

OMA  
329.9535  
COM  
JAN 1966

b 16058641

# ANI NEWS

January 1966

3d.

## UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTION DEMANDS FREEDOM FOR OMAN BY 61 VOTES TO 18

ARMED OCCUPATION  
AND REPRESSION  
MUST END  
—  
WITHDRAW BRITISH  
TROOPS AND FREE  
POLITICAL DETAINEES  
—  
SELF-DETERMINATION  
TO END COLONIALISM  
—  
U THANT AND U.N.  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE  
OF 24 TO HELP IN  
SOLVING THE QUESTION

See inside pages  
for detailed report  
of  
**The Great Debate**

### CO-SPONSORS OF THE RESOLUTION:

Algeria, Burundi, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Ghana, Guinea, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

### The Resolution

#### The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman,

Recalling its resolutions 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 and 1948 (XVIII) of 11 December 1963,

Having heard the statements by the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and by the petitioners,

Deeply concerned with the serious situation arising from colonial policies and foreign intervention by the United Kingdom in the Territory,

1. Takes note of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman and expresses appreciation to the Committee for its efforts;

2. Deplores the attitude of the Government of the United Kingdom and the authorities in the Territory for refusing to co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee and for not facilitating its visit to the Territory;

3. Recognizes the inalienable right of the people of the Territory as a whole to self-determination and independence in accordance with their freely expressed wishes;

4. Considers that the colonial presence of the United Kingdom in its various forms prevents the people of the Territory from exercising their rights to self-determination and independence;

5. Calls upon the United Kingdom Government to effect immediately the implementation in the Territory of the following:

(a) Cessation of all repressive actions against the people of the Territory;

(b) Withdrawal of British troops;

(c) Release of political prisoners and political detainees and the return of the political exiles to the Territory;

(d) Elimination of British domination in any form;

6. Invites the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to examine the situation in this Territory;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to take, in consultation with the Special Committee, appropriate measures for the implementation of this resolution and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty first session.



## editorial

### OMANI PEOPLE'S MORAL VICTORY

The United Nations resolution demanding Omani independence represents a diplomatic victory for the Omani people and those who support their just cause. Although by a General Assembly decision this resolution required only a simple majority, it in fact obtained a majority of over three-quarters, thus showing that the Assembly overwhelmingly rejected British Government claims and approved the Omani people's lawful rights. The British Government was left in an isolated position, being supported only by a few countries like its NATO allies and South Africa. At last the rigid censorship by which it hides Omani events from world opinion is broken.

Furthermore, the resolution is a strong one. It recognises the Oman question as a colonial one, thus finally refuting the Government's story that the quailing Sultan of Muscat is an "independent" ruler. It is now internationally understood that Oman is under British military occupation, which denies the people their democratic rights. Thus it is fitting that the question should be examined by the Special Committee of 24 whose function is concerned with the ending of colonialism in all its forms. The resolution also makes the question a concern of the Secretary General, thus ensuring action on the highest levels.

According to international law, this resolution is absolutely binding, and the British Government is morally obliged to obey what it lays down. However it is well known that the United Nations cannot force obedience to its resolutions; and the British Government has defied them in the past (over Aden) thus following the unfortunate example of South Africa. Indeed, the whole military occupation of Oman is in complete violation of all international legal principles.

There are positive benefits from the U.N.'s understanding of the Omani question, and its just stand for human rights. The matter is now before world attention, and the elaborate fabric with which successive Governments, Conservative and Labour, camouflaged the truth is swept away. Also, the Omani people can be encouraged that the rest of the world has not forgotten them or neglected their sacrifices on behalf of freedom. But it is realistic to recognise that this resolution can only be a moral victory as long as the occupying power refuses to honour the obligations of international law.

This raises the whole question of Britain's relationship with the U.N. The latter can only further peace and human rights if its members respect those ideals. The opportunist policy of successive British Governments threatens to destroy those ideals and render the U.N. like the League of Nations; a bright hope shattered by imperialist greed. It is up to us in Britain to see that our Government reverses its militarist policy, and honours this resolution's reasonable demands.

### THE SILENCE OF DEFEAT

It is remarkable how silent the British Press has been about the U.N. resolution on Oman. The Times, which boasts of objectivity, gave it two tiny unobtrusive paragraphs. The Express claimed there are only 36 British soldiers occupying Oman, conveniently forgetting the 1,000 stationed at Sharjah, the far larger number in Masira base, and all the British Army and RAF units in some 20 other military installations throughout the country. But most British papers did not report either the resolution or the debate which preceded it.

We frequently hear newspapers self-righteously proclaiming their duty to tell the public the truth. Does truth not matter in so important an event as the U.N.'s condemnation of the Government for colonial repression of a small defenseless people? There are loud slogans about this country's freedom of the Press. Does this freedom go by the board when it threatens vested business interests on which the Press depends for advertising revenue, and which are plundering the Omani people's oil? Let us stop all this hypocrisy about freedom and responsibility of the Press. Let us admit that the Press in this country is servile and inaccurate because it is controlled by monopoly capitalism.


## "TRUCIAL" COAST MUST BE FREED, DECLARES U.N.

The U.N. resolution calls for the liberation of the "whole historic area of Oman, which includes the Imamate of Oman, Muscat and the Trucial Shaikhdoms", the Delegate of the Syrian Arab Republic Mr. Ihsan Marrache told the Fourth Committee. He stated this as a sponsor in reply to a question by Mr. Lian, Delegate of Burma, on the meaning of the term "the Territory as a whole" in para. 3 of the resolution. The U.N. passed the resolution on the understanding of this explanation, thereby affirming the right of the people of the Trucial Coast to self-determination to restore Oman's historic unity.

### U.K. Manoeuvre Rebuffed

The Trucial Shaikhdoms of the North Oman Coast were separated from the rest of Oman by Britain in 1820. The British Delegate attempted to prevent inclusion of this area under the Oman item by denying that it was a part of Oman. The passing of the resolution thus represents a clear rejection of his claim. The Trucial Coast includes the town of Sharjah whose Shaikh, Saqar Al Qasimi, was overthrown and deported in June 1965 by the occupation authorities, for his opposition to their policies. Mr. Robert Edwards, Chairman of the Committee for the Rights of Oman, protested strongly to the Government over this action.

The Committee for the Rights of Oman has always maintained that, as Oman was divided by imperialism, the division was contrary to the popular will. The Committee has consistently demanded self-determination for the whole Omani area.



**Publishing Co.**  
(T.U.)  
14-16 Cowcross Street, London E.C.1  
CLErkenwell 3924

Your own  
Typescripts, Manuscripts  
Paste-ups and Illustrations  
printed economically

# END BRITISH AGGRESSION, SAYS TALIB

## UK Attacks U.N. Report

### Militarist Policy and Greed for Oil Led to Colonialism

Shaikh Talib Ibn Ali, Omani Representative, in his statement to the U.N. Fourth Committee, outlined the Omani people's demands for the end of British colonialist aggression against them, and declared that the British Government is occupying Oman in order to maintain its oil interests and strategic bases. He was speaking on behalf of the three man Omani Delegation at the U.N., led by Shaikh Sulaiman Ibn Hinyar and also including Mr. Faissal.

Shaikh Talib pointed out that Oman had been one country before it was divided by imperialism. One part of it, the Imamate, had remained independent of British control until it was invaded in 1955.

Since the situation had not been clear to the U.N., the Omani people had welcomed the Ad Hoc Committee's investigation. Shaikh Talib said the Committee "deserved praise for the energy it had devoted to the service of humanity and to the restoration of peace and justice in Oman". The report provided ample evidence that justice was on the Omani people's side. It confirmed that the Sultan survived only with British backing.

### Policy of Humiliation

British imperialism, Shaikh Talib stated, "is based on the humiliation of peoples for the sake of British interests". In Rhodesia for example it did not oust the Smith regime, as it was really "a British Government in the heart of Africa". It was the only British colony which, because of its white minority, was entrusted with internal self-government.

The British Delegate interrupted here and asked that Shaikh Talib should keep to the subject of Oman. The Delegates of Saudi Arabia and Liberia pointed out that he was making a valid analogy, and should be allowed to continue.

Shaikh Talib stated that the British Government was keeping the puppet Sultan in power, protecting him from the whole Omani people even including his own family. Although it had thus gained many of its aims of oil and strategy by repression, it failed to destroy the Omanis' determination to fight for freedom.

To further peace and justice, the U.N. should adopt the following decisions: "1) to condemn British aggression against the State of Oman 2) to work for an immediate end of that aggression, 3) to obtain a guarantee it would not be repeated, 4) to seek removal of the British presence in Oman in order that the lawful aspirations of the people to self-determination and freedom could be fulfilled, 5) to secure the release of all political prisoners."

### Quisling Council and Federal Plan Revealed Island Bases to Replace Aden in Imperial Regrouping

Mr. Faris Glubb, Secretary of the Committee for the Rights of Oman, in a statement to the U.N. Fourth Committee, revealed details of plans to maintain British Government control over the Omani people. These plans include regroupment of military bases, the establishment of an Eastern Arabian Federation, and a reorganisation of the puppet Sultan of Muscat's regime.

The Eastern Arabian Federation is planned to comprise the "Trucial" Oman coast with possibly Bahrain and Qatar. "Such a Federation would be one of those retrograde unions of which Whitehall is so fond, like the Central African or South Arabian federations, aimed at preserving colonial domination and the rule of a privileged minority and preventing the emergence of democratic ideas.

"British imperialism is planning, not a retreat from Arabia, but a strategic regrouping," Mr. Glubb declared. "To this end, the occupation forces need time to transfer themselves from Aden to other more tenable bases from which they are less likely to be thrown out", like the islands of Sokotra off Hadramaut and Masira off Oman. These bases are now being massively expanded and, being easily defensible, "they would more than compensate the British Government for the loss of Aden, a far less advantageous base."

Mr. Glubb condemned the British Government's denial, through the Sultan of Muscat, of the U.N. Ad Hoc Committee's entry to Oman. Many factors proved that the British Government really ruled Oman, and used the Sultan for its purposes. It plans "when an opportune moment occurs, to remove the present Sultan

Mr. Peter Hope, British Delegate, opened the debate by claiming that Oman was not a colonial question and that the puppet Sultan was an "independent sovereign". Much of his speech was an attack on the report of the U.N. Ad Hoc Committee, which he claimed was not authoritative as the Committee had not visited Oman. Since the reason for this was that the occupation authorities had denied it entry, Mr. Hope's argument was not generally regarded as valid.

Mr. Hope also leaned heavily on the report of U.N. Representative Mr. de Ribbing, who in 1963 was given a conducted tour of Oman by the occupation authorities. But Mr. de Ribbing himself honestly admitted the deficiencies of his report, and the Ad Hoc Committee was formed to make a more complete study.

and replace him with his son Qabus, who would at the present stage be a far more useful instrument... A council will be nominated to rule with him. While this is intended to give an appearance of more representative government, the council would in fact consist of hand-picked people on whom the British authorities can rely." This move is a plot to deceive world opinion.

The occupation authorities were guilty of serious atrocities against political prisoners, especially in Fort Jalali dungeons, where Zahir Ibn Abdullah had been electrically tortured, and many other prisoners had suffered other tortures with mechanical equipment. Denials of such facts carried no conviction, since the British occupation allowed no impartial authority to inspect the prison. Mr. Glubb challenged the British Government to allow inspection by an international, impartial body; "only thus can it be shown whether it is I or they who speak the truth in this matter". Mr. Glubb asked why the British Government is actively preserving the slave trade "by maintaining in power rulers like the Sultan of Muscat and the Shaikh of Qatar who keep their own slave retinues." The British delegate kept an embarrassed silence on this.

### American People Greet Omani Revolution

A reception at Yonkers, N.Y., was held for the Omani Delegation, attended by the Mayor of that town who gave an address of welcome. It was arranged by Miss Esther Brown, an American supporter of the Omani people. Thus despite the U.S. Government's opposition to the resolution on Oman, the American people nobly showed their devotion to democracy.

## B.P. SENT OMANI OIL TO SMITH

The Delegate of Cuba in the Fourth Committee, Dra. Campos, pointed out in her statement in the Oman debate that British Petroleum sent a large consignment of oil from the Omani area of Abu Dhabi to the Smith regime in Rhodesia. This was a direct example of how British imperialism in Oman influences events in Africa.

Quoting the New York Times, Dra. Campos stated that B.P. "a company of which more than 50% belonged to the British Government, transported to Africa 12,000 tons of petroleum", destined for Umtali Refinery in Rhodesia, "a refinery which is the property of British Petroleum Co. and six other oil companies. This is the first consignment of petroleum for Rhodesia since the racists declared their so-called independence on 11 November last. And the petroleum came from the Persian Gulf, from the so-called State of Abu Dhabi, a dismembered part of Omani territory.

"This shows us the character of the so-called governments, like that of the Sultan of Muscat. Abu Dhabi has special relations by virtue of treaties, according to the colonialist terminology which pretends to conceal subjugation." Its external affairs are placed under Britain, whose Political Agent there is Col. Sir John Boustead KBE, CMG, DSO, MC.

## Threat to All Africa

Mr. El Hadi, Delegate of Sudan, warned that the British occupation of Oman was a threat to all Africa. The British Government wanted an oil bearing area which it could dominate politically, and whose oil it could use as it pleased, to support racist regimes in defiance of U.N. resolutions. This showed that the struggle against imperialism "is one and indivisible; its fronts are many". Mr. El Hadi praised the Committee for the Rights of Oman and M.P.s who had raised the issue in the Commons, notably Mr. R. Edwards, Mr. W. Yates Mr. W. Hamling and Mr. C. Jackson.

It is true that on 17 December the Government finally announced its compliance with the oil embargo. But by then it had already sent Smith considerable supplies of oil through B.P. So the sincerity of this move is, to say the least, open to doubt.

## The Sultan a Vassal

clearly "that the United Kingdom Government was deeply involved in the domestic policies and affairs of the people of the territory. That had led to confusion and the loss of human life and destruction of property and had created a serious refugee problem." His delegation agreed "that the British presence, in any form, must come to an end" and that "the right of self-determination, the withdrawal of British troops, the release of political prisoners, and the payment of compensation to the people of Oman" must be the basis of a solution. The refugees of Oman "have the right to live in peace in their own country without fear of being imprisoned or killed for asserting their rights".

Kenyan Delegate Mr. Kisaka, as a co-sponsor of the resolution, said the facts "amply demonstrated that the Sultan of Muscat and Oman was a vassal of the United Kingdom and that his rule rested only on the presence of United Kingdom forces in the country. Whether the Sultan remained on his shaky throne or was replaced by his son, Oman was still a Non-Self-Governing Territory and the people of Oman were being denied their right to self-determination and independence by the U.K.'s military intervention and imperialist policies." Britishers dominated the Omani civil service "and there was no indication that they intended to give up their lucrative jobs to make way for Omanis".

## STORMY ENDING TO TENSE DEBATE

### U.K. Delegate's Outburst of Personal Abuse

The Fourth Committee debate on Oman reached a stormy climax on 15 December, with a violent speech by Mr. Hope, U.K. Delegate, full of personal abuse against Shaikh Talib Ibn Ali of the Oman Delegation and Mr. Farris Glubb of the Committee for the Rights of Oman. The Fourth Committee passed the resolution by 55 votes to 15 with 26 abstentions. The Assembly then passed it by 61 votes to 18 with 32 abstentions.

Mr. Hope accused Shaikh Talib of being an "unsuccessful rebel" whose "general history" made him incapable of carrying out a reform programme. Shaikh Talib replied that the revolution which he served was still not successful simply because of massive British repression. Of reforms, he said, "I want Mr. Hope to know that I am an individual of the Omani people, and that it is the people by concerted action who bring about these achievements." But he could not implement anything like "the reforms of destruction and devastation caused by the British forces in Oman's towns and villages." Shaikh Talib added that out of respect for the United Nations, he would not reply in the same tone as Mr. Hope.

Mr. Glubb said Shaikh Talib was a man "who for ten years has fought on undaunted for the liberty of his people. I am proud to know this man, proud to work with him, and the Omani people are proud that he is a

## Colonial Question

son of their homeland and a faithful servant of their cause." Mr. Hope had accused Mr. Glubb of lying. Mr. Glubb asked why, then, Mr. Hope "was unable to give a proper refutation of anything contained in either Shaikh Talib's speech or mine, and so he resorted to personal abuse. I do not blame him for this, since I know he has no other answer to the undeniable facts which we have placed before this distinguished Committee."

It was notable in this debate that many delegations stressed the problem's colonial nature. There had been confusion on this in past years due to the fact that this colonialism was disguised by a facade of treaties establishing the Sultan of Muscat's fictional "independence".

Nigerian Delegate Alhaji Aminu Kano stated that the evidence showed

Continued in column 3.

## Brilliant Victory

Trinidad and Tobago Delegate Mr. Donaldson stated in the Assembly that his delegation "views colonialism as a question of fact, and not merely of law and constitution". It would vote for the resolution, since "all the outward trappings of a colonial territory seemed to exist".

Dr. Al-Daoud, Delegate of Iraq, proposed that since the question is colonial, the resolution needed only a simple majority, not two thirds. The Assembly agreed by 63 votes to 37 with 12 abstentions. This gave a brilliant psychological victory, as the resolution finally passed by a far greater majority than it needed. Paragraphs 6 and 7, voted separately, passed by 57 votes to 22 with 32 abstentions.

The Oman Question & the UN. Pamphlet price 1/6, on the Ad Hoc Committee's Report. Obtainable from Omani News.

Published and edited by F. Glubb and A. Deane at 14-16 Cowcross St, E.C.1