



## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Washington, D.C. 20520

19857

→ INC  
OCT 9 1970~~SECRET~~

TO: The Secretary  
THROUGH: S/S  
FROM: NEA - Joseph J. Sisco  
SUBJECT: U. S. Sale of Military Equipment to Pakistan -  
INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

The Indians have now protested our decision to sell a limited quantity of military equipment to Pakistan, both in New Delhi and in Washington. They have also issued a very starchy public statement indicating their dissatisfaction with our explanations for the sale. The Pakistanis are pleased that we have brought this matter to a conclusion and are cooperating with us closely and discreetly in handling it. President Yahya has publicly announced his plans to dine at the White House October 24 and have a bilateral meeting with the President in Washington.

In formal oral presentations in New Delhi and Washington October 7 and 8, the Indians conveyed their "strong protest and serious misgivings about our decision." They were careful to say, however, that they meant this in a "friendly spirit." The Indian spokesmen (Acting Foreign Secretary in Delhi - Indian Minister in Washington) warned of "the most adverse and violent reaction of Indian public opinion" and expressed concern about the political pressures which our decision would place on Mrs. Gandhi's Government. They expressed fear that our sale might seriously affect India-Pakistan negotiations which have been showing some signs of progress. They took serious exception to the rationale for our sale which had been previously conveyed to them. They explained that Pakistan was arming only against India. Therefore, they said the GOI must

SECRET

GROUP 3

Downgraded at 12-year intervals;  
not automatically declassified.

MICROFILMED  
BY S/S: CMS

DECLASSIFIED  
PA/HO, Department of State  
E.O. 12958, as amended  
June 9, 2005

(10)

take an extremely serious view of any addition to Pakistan's armed strength. They claimed that India had expressed similar views with the same force to the Soviet Union about its supply to Pakistan and that the Soviet Union had reacted positively to this warning.

On October 8, the Indians issued a press statement announcing their protest and indicating that they were not satisfied with U. S. explanations for the sale. The statement alleged that our decision was against the interest of peace in South Asia. It said "the resumption of inflow of arms" to Pakistan, which has committed aggression against India three times, is of grave concern; Pakistan is armed only against India. The statement said that Pakistan used U. S. arms against India in 1965 despite U. S. assurances, and the new U. S. special supply "is not even subject to any such assurances."

While we recognize that because of internal political requirements the GOI had to publicly criticize our sale, we believe their statement goes far beyond what was necessary. They have failed to take into consideration: (1) the limited nature of the sale; (2) that the sale was a one-time exception to our embargo which remains in effect; (3) that we are selling primarily replacements or unsophisticated equipment; (4) that we are not selling tanks. To the contrary, this statement incorrectly refers to the "resumption of inflow of arms" and is likely to provoke additional public reaction rather than control it. Furthermore, the Government of India has reacted much more strenuously to our sale offer than it did to the decisions of the Soviets and the French to supply much larger quantities of military equipment to Pakistan. We have told the Indians here of our views on their statement and instructed Embassy Delhi to express similar serious concern about it.

Meanwhile, we are proceeding to discuss with the Pakistanis arrangements for carrying out our sales offer, a subject which President Yahya will probably raise in general terms with President Nixon during their bilateral talks.

Clearances:

NEA/PAF - Mr. Spengler

NEA - Mr Van Hollen *CVH*

cc: U, J, C

NEA/INC:DTSchneider:jlb:am  
10/9/70 x22141

DECLASSIFIED  
PA/HO, Department of State  
E.O. 12958, as amended  
June 9, 2005