

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

JFK'S FORGOTTEN CRISIS:  
TIBET, THE CIA, AND THE SINO-INDIAN WAR

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, October 13, 2015

PARTICIPANTS:

**Introduction and Moderator:**

MARVIN KALB  
Nonresident Senior Fellow  
The Brookings Institution

**Featured Speaker:**

BRUCE RIEDEL  
Senior Fellow and Director, The Intelligence Project  
The Brookings Institution

\* \* \* \* \*

## P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. KALB: Hello everybody, and welcome to Brookings. My name is Marvin Kalb, and I have been privileged today to be asked to introduce this program, and also serve as a kind of Moderator. So I'll be the guy asking Bruce Riedel questions.

Now, we are here, all of us, to celebrate the publication of a first-class book called, *JFK's Forgotten Crisis: Tibet, the CIA, and the Sino-Indian War*, and I'm happy to tell you there are copies right outside. And you can also rush right after this and buy at least two.

This is a very special book at a very special moment for me. I was, in 1962, Bruce, the CBS Moscow Correspondent, and I hope that you will forgive me, but I was totally absorbed in another crisis that was taking place at that time. It was called The Cuban Missile Crisis, and those of us in Moscow were 99.5 percent absorbed with either the coverage of that story or asking questions about what are the Russians up to. In those days it was, what is Khrushchev up to? And today we ask the question, what is Putin up to?

And that is one of the issues that's going to be raised in our discussion today, the applicability to the degree that there is between what we have learned from the 1962 Sino-Indian War, and ways in which that can be applied to our knowledge of what is going on today. Also, at that time in 1962, I did have one ear cocked to news about the Sino-Indian War, because my brother who is right here with us today, Bernard Kalb, was a Journalist for CBS covering that war. Something I doubt any other person in this room was actually doing.

So, let us start first with hearing from Bruce and what I would appreciate Bruce, is tell us, as an opening, what is the theme of the book, the important points, what is it that you were attempting to do?

MR. RIEDEL: First of all, thank you, Marvin, very much to be prepared to do this. Thank you for bringing your brother as well, and thank all of you for coming. Let me begin by setting the stage for you a little bit about this crisis and this war.

On the 16<sup>th</sup> of October, 1962, or just about 53 years ago, McGeorge Bundy, John F. Kennedy's National Security Aide, came into his office early in the morning, in the West Wing, and opened his top-secret folder. Every day the National Security Advisor gets a top secret folder put together by the White House Situation Room, of the most important cables, and events that have gone on overnight.

On the 16<sup>th</sup> of October, McGeorge Bundy had two very, very important cables in that folder. One was an assessment from the State Department about the situation between India and China, and the State Department warned that the border conflict between India and China was heating up, heating up rapidly, and that it increasingly looked likely that China and India would find themselves in a full-scale border war sometime in that month.

The State Department also told the President that should that come to pass, the Chinese would almost certainly prevail because they were better equipped, they were better led, and they had more experience recently in fighting. And if they did prevail, India would probably turn to the United States for assistance, requiring a major presidential decision, not just about assistance to India, but also how that would balance with America's very close relationship with Pakistan.

The second memorabilia in McGeorge Bundy's overnight folder was from the Central Intelligence Agency, and it reported that U2 imagery taken 24 hours earlier had found intermediate-range ballistic missiles was being introduced by the Soviet Union into Communist Cuba. And it began the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Like many people you focused on the Cuban Missile Crisis, I think the

vast majority of Americans focused on the Cuban Missile Crisis for good reason. It appeared to be an issue in which the survival of mankind was at stake, and in fact it was an issue in which the survival of mankind was at stake. We thought back in 1962 many Americans, many Russians, many Europeans, many people around the world thought the world was on the brink of Armageddon.

In fact, it was closer than we thought, at the time for example, the CIA estimated that there were 5 to 8,000 Soviet soldiers in Cuba. We now know there were 50,000 Soviet soldiers in Cuba. But at the time the CIA thought there were only intermediate-range ballistic missiles. We now know that the Soviets also brought with them tactical missiles capable of firing nuclear weapons at relatively short ranges and that they had surrounded Guantanamo Bay with a battery of these, and the Battery Commander had preauthorization to start firing nuclear weapons at Guantanamo Bay when the first bombs dropped by the United States on the island. So that's how close we were.

But that shouldn't dismiss for our eyes the other crisis, the crisis the State Department was writing about and warning about, and the State Department turned out in this case to be remarkably present. China did invade India, and it quickly got the upper hand, and within days of the Chinese invasion of India Prime Minister Nehru had to do one of the most difficult things in his entire life.

He had to turn to the Americans, and even worse, to the British for assistance. And at the end of October, 1962, the United States and the Royal Air Force began an airlift of urgent supplies to India. That eight Boeing 707s landing every day, each one of them dropping off 20 tons of equipment for the Indian Army, and we had American C-130s flying them to the battlefield to try to stop the Chinese invasion.

And the State Department was right about something else, the

Pakistanis didn't like it. Pakistan was then the most allied ally of the United States. They weren't just members of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization; they were members of the Central Treaty Organization. We had alliance requirements with them that specially said, we wouldn't sell arms to India without consulting with them first, and pretty soon in this crisis, the Pakistani leader, Field Marshal Ayub Khan, began complaining to the American Ambassador, and writing to Kennedy and saying, Pakistan deserves some kind of compensation, as he put it, for staying neutral in the war.

In effect, signaling that if it didn't get what it wanted, and it was pretty clear what it wanted, it wanted Cashmere, it was prepare to open a second a front which was, in the end, the nightmare scenario of both President Kennedy and Prime Minister Nehru.

The Chinese then stopped and then started again. And when they started their second offensive, they overwhelmed the Indians completely. It appeared for a brief period of time, in mid-November 1962, that the Chinese would not only take over the border area, but will in fact take over all of Eastern India, the whole part of the country to what is now the east of Bangladesh. Remember, of course, in 1962 Bangladesh was East Pakistan.

There were even fears in India, and the CIA had the same fears, that the Chinese would open another front, occupy the tiny principality of Sikkim, and then march down the border of what was then East Pakistan to Calcutta.

On the 19<sup>th</sup> of November, 1962, Nehru wrote two letters to President Kennedy, in the second of those two letters he said, catastrophe was imminent. Let me just read you two sentences from this letter. "The situation is really desperate. We have to have more comprehensive assistance if the Chinese are to be prevented from taking over the whole of Eastern India. India faces a catastrophe." Then he went on to ask for

the President to send urgently 350 American combat aircrafts and the crews to fly them, and the radar installations to make them work, in order to launch an air war against China.

Nehru's request was that the Indian Air Force would bomb into Tibet at the supply lines of the Chinese, and the American Air Force would defend Indian airspace. But in fact he was asking the United States to enter a war with China. Now, if you think about President Kennedy's position. Here he is, he is on the one hand, dealing with an issue of the survival of the human race, the most tense moment in this U.S.-Soviet Cold War, and at the same time, is now dealing with the request from the world's largest democracy, to the United States, with assistance to fight the world's largest most populous country on the other side the world. Talk about multi-tasking, this is multi-tasking at it's probably highest art form.

Fortunately, 36 hours after Nehru's letter was received in the White House, the Chinese unilaterally stopped. Why they stopped, whether that had always been their intention to stop, are questions we don't know the answers to. We don't have access to the Chinese records. We have access to a lot of American records, and a good deal of Indian records, but we don't have access to the Chinese records. They stopped.

At the time the President didn't know, was this a halt, would another war start a year later? We do know that he had done two immediate things in response to Nehru's letter. One, he dispatched an American aircraft carrier, the Battle Group, to the Bay of Bengal, as a visible show of American support; and second, he dispatched Averell Harriman, who is one of the wisest, gray-haired statesman in American history. Now this is a guy that FDR had sent to London during the Battle of the Blitz and then sent to Moscow during the Battle of Moscow.

He sent him urgently to India to assess India's needs. A year after the crisis would come to a head in November 1962, the United States Air Force, the Royal Air Force, and pilots from the Royal Canadian Air Force, and from the Royal Australia Air Force, carried out a large exercise in India which was exactly what Nehru had requested the year before.

We'll never know the answer to the question, what would Kennedy have done, had the Chinese not stopped. But I think that the fact that a year later, we carried out exactly the -- in an exercise the operation Nehru wanted, it gives you a lot of indication that we probably would have gone to war in 1962 with China.

All of this is of course about the past. It's about the presidential handling of crisis situations. I think there's a lot of lessons to be learned here. One of the key lessons, I think, is that the President learned in Cuba, and applied it almost immediately to India, that government by committee is not a good idea. That the committee will almost always all revolve towards one option. He also learned to be very careful listening to the experts, listening to the experts you hand-selected for the job, and in this case he listened to his Ambassador in New Delhi, John Kenneth Galbraith, and I think we'll come back to that in a minute.

It's also terribly relevant in another way, because if you put it, oversimplified, and it is oversimplified, but I think it's essentially true, the geopolitics of Asia were set in 1962. The entente, the access, the alliance, whatever you want to call it, between China and Pakistan began in 1962, it began in Ayub Khan's beginning to think about: who is my real ally, Washington or Beijing; Kennedy or Mao Tse-tung? We are now 50-some years later seen this access develop to the point where China is now clearly Pakistan's number one ally in the world investing, this year, \$46 billion in Pakistan.

The U.S.-Indian relationship has gone through a lot of contours in

variations and ups and downs in the 50 years since then. We've had very low, low moments in those years. But in an ironic kind of way, 50 years later, we are not back to where Kennedy and Nehru were back in 1960s, so U.S., India, entente, access, relationship, whatever you want to call it, that balances to China and Pakistan.

What we've also done in the last 50 years is seeing this conflict turn into an arms race, an arms race that is gone nuclear, an arms race which is, today, the most dangerous arms race, I think, in the world, because the essential issue at the heart of the 1962 war, the border between India and China is not settled today, it is the longest-disputed border in the world.

Now, while China has a lot of other reasons to develop nuclear weapons and other weapons; one of those reasons is India, and for India, China is its number one threat. In 1999 when the Indians tested nuclear weapons they cited the 1962 War as the principal reason they needed nuclear weapons, and then they cited China's clandestine support for Pakistan's nuclear weapons.

So it's (a) a fascinating piece of history, most of which has been kind of lost over the last 50 years for understandable reasons, and (b) a story that's very important, very relevant to Asian-American politics today, 53 years later.

MR. KALB: Bruce, thank you. That's a wonderful review, not only of the book, but carrying it from 1962 to 2015. I would like, with all of your permission, which I'll take anyway, an opportunity to ask you a couple of questions, and then we'll go to the audience for their questions. I'm trying to put myself in the position of a President who goes before the American people and the world, 7:00 p.m. Monday night, October 22, 1962, and says, "Ladies and gentlemen, we are on the edge of something hugely dangerous. I may have to take action against Cuba, if the Russians don't do X, Y and Z."

Two days earlier the Chinese opened their offensive against India on

October 20<sup>th</sup>. So he knows that, and yet his mind is on the Cuban Missile Crisis. How much did he know at that time? Who were the experts who were kind of feeding him that information? You mentioned a moment ago that for a President in order to be able to do these things, in a sense, on his own, don't get stuck with the wrong kind of expert, but who was the expert at that time? Who was helping him balance these two incredibly dangerous crises?

MR. RIEDEL: It's a very interesting question because as you know we have a multitude of information about the handling of the Cuban Missile Crisis. The President set up a special committee, the ExCom, and he taped their deliberations, and they didn't know he taped their deliberations, and we didn't know they taped the deliberations until years later. So we have a huge abundance of material about him and his experts.

We don't have that same abundance of material about how he interacted with his experts in Washington, but it's safe to say that Dean Rusk, Bundy and Bob McNamara, were in the loop also on the Sino-Indian Conflict, but they weren't meeting day in and day out. The real expert, and the man he relied on, was John Kenneth Galbraith. And John Kenneth Galbraith, born in Canada, a graduate of the Ontario School of Agriculture, 6'6", that's the conservative estimate, I've seen 6'8" --

MR. KALB: That's when he stooped, he was only 6'6".

MR. RIEDEL: That's when stooped, that's right. Famous Harvard Professor, wrote some of the most famous books about the American economy in history. A man with a very high opinion of himself, and who let the rest of the world know he had a very high opinion of himself, but who had spent a lot of time in India, wanted to be American Ambassador in India, had decided years before that he wanted to be the American Ambassador in India, and who was -- because he wasn't a career foreign

service officer, or a career ambassador, this was it, he was going to be ambassador to India, that was it.

He had an independence that was remarkable, and he seized the day. He realized that Washington was going to be consumed with Cuba, he was going to therefore get very little helpful advice, but also very little unhelpful interference in what he did, and he basically ran it, while sending back to Kennedy, eyes-only letters for Kennedy on what he was up to. He kept Rusk and Bundy and the others in the loop, but he had a direct channel to the President, and he felt that he had authority from the President to do what he thought was the right thing to do.

In addition to that he had built by this point in time a very close relationship with Nehru, and I think it's safe to say that by the middle of this crisis, he was no longer just the American Ambassador to the Prime Minister, he was an advisor to the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister was now looking to him for advice on what to do next, particularly on very tricky issues like how to deal with Pakistan, and what to say to the Pakistanis, and what not to say to the Pakistanis. And Nehru was given -- Galbraith was giving advice on all of these things.

The last thing I want to say about Galbraith is he wrote a diary, he kept a diary of what was going on, and from a historians perspective a diary written while the crisis is going on is of course the ultimate good source, because this is not a memoir in which you say, oh, yeah, I played -- I was the most important person in the room because everyone's memoirs say that. It's important what you actually said in your diary on those days.

And Galbraith is a great writer, a very witty person. Also by 2015 standards, extremely politically incorrect, and would say -- and would write things about people and their behavior which nobody in their right mind in 2015 would put on paper

JFK-2015/10/13

anymore, and certainly not have published a couple of years later on, you would have taken these things out of it.

But that diary, and all the documents that have been declassified, especially the two letters that I referred to, which have only been declassified in the last couple of years, provide us with a very good basis for understanding who was in the loop, Kennedy's centrality to the loop, John Kenneth Galbraith's critical role in all of this, and what was really going on in the White House in those days.

MR. KALB: Bruce, is it fair to say, and I'm trying to read between the lines here, that Kennedy did not really have major support from anybody in Washington, that he was getting a lot of what he knew about India, about Nehru, from his Ambassador?

MR. RIEDEL: I think that's absolutely true.

MR. KALB: So, who -- so if we get to November 19<sup>th</sup> now, and November 20<sup>th</sup>, and the President has before him two letters, one of them explaining the dire situation in India, and in effect, in effect asking the President to get into a war with China to protect India. Now, I would imagine a decision like that is so enormous because it could lead to a war. Where did the President turn then? Did he go to Congress seeking some kind of authority to move the United States into a war against a foreign enemy?

China at that time, in the height of the Cold War, a Communist monolith, was certainly not regarded with any kind of sympathy. Therefore, they are the obviously enemy, I as President, am about to take the U.S. into a war with that enemy, and I do that only on my own? Was that about right?

MR. RIEDEL: That's what the record we have, and it stops with the Chinese unilateral announcement takes us. Or, to put it slightly differently; an airlift had

begun, we had begun an airlift. We were an active partner in assisting the Indians. He had not gone to Congress for that at all.

MR. KALB: But whether presidents have done over the years --

MR. RIEDEL: Right. Many presidents.

MR. KALB: Many presidents, yes.

MR. RIEDEL: Yes, that would be.

MR. KALB: Right, right.

MR. RIEDEL: When he got the letter he convened a meeting of the National Security Council principals, on the night of the 19<sup>th</sup>, Bundy, Rusk, McNamara and the Director of Central Intelligence, McCone, were all there, we have the record of the meeting, there was pretty much a consensus that we should support India, but also a consensus that we needed to see what they really needed.

Whether, was this request for all these aircraft really the right answer? And that's why I think he picked Averell Harriman, who he had a lot of faith in, and who the other people in that room had enormous faith in, too. I don't think we have people like Averell Harriman around anymore, who are that distinguished, but there is anyone like it, I'd say it's, you know, either like Brent Scowcroft or Bob Gates. And sent him out urgently, to go assess the situation and then give the President the bottom line on what he needed to do.

And he did go out, and he did then spend a great deal of time in India over the next few months, and a whole series of initiatives began, one of which I've already highlighted, which was the U.S.-Indian military cooperation leading to this military exercise in 1963. Another thing it led to was an effort to try to negotiate a Cashmere solution.

The President had been adamant during the war that there would be no

hint of any compensation, and he made that clear to Ayub Khan. But when the war was over, when the ceasefire went into effect, there was strong pressure in Washington, and even stronger pressure in London, to try to address the Cashmere one way or another, that of course in the end failed to work.

Now the interesting question is, what if we fast-forward a week, China is still coming on, it's advancing into Eastern India, at some point the President would have had to do two things. One, he would have had to go to the American public as he had at the height of the Cuban Missile Crisis, and explain why he was now sending American combat aircraft, if that's what his decision was, into the war. And secondly, he would have had to go to the Congress with some kind of request.

My suspicion from looking at the Cuban side of the crisis, is that he would have been very reluctant to get the Congress in the loop any earlier than he had to, because if you recall in the Cuban crisis, fairly early on he had gone and brought in some of the distinguished Members of the Senate and the House, and they were all rabid hawks, telling him that this was all his fault, that his weakness had led to this, and that if he'd only listened to them, he would never have been in this position.

Since he was hearing that from many of his own advisors, from the entire Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I think he'd kind of come to the conclusion that, "All the experts and wise men in Washington all seem to line up consistently on the side of doing the most dangerous thing, and advocating that because they didn't want to look like they were weak."

MR. KALB: I don't want to nail you on this one, but I would like to get it clearly in my own mind. If the Chinese had not decided to call it off on November 20<sup>th</sup>, and the President had the letter in front of him, would he have committed the United States to active military involvement against China?

MR. RIEDEL: I think he would have. I think the cumulative evidence of his strong relationship with India that went back to the 1950s, his belief that India was a democracy and that we needed to help India succeed. His belief that this was an aggressive act by the Chinese, and his belief that the United States had to show resolve, I think he would have. He sent a carrier, the Battle Group, a year later he sent a whole exercise. We'll never know.

MR. KALB: Yes, but it's easy to do it a year later, it's not easy to do it at the height of the crisis, and if he had done it, following your line of reasoning, what do you think the Russians would have done?

MR. RIEDEL: Probably (crosstalk 00:29:51) --

MR. KALB: They had just gone through a humiliating experience in Cuba.

MR. RIEDEL: The Russians and Chinese were coordinating, that I think we can say without question. Khrushchev and Mao were as much competing with each other as they were trying to confront Kennedy. And both were trying to look more like the leader of Communist Bloc than the other. You know, one of the interesting things I discovered in doing this, and I went back and I read the national intelligence estimates prepared during the early 1960s about the Soviet Union, and Communist China; I had always had the impression that well into the Vietnam War, the American Government was obsessed with the idea of monolith.

And certainly the intelligence community wasn't, they had recognized that this competing Soviet Blocs, not necessarily a cooperating Soviet Bloc, and they were telling the President that, so I don't think at any point in this crisis as far as I could tell did the President look at this and say, is this some master plot of Khrushchev and Mao, you know, pushing me on opposite sides of the world? I think he recognized that

he was dealing with two very, very dangerous individuals.

The other thing I want to highlight, and you alluded to it, in 1962 we thought the Soviet Union was our evil foe. We thought Communist China was a country of insane fanatics, who were, you know, prepared to do all kinds of things to take over the globe. They were -- if you remember back to movies in the 1960s, that the Russians are always the kind of clever international agent, and the Chinese are this kind of faceless enemy that's inscrutable to all of us.

We now know that our perceptions of China were most misguided back in the 1960s, but I don't think that would have -- you know, if he had gone to Congress of the United States in 1962, and said, Communist China is on the march, and we have to fight, I think the Congress of the United States would have stood up and sung *Star Spangled Banner*, and voted yes. There might have been a couple of hold outs, but as we discovered over the course of the years ahead, 1964 and 1965 in another place, there weren't very many holdouts when it came to --

MR. KALB: You mentioned earlier, Bruce, that we do have a good bit of documentary evidence, from the U.S. and from the Indians, but not from the Chinese at all. Is there anything in recent years that has emerged from the Chinese that gave us any insight into what happened at that time?

MR. RIEDEL: There is, and I should say, I'm not a China scholar, I'm working on it, but I'm not a China scholar, but there are several experts on Chinese foreign policy who have recently been looking at this Chinese decision-making process, and I think they've helped us to understand it a lot more. And just to put in the Chinese perspective for a minute, China had just come together after a century of being in a state of civil war and foreign occupation in fighting the Japanese, and before that fighting European imperialism.

In 1951 it took over Tibet, and we can spend a lot of time on the legal status of Tibet, but it took over Tibet. The Tibetan people, and the Tibetan leadership, led by the Dalai Lama resisted this; first in a nonviolent way, and then in an increasingly violent way. From the Chinese perspective, of course, this was all a threat to the territorial integrity in unity of the New China.

The United States supported the Tibetan resistance. The CIA, early on, began supporting the Tibetan resistance. When the Dalai Lama famously left Tibet and went into exile in India, a CIA team, not Americans, but American-trained individuals had gone into Tibet and helped exfiltrate him out of the country. One of many of Allen Dulles' success stories to report to President Eisenhower, was the morning the Dalai Lama got out, he was able to report to the President in the Oval Office that the CIA had helped get the Dalai Lama out of Communist China and into India.

We supported them by, for instance by training them, small numbers, in Colorado, because it was felt that Colorado had the closest geology and geography to Tibet, as you could find in the United States. I guess Alaska wasn't counted as a state at that time, and armed them. And we did it with the participation of the Pakistanis. The Pakistani Intelligence Services, at the direction of Ayub Khan, let the United States fly missions to drop equipment and personnel into Tibet out of East Pakistan. You could see that it's a very short distance across Indian airspace, and Nepalese airspace and you are in Chinese airspace.

This was a great top secret project. The Indian Government was probably aware of some of what was going on, the Pakistani Government was fully aware of what was going on, and because a lot of these people were caught the minute they landed, and interrogated/tortured by the Chinese, I mean, the Chinese had a pretty good idea of what was going on. And from the Chinese perspective what appeared to be going

on, was an effort by the CIA to destabilize Tibet, and was coming from the South.

I think they assumed India was in the loop on this, the poor Tibetans who were being caught, never spent any real time in East Pakistan, so they had no idea where the airbase was, and they were -- the way the CIA operates in something like this, you don't people anything they don't need to know. All they knew is they'd flown someplace south of Tibet. Undoubtedly, to some extent, the CIA operation, which had begun in the Eisenhower Administration, probably fueled the conspiracy theories in Mao's inner circle, which was prone to paranoia for good reason.

He lived in a very, very dangerous situation with many, many opponents including the United States, including the Russians, including most of his Cabinet from one time or another. He saw all of this as an attempt by India and the United States to take Tibet back from China, and he reacted as he did. The exact play for all these things we do know because we don't have any archives, I, actually myself having studied this a little bit, I don't think Mao Tse-tung had an archived system in which his ideas were, you know, put down in any vigor for the sake of history.

If they were put down with any sense of vigor they were probably adjusted whenever he changed his mind, and all the archives were adjusted to go along with whatever he came up with then. It raises an interesting question, why did Kennedy let this operation go on? Certainly after the Bay of Pigs, you would have thought that Kennedy would be saying, you know, there's some really air-brained ideas coming from those guys out in Langley, and this may be one of the most air-brained, and Galbraith was completely against it.

He thought it was feckless and dangerous, but Kennedy decided to keep going with it. And the best answer I can give you as to why I think he did that, is that Kennedy, like a lot of people of his generation, was obsessed with covert operations, with

the whole notion that somehow you could -- at very little cost, using clandestine means accomplish big things. It was sexy, it was dramatic, and even after the Bay of Pigs, as I said, he continued to move forward.

MR. KALB: Well, he certainly pursued that in those years, in '61, '62 in Vietnam, when he tried to do, essentially that. I'm going to turn to the audience, but I do have one-and-a-half questions to ask about the book itself. How long did it take you to do the book, and what was the most fun part of doing the book?

MR. RIEDEL: This book is the most fun I've had in years.

SPEAKER: Considering the others.

MR. RIEDEL: If you didn't hear it, somebody said, "Considering the other subjects I write on." Yes, that's true. Nobody gets beheaded in this book; nobody drives airplanes into the World Trade Center, but more than that. I became interested in this about three years ago, when I was writing a broader book about U.S. relationships with South Asia, and it dawned on me the coincidence of these two crises. And once I focused on the coincidence of these two crises, then I began to say, well certainly there is a story here, then I have to admit it, the glamour of the Kennedy, Camelot White House, became intoxicating.

Because it was just so much more interesting than any of the White Houses' I actually worked in. So much more style, so much more class, and it's not to denigrate anybody, but to recognize that the Kennedys had a very special mystique about them. And John F. Kennedy served only 1,000 days, but go to your local book store, go to your neighborhood library, and there are more books about John F. Kennedy than there are about any President except Abraham Lincoln or FDR, he has been very studied President.

He had this really critical part of his presidency, at his finest hour, lacked

one of its dimensions, and that's what I found exciting and interesting to do, was to explore that dimension in all of its scores.

And the last thing I'll say there, we haven't talked about this, but we did allude to it in the slides. Mrs. Kennedy, the First Lady, played a very, very role in his interaction with South Asia, over the course of those 1,000 days. She wasn't necessarily an advisor on the night of 19<sup>th</sup>, although who knows what they said to each other at the end of the day. But she was very much involved in America's engagement with India and Pakistan, and that's another part of the fascinating story here.

MR. KALB: Okay. Thank you very much. I will definitely recognize each one of you, raising your hand. Please do ask a question, if you go into a speech I'll have to cut you off, and I'm really a sweetheart so don't let me do that. But I see this hand right here, the gentleman right here, in the middle. Yes, you. Are we going to get a microphone to you? Hang on just a second.

SPEAKER: (No response heard).

MR. RIEDEL: Yes. The territorial dispute over these -- Can you put the map up for one more second. By the way, just when I needed it the most. The territorial dispute here can be basically lumped into two parts. There's the Eastern part, the yellow is Indian territory claimed by China, and the Western part, which is the yellow here, is area occupied by Chinese forces but claimed by India. It's actually part of Cashmere.

The obvious solution to this problem, and it's been obvious for 55 years, if not longer, is the trade, except the status quo. And in the 1950s the Chinese hinted at this over and over again, to Nehru. That kind of trade, dictatorships can do. It's very hard for a democracy to accept that kind of a trade, and especially a young democracy. And Nehru was just politically unable to accept that trade.

Despite the fact that the part of Cashmere that is occupied by China has

no people, I mean it is barren, a step -- it's strategically important because it is the main access for entry from Sikkim into Tibet, and from Tibet into Sikkim, so strategically it's very important, but there are people. You weren't actually trading away an unhappy population, but Nehru couldn't do it.

And the Chinese, over the course of the early '60s increasingly became more and more clear of that, they were going to do something. And like most democracies, Nehru became more and more entrenched that he wasn't going to give in, and he began pushing the Indian Army forward into positions which were tactically unsound. But, Nehru was the father of country, he was the most revered person in the state, and none of his generals were going to come up to him and say, Mr. Prime Minister, you are really getting us in a whole lot of trouble.

So, he had surrounded himself with the court of people who told him he was always right, and he ended up paying the price terribly in October and November. This crisis devastated Nehru. He was already an old man, but this crisis really was devastating for him. The very fact that he had to go to the imperialists, especially London, it must have just been so humiliating to a man who had spent years and years of his life in prison fighting British imperialism, but he did.

The 1950 example of where American forces moved, despite Chinese warnings. I talk about in the book as well. And there, we had the perfect storm of two factors. One, an American Military Commander, Douglas MacArthur, who believed that if he was not God he certainly talked to God every day. And his Intelligence Chief, a very unusual man, who styled himself like oppression officer, which is really kind of weird in the 1940s since we were just fighting the Nazis, but he styled himself oppression officer, he was a big fan of Franco, who told MacArthur whatever MacArthur wanted to be told. And if MacArthur believed that there were no Chinese troops south of the Yalu, there

were no Chinese the south of Yalu, and as a consequence the greatest military disaster, I think, in American military history.

MR. KALB: Of course.

MR. RIEDEL: The Indians tried to warn us. The Indian Ambassador in Beijing was summoned in the middle of the night to go see Zhou Enlai, and Zhou Enlai said, if the Americans keep coming we are going to intervene. His warning was brought back to the United States, and Truman and his advisors, and especially MacArthur said, we are not going to listen to this Indian diplomat, he has, you know, obviously been turned, he's probably a pinko, if not a fellow traveler, and all of those kinds of things, that people actually said back in the 1950s and '60s, and they were ignored. The lessons here for intelligence, are many, I think.

MR. KALB: Bruce, I'm going to ask you, because there are a lot of hands up, if you could, shorten up your answers just a bit.

MR. RIEDEL: Yeah. And I'm going to take the liberty now, and please bear with me, if I ask my brother, Bernard, to ask a question, since he did cover that war?

MR. BERNARD KALB: As Marvin indicated, I was with the Indian army at that time, in 1962, and in fact was one of the reporters who was evacuated the night of, I guess, October 19<sup>th</sup>, evacuated by the Indian Air Force from Tajpur to New Delhi, only to wake the next morning to read in the *Times of India*, that the Chinese had declared a unilateral ceasefire. But at the time of the war, there reports of friction along that border between China and India scraps of incidence.

What was the ultimate evidence that it was China that triggered the grander confrontation? Because India had reasons too to enjoy the possibility of benefits if the Indians had poked the Chinese a little too much and -- and you alluded to it -- Marvin, is telling me to keep quiet, but you got the question.

MR. KALB: He got the message. Yes, sir.

MR. RIEDEL: There is a vibrant debate among historians about who was to blame for the China-India War. And I try in the book to lay that debate out. You know, the 1962 version for most of the world was India is a good guy; China is a bad guy, as simple as that. Later, the historical work argued that China was provoked, that it had tried to signal reasonableness, and that the Indian forward policy of moving troops forward had provoked the war.

There is now a -- you know, there's always new revisionist wave, there is a revisionist wave now that says all that's true, but the Chinese also has a broader mind - - broader interpretation which was to somehow humiliate India, and Nehru in particular, in order to advance their geo-strategic desire to be seen as the leader of the third nonaligned world. There's a lot of truth in all of these arguments, and from my point in this book, I don't try to come down on one side or another, I try to lay out all the arguments, because what I'm really talking about is what do the Americans do, what would the Americans -- what was the American reaction to all of this?

And there's no question that in the Kennedy White House, and in the Galbraith's embassy in New Delhi, while they understood the complexity of the underlying dispute, there was no doubt as to who our side was, and who the other side was. And that's particularly true because of the kind of black and white, very stereotyped imagery that American's had in the 1960s about Communist China. We didn't try any -- we didn't make any significant effort at trying to look at the world through Chinese eyes.

MR. KALB: Over there. Yes, sir, right here.

SPEAKER: Hi, Bruce. It's a pleasure to see you on something other than related to terrorism. As your book suggests the U.S. doesn't have very long memories, but the actors in the region do. I'm wondering if there are any lessons we

JFK-2015/10/13

should draw from the historical case study that you've presented here for the U.S. that seeks to rebalance in Asia and is now trying to help build up India, and help manage China's rise.

MR. RIEDEL: It's a good question, and I think one wants to be humble to a certain degree here. The events I write about are 50 years ago; the world has changed a lot in those 50 years. But I think one of the lessons that comes through to me is that our tendency in the U.S. Government to compartmentalize issues, it does us no service. One really needs to think about these politics, seeing at least a triangle of quadrilateral.

The China-Pakistan access that begins in 1952 is now matured. The U.S.-India access, I would argue is still maturing, it's not as closed in entente, but it's moving in that direction. If you really want to, say, find an arms control solution to the Pakistani nuclear arsenal, which according to David Ignatius, the White House is now thinking about, you had better think about all of these players, and how you are going to build a consensus of not just Americans and Pakistanis, but Americans and Pakistanis and Indians; and Americans and Pakistanis and Chinese.

That's complicated, that's really hard, but if you aren't playing the chess game, recognizing all of those dimensions, I think you are likely to fail, and I think we've had trouble over the years, I've not participated, I've seen this on the inside. In getting our South Asia team, and our East Asia team, and our Europe team, and our clandestine team, to all sit down in same arena, it would have to be bigger than Falk, I think, these days, and interact, and recognize that a kind of half-baked CIA program to support Tibetan rebels.

Whatever the wisdom of it as a covert operation, it's going to have ripple effects that you really ought to think about well in advance. I don't think we do that as well, and I think in this environment we need to -- we really need to bring in all of these

JFK-2015/10/13

players and think about them collectively.

MR. KALB: Is there a hand -- Right there, yes, please? Get the microphone up here, if you can?

SPEAKER: I can't help ruminating about any parallels between the situation you described and the situation in Ukraine now with the Russians invading, however covertly. And I wonder if there are lessons. It appears that Kennedy had much more freedom of movement, although he didn't have to exercise it necessarily. Obama is accused of being a weak leader, but there's a lot more media attention to things. And anyway, I'd be interested in your comments on this.

MR. KALB: Thank you.

MR. RIEDEL: That goes back to what you were talking about, the role of Congress, potentially in all of this. If you remember in 1962, congressional oversight of the intelligence community was a complete joke. One a year, and probably not every year, Allen Dulles went up to The Hill, talked to two or three Senators and a couple of Congressmen, and probably over a large quantity of Bourbon, and told them a couple of war stories, and they said, great, you are doing a great job. You know, come back next year with more war stories.

There was no accountability process. There was no -- you can be critical of the current accountability process but there is a process. There was not process. When did that start? It didn't really start until the end of the Vietnam War, and the investigations in the early 1970s of the --

MR. KALB: Of the Church Committee.

MR. RIEDEL: -- of the Church Committee and those things, then you begin to have a proper Congress process which you may be critical of, but which does provide some structure to congressional oversight of covert operations. The President

also had a great deal of liberty with military operations. As I said, you know, he had begun and airlift of supplies, and there is no record that I found that he ever went to the Congress on this.

He also is at liberty in another kind of way, because the Cuban Missile Crisis ate up all the political space, right? I mean, you know, if Pierre Salinger had gone in front of the news media at the height of the Cuban Missile Crisis and said, before I get to Cuba, gentlemen, I'd like to talk about India. I think the people there would have, you know, boo-boo. I see one dissenting vote. It was definitely different in New Delhi but I think in Washington it would have been very hard to get political space to talk about this, particularly in the early days of the crisis, when Americans thought, the end of time was facing them, in the face.

And I'm not saying that Kennedy deliberately took advantage of this, but I think Kennedy was a very, very smart politician, and he didn't see any particular reason to complicate his life. He already was accused. We think of Kennedy now as a strong and decisive leader. In 1962 people thought of Kennedy as the guy who Nikita Khrushchev had kicked all over, around the world.

He kicked our butt in the Bay of Pigs. He kicked the President's butt literally directly in Vienna. The Kennedy Administration, for at least the first six months of 1961, had a horrendous start. Another reason why I think Kennedy is such a fascinating figure to study, is there is a learning curve here. There is clearly a learning curve here. This President learns from his mistakes, and one of the mistakes that, early on, he said he would never repeat, is he wouldn't listen to "the experts" because he found out that experts, at the end of the day, often had their own agenda, or that if he was going to listen to experts, he was going to listen to the experts that he picked for the job, like his brother, and like John Kenneth Galbraith.

MR. KALB: The gentleman right there, and then begin to -- We have one, two, three -- a cluster of -- Oh, my, goodness; many questions, shorter answers. Go ahead.

SPEAKER: Thank you very much. I am Dr. Nisar Chaudhry, with National Defense University, visiting fellow at Islamabad, Pakistan. My question is, during 1962, Sino-Indian War, Ayub Khan was the President of Pakistan, and even in 1965, he was the President of Pakistan, and he started a covert, and insurgency inside to occupy Cashmere, for the deliberation of Cashmere.

My question is that in 1963 when India was preoccupied and engaged in the war with China, why he did not choose that time to launch this kind of operation? Was he independently using his exercised judgment? Or was it advised by the Americans? And were the Americans involved in not allowing him to get engaged at that point? Thank you.

MR. RIEDEL: Kennedy had a very close relationship with Ayub Khan. Ayub Khan came to the United States twice in the 1,000 days. He was wine and dined at Mount Vernon. The only time the First President's House has ever been used for a State Dinner. From the beginning Ayub Khan, recognized, what everyone else recognized, which was that Kennedy wanted a better relationship with India, and he feared, understandably that this was going to come at his expense, and in the end he was right on both counts.

We did develop an arms relationship with India, and Kennedy and Galbraith both admitted at the time, that the airlift was not consistent with the promises that they had left with Ayub Khan that no arms would go to India without some prior consultation with Pakistan. There was no prior consultation. There was prior consultation -- there was no consultation with Congress, there was no prior consultations

with the Pakistanis.

During the war the President was very clear with Ayub Khan that an opening of a second front against India by Pakistan would be regarded as a hostile act to the United States, and that Pakistan would be regarded as an aggressor, just like China. I think that helped persuade Ayub Khan to stay neutral. I think there were other reasons for him to stay neutral as well, but I think that helped.

When the war ended, there was a strong opinion in Washington and in London; that now is the time to try to resolve the Cashmere issue through negotiations. Galbraith was one of the dissidents, who said this is the wrong time, Nehru is not politically capable of doing a Cashmere deal when he has just been humiliated by the Chinese. And in the end I think Galbraith was proven right. But through 1963, there was a faint hope that perhaps a negotiations process would go somewhere.

I think when Kennedy leaves the scene in 1963, Ayub Khan comes to the conclusion he's going to have to take unilateral means in collaboration with the Chinese. And I think there's pretty good evidence that the 1965 War -- I wouldn't say it was cooked with the Chinese -- but I think the Chinese had seen the menu, and had a pretty good idea of what was coming.

MR. KALB: Thank you. What I'm going to do with three questions in a row that will be asked; the gentleman there, then Bruce and Kerry. Then we'll go on this side for three. Okay.

SPEAKER: I've been talking to Tom Hughes, he was INR Director at the time, and as I recall, Allen Whiting was the Senior Analyst in INR and the time, and his book, *China Crosses the Yalu*, was a very significant volume, you can remember that I'm sure, Bruce. If that is so, I would think that Whiting and the initial State Department telegram to Bundy maybe reflected Whiting's input, and if Whiting did have the input

JFK-2015/10/13

you'd think, maybe the lesson is that Kennedy did listen to the experts, and that's why he had a better result.

MR. KALB: Thank you, Bruce. Why doesn't that gentleman ask the question next?

SPEAKER: Thank you very much for a fascinating story in history. You talk about how Ambassador Galbraith went from just being the U.S. Ambassador to almost becoming an advisor to Nehru. I'm going to speculate then, that I'd like to see if you care to comment. Might he have had a hand in the writing of those two letters? Thank you.

MR. KALB: Thank you very much. And Gary, you are the third in this grouping.

MR. MITCHELL: Thanks very much. Gary Mitchell; and I write the Mitchell Report. And I love the story, and I can't wait for the movie.

MR. RIEDEL: We are working on that.

MR. MITCHELL: Yeah. Well, so am I. As I listened to the story unfolding, and then as you got to the point about how much fun the writing of this book was, and the fascination with the Kennedy Administration. I had been thinking all the way through that -- and this is a question -- I've been thinking all the way through listening to your story and the management of these enormously difficult issues at the same time.

I was thinking to myself, has there been, subsequent to that time, in your judgment, another administration that could have or would have handled it -- these crises, with the apparent deftness of this administration? And as you comment on that I couldn't help but think about the current scenario in Syria, where we now have the entry of Putin, we have the question mark about what Iran will do, and whether there is an opportunity to link hands and arms to deliver some kind of reasonable set of circumstances in Syria.

And I think I'll leave it there, but I'm really interested in your perspective about whether -- I think part of what I'm asking is whether you think there is that kind of deftness and nimbleness in this administration?

MR. KALB: You've got three questions there, and then we'll get three on this side, here. Go ahead, please.

MR. RIEDEL: Very quickly. Allen Whiting also wrote another book which is more particularly towards this crisis. He undoubtedly was one of the people that helped cook that State Department letter, and you are right. Kennedy was willing to reach down or help people reach down in the bureaucracy, but I think the real expert he listened to was Galbraith more than anyone else.

And just as a footnote, Galbraith's relationship with his punitive boss, Dean Rusk, was terrible. Galbraith actually wrote a series of short stories while he was Ambassador, and published them under a pseudonym that ridiculed the State Department. I mean they are cutting, obviously only a person who the President was protecting could get away with this kind of behavior.

I don't think though that Galbraith had a role in the writing of the letters, because when you read his diary. And he's very careful in his diary, because the second letter when his diary came out it was classified top secret, and would be classified for another 50 years, after his diary came out. He alludes to it, but there's a sense of kind of shock on his part that he knew Nehru knew he was in trouble, but 12 squadrons of American Fighter Combat Aircraft, I think struck Galbraith's, this is out of proportion, this is too much.

And anyway there is no way we can get 350 combat aircraft and cruise here, on the ground, ready to fight in the kind of timeframe that you are looking at. So, he was definite advisor. I think Nehru, that second letter from Nehru is Nehru's own hand,

written in a panicky environment.

And the trick question, which attempting to get me to say something unkind about the Obama Administration, I see through you Gary. I think there are other Presidents, a few who've managed multiple crisis as well as Kennedy, I think FDR falls into that category, his handling of the Second World War is magisterial, presidential leadership. It's hard to see that in the last 50 years, of something quite, of this caliber of decision-making.

And part of that is also the nature of the event, particularly the Cuban Missile Crisis. If Kennedy had gotten that wrong, we wouldn't be in this room. We wouldn't be here. And that's more clear now, that we've had access to the Soviet archives, and it wasn't even clear then. The Chinese invasion of India didn't have that apocalypse character to it. But these are the two largest countries in the world fighting a war, and while it's now obvious that it was a border war, it was not obvious at the time.

There is a part of Galbraith's memoirs where he says, an Indian politician had come to him on about the 18<sup>th</sup> or 19<sup>th</sup> and said that; she had just been to the Northeast Frontier Agency, and she was reporting that people up there were being told that all of Eastern India was going to be turned over to Pakistan. And Galbraith says to her -- he doesn't identify her -- but do you really think the Communist Chinese would be telling illiterate peasants on the ground, their geo strategic plans for the future? And she -- not identified -- agrees that yeah, she's probably overwhelmed by events.

Well the "she" is Indira Gandhi. She is the only Indian politician who went there at the time, so while he protected her in the diary, you don't have to be Sherlock Holmes to figure out who he's talking to. And it's reflective of the sense of panic that was going on. People actually thought the Chinese might take Calcutta. Now that sounds ridiculous today, but there people who were afraid that that could happen.

JFK-2015/10/13

MR. KALB: You know, we ought to point out, since you have spoken so incredibly highly of the efficiency of the Kennedy Administration. The Kennedy Administration did a number of things in Vietnam that, in retrospect, looks sort of dopey, but let that go. Let that go. Do we have three hands on this side? One, two, three; yes, please.

SPEAKER: At what point did Nehru, who at one time wanted to lead the third world, was it this war that forced him off of that role, and perhaps broke his leadership along with Tito and Nasser of the nonaligned group?

MR. KALB: Thank you. Number two, right there?

SPEAKER: Can you briefly talk about the U.S. position on Tibet from the '50s to '70s especially -- is it a change of policy in the '70s when India sided with the Soviet Union and China joined the camp of U.S. and Pakistan? Thank you.

MR. KALB: And the third hand was back there, yeah.

SPEAKER: Thank you. Yes. I'm really glad that you wrote this book, I've been really interested in this topic since I was a child. My grandfather served in the Indian Army so he has told me a lot about these events, and I think they are very reflective of the geopolitical issues that are going on today. I was just curious since in your book you focused on U.S. relations, and I understand this is more looking at the actual events that happen during this time versus what's going on today. Do you see any similarities? Do you see any changes in the present situation? Because so far there's been a lot of mobilization, but on India's side, compared to China where there's been a lot of mobilization there hasn't been a significant change, or in policy. The policy seems to be very, you know, 50 years old.

MR. KALB: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. Bruce, please?

MR. RIEDEL: I think this war did break Nehru. He was already old. He

came once to the White House during the Kennedy Administration. Since they had already given Ayub Khan, this spectacular dinner at Mount Vernon they had to think of something, you know, at least as good if not better, so they took him to Newport, because Mrs. Kennedy was from Newport, and her family home was there. It's referred to as The Cottage, but if you've ever been in Newport you that their ideas of cottages are the same idea as our idea of cottages.

But Nehru was unusually silent and tired, and he did not respond to conversation. They came to the White House for the State Dinner; somebody forgot to open the flue in the fireplace when they started the fire, the state dining room filled with smoke. It was a disastrous state visit. So, Nehru was already passed his peak performance, but I think the 1962 War with China was really a blow to him. He didn't give up on being leader of the third world, he still aspired to do that, but now he realized that China was going to be his competition and not his friend in that.

Now the Indian Army was in a very difficult situation. The Indian army was equipped with Lee Enfield rifles, leftover from the First World War, if not from the Third Anglo-Afghan War. Now they were fighting Chinese troops who were well-equipped with automatic weapons, many of whose officers had fought in the Korean War.

The Indians fought very, very bravely. Indian troops were often outnumbered, they were always out-equipped, but they fought very, very bravely. And it had an impact on the whole generation of Indian soldiers. One I would highlight to you is Jaswant Singh. Jaswant Singh would go on to be Foreign Minister in the first BJP Government, and a real architect of U.S.-Indian rapprochement. Read his memoirs, he saw the 1962 War as the crucible which shaped modern India. And for him, China, and the humiliation of 1962, was the critical moment.

The 1970s, yes, as I alluded to, this book -- this is not a book about U.S.-

Indian, and U.S.-Pakistan relations. I urge you to read *Avoiding Armageddon*, I tried to write about that in there. The Nixon Administration on India, like on many things, decided that anything that Kennedy had to be wrong, and therefore they were going to go the other way. Richard Nixon visited India many times.

He always felt he was snubbed. And he was. Indira Gandhi was really, really good at figuring out how to snub people, and enjoyed it immensely, and Nixon was one of her favorite targets. And he liked the Pakistanis. But as I said in an odd kind of way, the journey, as it progresses, has brought us to a situation where in 1962, I think is very relevant to a lot of today.

And what do I mean by that? I don't think there's going to be another Indo-China War, I think that's a highly unlikely scenario. I wouldn't be surprised by incidence on the India-China border, but I don't think either one of these countries, sees the territory at stake here as worth going to war over. But they do have an arms race. The Chinese may have a lot of other reasons for their arms race. South China Sea, the United States, Russia, Japan, but India is part of constellation.

For the Indians, China is the part of the constellation. As I said, when China tested nuclear weapons in 1999, Vajpayee's letter to the President was all about China. Pakistan is a secondary consideration, and a consideration because it is an ally of China. When India finally in either 2012 or 2003 -- 2013, I can't remember the exact year, tested its Agni-5 intermediate-range ballistic missile, which for the first time gave India a missile capable of reaching Beijing.

If you read what Indian leaders said at the time, it's abundantly clear that they see themselves in an arms race with Beijing and that for 50 years they had been the loser in that arms race, and that the Agni-5 finally now was an equalizer. That they could nuke Beijing just as China could nuke all of their cities.

And I think that this triangle, I don't think there's a prospect of an India-China War in the future. I would not rule out another India-Pakistan War in the future. And if there is another India-Pakistan War in the future, the question of where the Chinese come in and where the Americans come in will determine, I think, an awful part of the future history.

MR. KALB: We have time for two more questions. I will take one on this side, and one on that side. The young lady right here; and the right is speechless. No. Go ahead, we'll get you next. Okay, you start, you are next. Your answers and then we are in business.

SPEAKER: Hello. My name is Satina, I'm a student at the University of Utah. And this might be a naïve question but it's certainly been on my mind for a quite a while. I'm curious to know why Pakistan and China's have had such a strong alliance for so many years, and in my head, as you explain the turn of events, I wonder why China and Pakistan won't gang up on India, aside, I mean, you mentioned that Pakistan, the Prime Minister had relationship with President Kennedy, where he basically said, he would be looked at as an aggressor, but at the time, you know, the United States was very preoccupied, and the Soviet Union was certainly against, so why didn't Pakistan take advantage?

MR. KALB: Good question. Yes, right here.

SPEAKER: Hi. In 1962 I was a high school student in Calcutta learning how to duck under tables, whenever a plane flew over it. But one thing we learned over the years after that is that what you said, that why did China do what it did? And one reason was of course the Tibet, the Dalai Lama connection, the other was the leadership of the nonaligned world. I was wondering whether your book touches on anything internal in the Chinese political structure. Because this was right after the Great Leap

JFK-2015/10/13

Forward in which millions had died, and Mao's position within the Party, may have been a little shaky according to some accounts. And whether this was one way of Mao and Chou, in particular, to sort of say that, look, we are in charge, and don't mess with us internally.

MR. KALB: Thank you, Gupta.

MR. RIEDEL: I'll flip the order, go right to left. Undoubtedly there were internal Chinese reasons. Mao also was -- I think there was also a Nehru-Mao dynamic. Nehru wanted to lift up Mao to be his equal in leading the third world. I think Mao resented that immensely. He was not Nehru's equal, Nehru, in some of the Chinese literature, in some of the statements they wrote at the time, which we now know were carefully written by Mao himself, or rewritten by Mao himself. Nehru was portrayed as this Anglified Indian who is trying to rebuild the Raj.

Now, you know, I understand that for Indians, that all seems really cockeyed and worse, but I think to a certain degree, Mao who was an incredibly paranoid man, probably fell into some of these conspiracy theories, and it's was a way to outdo Nehru, weaken his -- whatever problems he had at home, secure Tibet, and at the same time, stick it to Kenney and Khrushchev all at the same time. It was a win-win.

Pakistan, I'll divide the question into two parts. Why didn't they do more in 1962? I think the big reason they didn't more in 1962 aside from a very, very American warnings was that they didn't really know China either. Their relationship with the Chinese as in its very infant stages; and I think as Ayub Khan looked at Mao, he was -- he probably was afraid that if he started a second front, the Chinese could stop the first front, and he'd be left hanging out to dry.

By 1965, the relationship is matured enough, that now Ayub Khan thinks that if he starts the war, the Chinese will be there to back him up. And here's what's

interesting about the Chinese-Pakistan relationship, the Chinese and Pakistani statesmen all the time say, that this relationship is taller than the Himalayas, deeper than the Indian Ocean, and it's a all-weather relationship, that Pakistan and China can count on each other.

A careful analysis of Pakistan's position in 1965, 1971, and 1999, the Cargo War, is that at the moment of truth, the Chinese usually say, I'm sorry, but I can't hear you, there's something wrong with the line. Call me back. You know, we'll be back to you sometime in the future. They are strong ally, don't get me wrong. They are critical to the development to the Pakistan Nuclear Weapons Arsenal; but China is not going to sacrifice its national interest for Pakistani objectives. And it's made that clear, I think, over and over again in its history.

MR. KALB: Bruce, thank you very, very much, for taking a story that is more than 50 years old, and making it relevant and interesting. And the name of the book, *JFK's Forgotten Crisis: Tibet, the CIA, and the Sino-Indian War*. Thank you, Bruce for writing it, and for being here.

MR. RIEDEL: Thank you. Thank you so much. (Applause)

\* \* \* \* \*

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2016