy.