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Your Excellency,

You will be aware that in the course of the discussion of the question of Oman during the Seventeenth Session of the General Assembly my delegation made a statement on December 11 to the effect that the Sultan of Muscat and Oman, while preserving his position that he did not recognize the right of the General Assembly to discuss the internal affairs of his country and on the understanding that the General Assembly did not take any formal action at that stage, was prepared to invite on a personal basis a representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to visit the Sultanate during the coming year to obtain first-hand information as to the situation there.

Since the Assembly decided to take no action, I have now

His Excellency,

U Thant,

Secretary-General,
United Nations,
New York, N.Y.
have now been instructed on the Sultan’s behalf to convey his invitation to Your Excellency to nominate a personal representative to visit the Sultanate for the purposes described in the statement of my delegation. I am to express the hope that Your Excellency will feel able to accept this invitation and I shall of course be at Your Excellency’s disposal at any time for further discussion of the matter.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurance of my highest consideration.

(P. Dean)
The Secretary-General

8 January 1963

J. Van Wyk

CONFIDENTIAL

Question of Oman

1. Mr. Colin Crowe, speaking for the U.K. at the 1131st meeting of the General Assembly on the Question of Oman, took the floor prior to the vote on a draft resolution which had passed the Special Committee by 41 to 13 votes with 36 abstentions. That draft resolution called for the recognition of the right of the people of Oman to self-determination and independence, for the withdrawal of foreign forces, and for the parties to settle peacefully their differences with a view to restore normal conditions in Oman.

2. The significant part of Mr. Crowe's statement was:

"I am now authorized to state, on behalf of the Sultan of Muscat and Oman, that, while preserving his position, which has already been conveyed by his telegram to you, Mr. President, he does not recognize the right of the General Assembly to discuss the internal affairs of his country and, on the understanding that the General Assembly does not take any formal action at this stage, he is prepared to invite on a personal basis a representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to visit the Sultanate during the coming year to obtain first-hand information as to the situation there."

3. Subsequently, the resolution failed to obtain the two-thirds majority.

4. Comments made by the representatives of Dahomey, Iran, Greece, Chile and Turkey during the short discussion on this matter in the plenary session indicated a genuine concern about lack of impartial information on the situation in Oman. During the discussion in the Special Committee the representatives of Chile and Peru expressed their bewilderment about conflicting statements made by the representatives of the U.K. and the Arab Governments. I have attached as an annex a list of specific questions raised by the representatives of Chile and Peru which could be useful as a guideline for the Representative during his assignment.
5. Sir Patrick Dean's letter emphasizes the fact that the main purpose of the Representative would be to obtain first-hand information as to the situation there. The U.K. seems to define the task of the personal Representative in a narrow way. It should be noted that during the debate a number of accusations were directed against the British Government such as the presence of British troops, the suppression of a national movement, the denial of the population to self-determination. All these allegations were denied by the U.K. and undoubtedly they expect the Representative to look for himself as to the facts on these points.

6. The Arab Governments' on the other hand have presented this matter up as a question of colonialism, as a violation of the principle of self-determination, as an example of oppression by a foreign power. They have paraded tried to justify the existence of a separate state of Oman which they claim as had a history of some 1,200 years; they have advanced historical and legal arguments in order to demonstrate its existence. Undoubtedly, as soon as they hear about the appointment of a Representative they will expect him to consider these arguments. They probably will expect the Representative to take cognizance of their views and will attempt to explain to him their points; they may extend invitations to the Representative to see them, to call on the late, who is now residing in Saudi Arabia and to obtain views from other "nationalistic" elements.

7. The Representative, therefore, as soon as you have agreed to appoint him should discuss his terms of reference in some detail with you before he starts out on his assignment. A decision should be made if he will limit himself to what the British and the Sultan consider to be his task. It should be realized that it was the Sultan who formally extended the invitation.

8. I will prepare a dossier with the records of the Special Committee on this matter and other relevant facts as they are available here. The Representative will then be in a position to discuss with the scope of his assignment.

9. The selection of the particular individual for this assignment should be based on such factors as complete objectivity and integrity, a general understanding of the problems of the area and adaptability in order to cope with the unusual factors which will come up during his visit to this "exotic" part of the Arabian Peninsula. Undoubtedly, the

\[ A \text{ possible way out of the dilemma may be a combination of } \text{a "fact finding tour", which should be arranged as soon as possible in order to avoid undue publicity and possible disturbances in the area, and, for instance, the use of a questionnaire to be sent to the Arab Governments' covering some of the wider issues which have come up during the debate on the Oman Question. } \]
Representative will need full cooperation from the Nascent authorities so that he can obtain information on the spot without being hampered in his movements in Oman. He will also need some staff help during this period.

10. I believe it is not too early to consider at this stage the financial arrangements. There is no formal resolution authorizing the Secretary-General to perform this task and, therefore, no budgetary has been made. I doubt it very much if it would be appropriate to ask the provision of $2,000,000, for unforeseen and extra-ordinary expenses. This would require either a certification by you that the expenses are used for the maintenance of peace and security or concurrence by the Advisory Committee. I hope that in view of the intervention by the U.K. we can assure that they will underwrite the costs of this Mission. This particular matter should be investigated and a decision should be made in the near future.

11. If you agree with the points outlined above, I will prepare a formal draft reply from you to Sir Patrick's letter. If it is your decision to appoint a particular individual, you will wish to extend a formal invitation to him at the earliest moment possible, and the Office of Personnel should be informed so that the necessary arrangements can be made.
Mr. Bernstein of Chile raised the following eight questions to which there were no clear answers:

1. Why did the Sultan of Muscat and Oman not send a representative to the Assembly to define his case? Was it because he was not independent or because he wished to give complete freedom of action to his "very capable and efficient defenders?"

2. Was Talib ben Ali, who pleaded the case of Oman for the Special Committee, a representative of Oman or a rebel?

3. Were Oman and Muscat a single state or two separate entities?

4. Was the principle of self-determination at issue or was it a matter of the dismemberment of a sovereign state?

5. Was the Treaty of Sib an international treaty between two sovereign independent states or was it only an agreement between the Government of the Sultan and Omani tribal chiefs concerning certain internal matters.

   *Note: Mr. Bernstein stated it has some characteristics of an international treaty, but it was important to know whether the two parties to the treaty had been sovereign at that time.*

6. What happened during 1957 in Oman? Was there intervention in the domestic affairs of Oman prior to the introduction of U.K. troops?

7. Are there still U.K. troops at the present time?

8. What is the present situation prevailing in Oman? Is there oppression and are inhabitants fighting foreign troops or does peace exist?

   *Mr. Nautua, from Peru, added some questions of his own.*

   1. Were U.K. troops in the Sultanate at the request of that state?

   2. What is the extent of the rebel movement in Oman? Do rebel forces control any part of the territory (in case they do they automatically acquire a status of their own.)
TO:  The Secretary-General

DATE:  2 January 1963

FROM:  J. Van Wyk

SUBJECT: Question of Oman

1. Mr. Colin Crowe, speaking for the U.K., at the 1191st meeting of the General Assembly on the Question of Oman, took the floor prior to the vote on a draft resolution which had passed the Special Committee by 41 to 12 votes with 25 abstentions. That draft resolution called for the recognition of the right of the people of Oman to self-determination and independence, for the withdrawal of foreign forces and for the parties to settle peacefully their differences with a view to restore normal conditions in Oman.

2. The significant part of Mr. Crowe's statement was:

"I am now authorized to state, on behalf of the Sultan of Muscat and Oman, that, while preserving his position, which has already been conveyed by his telegram to you, Mr. President, he does not recognize the right of the General Assembly to discuss the internal affairs of his country and, on the understanding that the General Assembly does not take any formal action at this stage, he is prepared to invite on a personal basis a representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to visit the Sultanate during the coming year to obtain first hand information as to the situation there."

3. Subsequently, the resolution failed to obtain the two-thirds majority.

4. Comments made by the representatives of Lebanon, Iraq, Greece, Chile and Turkey during the short discussion on this matter in the plenary session indicated a genuine concern about lack of impartial information on the situation in Oman. During the discussion in the Special Committee the representatives of Chile and Peru expressed their bewilderment about conflicting statements made by the representatives of the U.K. and the Arab Governments. I have attached as an annex a list of specific questions raised by the representatives of Chile and Peru which could be useful as a guideline for the Representative during his assignment.
6. The U.N. Governments, on the other hand, have presented this matter up as a question of recognition, as a violation of the principle of self-determination, as an example of oppression by a foreign power. They have, for example, tried to present the existence of a separate state of Iraq which has existed as a separate entity for over 1,400 years, and has a very long historical and legal argument in order to demonstrate its existence. Doubtfully, we see that they have tried to consider the appointment of a representative to look into the details in order to consider these arguments. They are trying to support the representative to take advantage of their points and to make decisions in order to consider these arguments. They are making the representative to take advantage of their points and to make decisions in order to consider these arguments.

7. The representative, therefore, as soon as he has been given an account on how to implement the decisions of the Security Council, he can proceed to make a decision on the assignment. A decision should be made to the best of his ability. It is certainly to be noticed that it was the British who practically extended the invitation.

8. I will prepare a document with the records of the reaction of the Government on this matter and other relevant matters as they are available here. The representative will be in a position to discuss with the King of his assignment.

9. The selection of the particular individual for this assignment should be based on many factors as complete ability, knowledge, a general understanding of the problems of the area and understanding in order to cope with the unusual factors which will arise during his visit to this particular part of the Arabian Peninsula. Additionally, the possible way out of the dilemma may be a combination of a visit to the Western tour, which should be arranged as soon as possible in order to make sure that the problem and potential outcomes in the area, due to the status of the representative, is covered as the delegate who is responsible during this visit to the Western tour.
Representative will need full cooperation from the nearest authorities so that he can obtain information on the spot without being hampered in his movements in Qatar. He will also need some staff help during this period.

10. I believe it is not too early to consider at this stage the financial arrangements. There is no formal resolution authorizing the Secretary-General to perform this task and, therefore, no budgetary has been made. I doubt it very much if it would be appropriate to ask the provision of $2,000,000 for expenses and extraordinary expenses. This would require either a certification by you that the expenses are used for the maintenance of peace and security or concurrence by the Advisory Committee. I hope that in view of the intervention by the U.K. we can assume that they will underwrite the costs of this Mission. This particular matter should be investigated and a decision should be made in the near future.

11. If you agree with the points outlined above, I will prepare a formal draft reply from you to Sir Patrick's letter. If it be your decision to appoint a particular individual, you will wish to extend a formal invitation to him at the earliest possible moment, and the Office of Personnel should be informed so that the necessary arrangements can be made.
Mr. Bernstein of Chile raised the following eight questions to which there were no clear answers:

1. Why did the Sultan of Muscat and Oman not send a representative to the Assembly to define his case? Was it because he was not independent or because he wished to give complete freedom of action to his "very capable and efficient defenders?"

2. Was Talib ben Ali, who pleaded the case of Oman for the Special Committee, a representative of Oman or a rebel?

3. Were Oman and Muscat a single state or two separate entities?

4. Was the principle of self-determination at issue or was it a matter of the dismemberment of a sovereign state?

5. Was the Treaty of Shib an international treaty between two sovereign independent states or was it only an agreement between the Government of the Sultan and Oman tribal chiefs concerning certain internal matters.

Note: Mr. Bernstein stated it has some characteristics of an international treaty, but it was important to know whether the two parties to the treaty had been sovereign at that time.

6. What happened during 1937 in Oman? Was there intervention in the domestic affairs of Oman prior to the introduction of U.K. troops?

7. Are there still U.K. troops at the present time?

8. What is the present situation prevailing in Oman? Is there oppression and are inhabitants fighting foreign troops or does peace exist?

Mr. Mauritua, from Fory, added some questions of his own.

1. Were U.K. troops in the Sultanate at the request of that state?

2. What is the extent of the rebel movement in Oman; do rebel forces control any part of the territory (in case they do they automatically acquire a status of their own.)
X Cable from Hassouna, S.G. of Arab Ligue to S.G.

I have learned that the U.K. Government proposes to have your representative go to Oman to inquire into the real situation and aspirations of the people of Oman. You will certainly agree with me that to guarantee sincerity of the inquiry, a representative of the Imam Ghaleb Ibn Aly should accompany your delegate to facilitate his task, it being understood that the UN will guarantee his security, and secondly, that the UN will take necessary measures so that the Oman population can express their opinion without pressure nor constraint nor intimidation nor fear of reprisals. Being convinced that Your Excellency will accept these suggestions and thanking you in advance, I am...
S. E. M. Uthant

Apprends que Gouvernement britannique propose charger Déléguée de la Part Votre Excellence se rendre Oman pour enquêter sur véritable situation et aspirations Peuple omânite stop vous conviendrait certainement avec moi que pour garantir sincerité enquête il y aurait lieu premièrement

P2/50

Un représentant de la Part Imam Ghaler Ibn Aly accompagnerait votre Délégué afin faciliter sa tâche étant entendu que les Nations Unies lui garantiront sa sécurité et devenir nombreuses Nations Unies prendront dispositions nécessaires afin que populations omânites puissent exprimer leur opinion sans pression ni contrainte ni intimidation ni grancient de

P3/28

Represseailles stop persuade que votre Excellence acceptera cette suggestion et vous en remerciant d'avance vous prie agréer assurances très haute considération

Abdel Khalek Hassouna
Secrétaire général Ligue Arabe

Coll. S. E. M. Uthant

RC25 TC285 ET26/6137
Cairo 128 14 1950 ETAT HAW GOVT P1/50

ETAT

S. E. M. Uthant Secrétaire général Nations Unies New York
To: Secretary-General
From: Abdel Khalek Hassouna, Secretary-General, Arab League (Cairo)
Date: 14 January 1963

I learn that the British Government suggests that you should send a representative to Oman to enquire into the real situation and aspirations of the Omani people. You will undoubtedly agree with me that in order to guarantee the honesty of the investigation it would be advisable, first, that a representative for the Imam Ghaleb Ibn Aly should accompany your representative in order to assist him in his task on the understanding that the United Nations would guarantee his safety and, secondly, that the United Nations should make the necessary arrangements so that the Omani people may express their views without pressure, coercion, intimidation or fear of reprisals. In the belief that you will accept this suggestion, thanking you in anticipation, I beg you to accept the assurances of my very high consideration.
To: Secretary-General
From: Abdel Khalek Hassouna, Secretary-General, Arab League (Cairo)
Date: 14 January 1963

I learn that the British Government suggests that you should send a representative to Oman to enquire into the real situation and aspirations of the Omani people. You will undoubtedly agree with me that in order to guarantee the honesty of the investigation it would be advisable, first, that a representative of the Imam Ghaleb Ibn Aly should accompany your representative in order to assist him in his task on the understanding that the United Nations would guarantee his safety and, secondly, that the United Nations should make the necessary arrangements so that the Omani people may express their views without pressure, coercion, intimidation or fear of reprisals. In the belief that you will accept this suggestion, I beg you to accept the assurances of my very high consideration.
To: Secretary-General
From: Taleb Ben Ali (Cairo)
Date: 14 January 1963

Your Excellency is aware that the Omani delegation to the seventeenth session approved in principle the proposal to send a representative to Oman to seek information on the wishes and aspirations of the Omani people. This proposal emanating from the United Kingdom whose forces are combating the aspirations of the fighting people of Oman conceals a sinister intention designed to mislead the United Nations, to confuse public opinion and to give a picture of the situation completely different from that which prevails in the country which is subject to arbitrary measures muzzling Omani opinion and thwarting its legitimate national aspirations. I therefore have the honour to suggest the following in order to obstruct the above-mentioned intentions and to permit your envoy to find out the truth of the situation. First, a representative acting for Imam Ghaleb Ben Ali should accompany your delegate in order to facilitate his task on the understanding that the United Nations will guarantee his safety. Secondly, the United Nations should take the necessary measures to enable the Omani people to express their views without pressure, coercion, intimidation or fear of reprisals. With my thanks in anticipation I beg you, Sir, to accept the expression of my very high consideration.

Taleb Ben Ali, head of delegation of Imamate of Oman to the seventeenth session of the United Nations General Assembly.
TO: Secretary-General
FROM: Taleb Ben Ali (Cairo)
DATE: 14 January 1963

Your Excellency is aware that the Omani delegation to the seventeenth session approved in principle the proposal to send a representative to Oman to seek information on the wishes and aspirations of the Omani people. This proposal emanating from the United Kingdom whose forces are combating the aspirations of the fighting people of Oman conceals a sinister intention designed to mislead the United Nations, to confuse public opinion and to give a picture of the situation completely different from that which prevails in the country which is subject to arbitrary measures muzzling Omani opinion and thwarting its legitimate national aspirations. I therefore have the honour to suggest the following in order to obstruct the above-mentioned intentions and to permit your envoy to find out the truth of the situation. First, a representative acting for Imam Ghaleb Ben Ali should accompany your delegate in order to facilitate his task on the understanding that the United Nations will guarantee his safety. Secondly, the United Nations should take the necessary measures to enable the Omani people to express their views without pressure, coercion, intimidation or fear of reprisals. With my thanks in anticipation I beg you, Sir, to accept the expression of my very high consideration.

Taleb Ben Ali, head of delegation of Imamate of Oman to the seventeenth session of the United Nations General Assembly.
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S E M UTANT SECRETAIRE GENERAL NATIONS UNIES NEW YORK

VOTRE EXCELLENCE AU COURANT QUE DELEGATION OHAN PRES
DE SEPTEMBRE NATION A APPROUVE PRINCIPE PROPOSITION
RELATIVE ENVOY DELEGUE OHAN POUR SE DOCUMENTER SUR
DEMENTS ET ASPIRATIONS PEUPLE OHANATS STOP CETTE
PROPOSITION EHANANT DU ROYAUME UNI DONT FORCES COMPATENT
ASPIRATIONS PEUPLE MILITANT

P2/50

OHAN CACH UNE MALVEILLANTE ARRIERE PENSEE DESTINEE A
INDUIRE EN ERREUR NATIONS UNIES DE VOYER OPINION
MONDIALE ET DONNER UNE IMAGE DE LA SITUATION
COMPLEMENTAIRE DIFFERENTE DE CELLE QUI PREVAUT DANS LE
PAYS EN DOTE AUX MEASURES ARBITRAIRES HUGELANT
L'OPINION OHANITE ET CONTRECARRANT SES LEGITIMES
ASPIRATIONS NATIONALES STOP AUSSI

P3/50

OHEN AT JE HONNEUR SUGGERER CE QUI SUTT AFTH ELEVER
BARRIERE AUX INTENTIONS PRECITTEES ET PERMETTRE VOYER
DELEGE COMANANTE Vента AU SUJET SITUATION STOP
PREMNCHEN UN REPRESENANT DE LA PART THAN OHANER REN
ALT ACCOMPAGNERA VOTRE DELEGE AFTH FACILITER SA
TACHE ETANT ETENON QUE NATIONS UNIES GARANTIRONT SA
SECURITE DEMAINE

P4/51

NATIONS UNIES PRENDRONT DISPOSITIONS NEECESSITRES AFTH
DE POPULATIONS OHANITES POUSSANT EXPRESER LEUR
OPINION SUR UN PRISONNY CONTRE UNE INCITATION
DE CRANITE DE REPRESAILLES STOP AVEC DES REMONDE-
MENTS APPLIQUEES VOUS PUTE AGREER EXCELLENCE MA TRES
HAPTE CONSIDERATION

TALER PAR ALT CHEF DELEGATION OHANAT OHAN
A DIT SEPTEMBRE GESTON ASSEMBLEE GENERALE NATIONS
UNIES

COLL LT S E M L'OPINION

S CNE AT 1233A EST
UNATTO 224537
YE 193 F (UN2) NY 46 18 1722 =

ETAT

S E MR ABDEL KALEK NASSOUHA
SECRETAIRE GENERAL
LIGUE ARABE
CAIRO (UAR)

JAI L'HONNEUR D'ACCUSER RECEPTION DE VOTRE TELEGRAMME DU 14 JANVIER ENA'ANT DU CAIRE ET DE VOUS INFORMER QUE J'EN AI PRIS DONNE NOTE. TRES HAUTE CONSIDERATION =

U THANT
SECRETAIRE GENERAL DE LONU
NEWYORK +

COL 14 +
VE19A F (UN2) NY 45 18 17222 =

STAT

S E MR TALEB BEN ALI

CARE LIGUE ARADE

CAIRO (UAR) =

JAI L'HONNEUR D'ACCUSER RECEPTION DE VOTRE TELEGRAMME DU 14 JANVIER EXAMINANT DU CAIRE ET DE VOUS INFORMER QUE J'EN AI PRIS DONNE NOTE. TRES HAUTE CONSIDERATION =

U THANT

SECRETARE GENERAL DE LONU

NEWYORK +

COL 14 +
I saw Colin Crowe this afternoon, who confirmed what I had already heard from Prince Faisal’s son, that he is going to be the next British Ambassador to Saudi Arabia. Mr. Crowe told me he had informed you.

I used this opportunity to ask for his help in order to get the Buraimi discussions on the track again. I told him that the climate now prevailing should make it easier for the British to come with proposals. I told him that we would be prepared to look at any suggestions which could be pursued by ambassador de Ribbing. He promised me that during his stay in London he will do his best to discuss these points with the people in the Foreign Office directly involved. He informed me that he expects to be in Saudi Arabia around the beginning of April.

Mr. Crowe asked me if there were any developments on the Oman Question. I told him you have been so busy with the Congo situation that you have had no time to take this matter up. I believe, however, that time is pressing and that there should be as soon as possible another meeting with the British on the specific terms of reference for the special representative. I have recommended this in my note of 8 January and subsequent notes to Mr. Nasasima of 15 January.

Mr. Crowe told me that he would be pleased to see you before his departure on Thursday. You had told him that you expected to be back from Geneva on Tuesday. He would be available for a short meeting on Wednesday.
TO: The Secretary-General

THROUGH: 

FROM: J. Van Wyk

SUBJECT: Forthcoming Meeting with Mr. Crowe

1. The agreement relating to Mr. Crowe's Ambassadorship in Saudi Arabia has been received. The appointment will be announced officially tomorrow in London.

2. The Mission has also received word from London that the U.N. will not have to pay for the costs of your Representative on the Oman Question. In accordance with Mr. Narasimhan's discussion with the British, they have put a ceiling of £3,000 for this activity. This amount was based on the following assumptions:
   a) Ambassador de Ribbing would be able to do all his work within 30 days (briefing, consultations, visit to the area, finishing the report.)
   b) He would be accompanied by one person.
   c) Transportation from Bahrain to the area would be provided. I have told the British that any change in these assumptions will have an effect on the costs.

3. You may wish to bring up the question of the terms of reference for the Representative. I have proposed before that this should be the subject of a meeting with Sir Patrick Dean.

4. You may wish to bring up the fact that the Saudis have replied to your letter of 18 January on the Buraimi Question. Perhaps Mr. Crowe could explain to London the need for some move.
TO: The Secretary-General

THROUGH:

FROM: J. Van Wyk

SUBJECT: Question of Oman

My note of 8 January to you and my subsequent notes to Mr. Narasimhan of 15 January contained the following suggestions:

1. To arrange for a meeting in the near future with Sir Patrick Dean in order to get the British view on the terms of reference for the representative of the Secretary-General. The Mission is already in touch with London, Bahrain and Muscat on this point. They will let me know as soon as there are any comments which would be useful for the meeting with you.

2. To consider a discreet approach to some or all of the representatives of Arab Governments directly concerned in order to get their views. Perhaps time could be saved if this "airing" could be done in the form of a luncheon.

3. To select a representative and let him come to New York as soon as possible for discussion of his task with you and for consultations with the British. This should await the meeting with the British and a decision that the costs will not fall on the U.N.
Dear Mr. de Ribbing,

The Secretary-General has asked me to write to you informally about what is happening in connection with the so-called Oman Question.

I am attaching a note which I prepared for the Secretary-General. I believe this note summarizes adequately what happened during the last session of the General Assembly when the Question of Oman was discussed at some length in the Special Committee.

We have had some talks with the British about the terms of reference for the Representative of the Secretary-General.

This of course is the crux of the matter. What is the Representative supposed to do? To put it very bluntly, the British would like him to produce a "white-wash operation" so that they can go back to the Assembly and say: "Well you see, there was really nothing wrong. All this noise about foreign troops and dominion and a nationalist's movement is fabrication." On the other hand, the eleven Arab Governments who have brought up this problem as a matter of Arab nationalism expect the Representative to produce a report which will embarrass the British and the Sultan of Muscat. They will drag in all kinds of issues on which it will be most time-consuming and perhaps impossible to produce the right answers.

The Secretary-General, therefore, will wish to be extremely careful before committing himself to a step which might draw him in a most unpleasant discussion of delicate and complex questions.

On the other hand, however, once the Secretary-General has decided that he will be able to play a useful role, he would like very much to count on your help on this matter. It is gratifying to know that the British have indicated their full agreement with the Secretary-General's wish to select you as his Personal Representative for this question. The Secretary-General hopes that he can count on your experience and your good relations with particularly the Sultan.

Ambassador Herbert de Ribbing
Embajada de Suecia
Valiesque 91, Triplipada
Madrid, Spain
of Muscat and Oman in order to undertake this most fascinating task. Taking into account the time needed for the British to consult the Sultan, Bahrain and the Foreign Office on this matter, he feels that at the earliest, arrangements could be made whereby you would be requested to undertake this mission around the end of April. He hopes that the mission would not require more than 4 or 5 weeks of your time including a period of some 2 to 3 weeks visiting the area.

Although it is too early to ask you officially if you would be willing to undertake this mission (of course we would approach the Swedish Government at the same time), the Secretary-General would appreciate very much your reactions on an informal basis at this moment.

At the same time we will continue our discussions with the British and keep you informed as to the developments. If you can let me know your reactions and at the same time give whatever comments you have on the substance of the matter, please do so. I am preparing a complete dossier on this question, and I will send it to Madrid as soon as we have your reaction.

The Secretary-General has asked me to send his best greetings to you, I am adding my own, and I hope that all is well with you and your family. With warm regards.

Yours sincerely,

Jan Van Wyk

P.S. You might be interested to know that the Secretary-General yesterday said goodbye to our good friend Colin Crowe. He is leaving New York today for London where he will spend a short period before going on leave in Europe. After that he will go to his next post, namely, Jeddah. He will be the first British Ambassador in Saudi Arabia after the break of diplomatic relations more than six years ago. We have now two experts on the Burundi question stationed in the Middle East. With Harold Beasley in Cairo and Crowe in Jeddah, the British have two intelligent men who certainly are aware of the international aspects of this question.
Minutes of an informal meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman held in Mr. G.K.J. Amachree's Conference Room, Room 3227B, on Thursday, 26 March 1964, at 11:00 a.m.

Members:

H.E. Mr. Abdul Rahman Pazhwak (Afghanistan)
H.E. Sr. Fernando Volio Jiménez (Costa Rica)
Mr. Ram C. Malhotra (Nepal)
Mr. Mustafa Zebairu (Nigeria)
Mr. Ciss Abdou (Senegal)

Secretariat:

Mr. G.K.J. Amachree, Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories

Mr. J.A. Miles
Mr. Kyew U
Miss M.L. Wright, Secretary

Mr. Amachree opened the meeting and stated that this was an informal one, which had been called to provide an opportunity for preliminary discussions about the Committee's work. He then drew attention to the relevant documentation, copies of which were presented to the Committee Members. He believed that although the formal nominations of representatives to the Committee were not complete the Committee might wish to appoint a Chairman to enable it to begin its work.

On the nomination of the representative of Costa Rica, Ambassador Pazhwak, Afghanistan, was unanimously elected as Chairman.

The Chairman noted that he had not yet received his Government's nomination as representative on the Committee. He hoped that all nominations would be completed in the near future.

The Committee then had a preliminary discussion on the following matters:

(1) Whether a visit to Oman and to neighbouring countries was necessary.

Members drew attention to the terms of the resolution
to the discussion in the Fourth Committee, and the Secretary-General's statement of the financial implications of the draft resolution, all of which implied that a visit was called for. It was pointed out that a visit to Cairo would also be necessary since the Imam was there. It was also understood that there were other interested parties there with whom the Committee would wish to have discussions.

(2) Modalities of approaching the Sultan concerning a visit.

The Committee considered the advisability of approaching the Sultan concerning a visit to the Territory by means of an approach through

(a) the United Kingdom,
(b) one of the Powers having treaty relations with the Sultan,
(c) a friendly power, neutral in the dispute, or
(d) a number of these Powers rather than through one of them.

The Committee decided to postpone further consideration of this matter until a later meeting.

(3) Discussions with the United Kingdom Government.

The Committee agreed that it would have to consider carefully the advisability of holding discussions with the United Kingdom Government. No decision was made.

The Committee decided that at its next meeting it should thoroughly consider the extent of its mandate as laid down by the General Assembly. In this connexion attention was drawn, in particular, to the implications of the last preambular paragraph of resolution 1948 (XVIII).

The Committee requested the Secretariat to prepare the following material for its consideration:

(1) A paper setting out the procedures normally followed by Committees of this nature.
(2) A statement amplifying the staff and budgetary arrangements in relation to any visit that might be undertaken by the Committee.

The Committee agreed to meet again on Tuesday 31 March at 3:00 p.m. in Mr. Anachro's Conference Room.
27 March 1963

Dear Mr. Sulaiman,

On behalf of the Secretary-General, I wish to acknowledge your letter of 7 March 1963. Due notice has been taken of the information contained in this letter.

Sincerely yours,

C. V. Narasimhan
Chef de Cabinet

Mr. Hymeyr Sulaiman
Head of the Office of the Imamate of Oman
O/O Secretariat of the Arab League
Cairo
United Arab Republic

cc. U-Thant
Mr. Van Wijk
Mr. Rolz-Bennett
His Excellency,
The Secretary General of the United Nations Organization,
U.N. Headquarters,
New York,
U.S.A.

Sir,

I am directed by the Imam of Oman to convey to Your Excellency his thanks for the opportunity given to the Omani Delegation to put the question of Oman before the bar of the U.N.

However, in the mean time, it is our duty to keep the Secretariat of the U.N. informed of developments of national struggle against the forces of aggression. The situation in Oman has considerably worsened since the debate of the issue in the last session of the U.N. The U.K. still holds to its policy of imposing their colonial regime on our people. And the latest report received from Oman tells of horrible massacres committed by the colonial forces against the innocent citizens.

Apart from daily military operations, the colonial forces resort to savage acts of terrorism and unlawfulness against the rank and file of our people. The colonial authorities make no secret of their tyrannical activities. People are innocently put to death, imprisoned, arrested and tortured. Illegal confiscation of properties and imposition of collective fines are common occurrence in Oman.

Upto this day the forces of occupation refuse to allow press agents and correspondence to visit Oman, in order to study the situation and report to the world public opinion. Even the Red Cross mission's appeal has been rejected. This signifies the highest degree of irresponsibility on the part of the colonial Power, to keep the whole world in darkness as what they commit in Oman.

The moral help of the U.N. has never been so essential as it is today with regard to the state of affairs in Oman.

In the circumstances, we appeal to Your Excellency to place these facts before the members of the United Nations. The U.K. Government stands in Oman guilty of an act of aggression of violation of the United Nations's charter, and last but least of all acts contradicting with the principles of international law and human values.

We hope further that this information will contribute in enlighting the members of the United Nations with the present conditions in Oman, and enlist their support in solving this problem in a way commensurate with the Charter of the U.N.

With best regards,

HIMYER SULAIMAN,
Head of the Office of the Imamate of Oman in Cairo.
TO: The Secretary-General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROVAL</th>
<th>YOUR INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAY WE CONFER?</td>
<td>AS REQUESTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR SIGNATURE</td>
<td>FOR ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE AND FILE</td>
<td>REPLY FOR MY SIGNATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE AND RETURN</td>
<td>PREPARE DRAFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR COMMENTS</td>
<td>ATTACH RELATED PAPERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATE: 1 April 1964
FROM: Godfrey K.J. Amachree
Visit to the area

The Committee agreed that it should give first priority to making arrangements for a visit to Oman. It also agreed that visits to Cairo and London were necessary but felt that there should be no decision at this stage on what other neighboring countries should be visited. The Committee's position would then be flexible and it would be able to respond to any information and invitations received.

Approach to the Sultan

The Committee agreed that its approach to the Sultan concerning the possibility of a visit should be through the good offices of one of the countries having treaty relations with the Sultanate. The Chairman would speak informally with the representatives of France, India, Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States on the possibility of enlisting their Government's cooperation in facilitating a visit by the Committee to the Sultanate. The Committee also agreed that, after the Chairman had obtained an assurance of cooperation from one of these Governments, and, taking into account any advice on the modalities of approach given by that Government, the Secretary-General be asked to address a letter to the Permanent Representative of that member state requesting assistance to the Committee in facilitating a visit to the Sultanate.
Procedure

The Chairman drew attention to the note on procedure prepared by the Secretariat and it was agreed that, on the basis of this note, he should draw up a set of rules to be followed by the Committee.

Staffing

The Committee requested the Secretariat to submit details concerning the staff that would be assigned to it.

Documentation

Copies of treaties with the Sultanate of Muscat were available and would be distributed to members the following day.

It was suggested that further documentation might be made available to the Committee by the United Kingdom and the Arab League.

Future Plans

The Committee agreed that it should try to make its visit to the area during the month of May. The Secretariat was asked to prepare tentative itineraries. It also fixed 21 April as the date for the first formal meeting of accredited representatives. It decided to meet again informally on Tuesday, 7 April, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 3327.
TO: The Secretary-General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROVAL</th>
<th>YOUR INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAY WE CONFER?</th>
<th>AS REQUESTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOUR SIGNATURE</td>
<td>FOR ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE AND FILE</td>
<td>REPLY FOR MY SIGNATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE AND RETURN</td>
<td>PREPARE DRAFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR COMMENTS</td>
<td>ATTACH RELATED PAPERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATE: 9 April 1964
FROM: Godfrey K.J. Amohree
Visit to Oman

The Chairman informed the Committee that he had had informal discussions with the permanent Representatives of India, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom, and with ambassador Yates of the United States. He would meet the representative of France after his return on 15 April. In accordance with his instructions from the Committee, he had explained to each representative that the Committee wished to know informally the reaction of his Government to any request from the Committee, through the Secretary-General, for assistance in facilitating a visit by the Committee to Oman.

The representative of the United Kingdom was reassured that the Committee did not intend to embarrass his Government, nor would it expect his Government to apply any pressures on the Sultan.

The Chairman reported that the Permanent Representatives had expressed their appreciation for this form of approach and had said that they would be in touch with him between 15 and 20 April, after ascertaining the formal views of their Governments and the degree of cooperation which would be possible. All had agreed to do their best in providing the Committee with any documents in their archives which might be of assistance to the Committee.

The Chairman also informed the Committee that he had had informal talks with a representative of the Arab League. He had been assured that the Arab League would put all documents available at the disposal of the Committee and was informed that there were a number of member states which would wish to express their views before the Committee.

Rules of Procedure

The Chairman circulated draft rules of procedure which he asked members to consider before the next meeting. The Committee agreed to vote on the adoption of the rules of procedure at its first formal meeting.
Visit to London

The Committee decided that it was not possible to designate a time to visit London until after the replies to the Committee's informal enquiries concerning a visit to Oman had been received.

Visit to Neighbouring Countries

The Committee decided to empower the Chairman to make informal enquiries concerning the presence of possible petitioners in neighbouring countries. When the Committee had this information and some idea of the number of petitioners in each country, it could then decide which of the neighbouring countries it should visit.

Terms of Reference

The Committee agreed that it was important for it to have a clear understanding of its terms of reference. To assist it, the Secretariat was asked to prepare a background paper containing an analysis of the treatment of the case of Oman in the United Nations and in particular setting forth the different views expressed in the Fourth Committee at the eighteenth session.

Staffing

The Committee agreed that until it knew more about the nature of its work, which countries it would visit and how long its visit would last, it could not give the Secretary-General any clear idea of the staff it would need. It would therefore take up this matter with him at a later date.

Agenda for the First Formal Meeting

The Committee agreed that the agenda of the first formal meeting should include:

1. Election of officers (chairman and rapporteur),
2. Rules of procedure,
3. Terms of reference, and
4. Visit to Oman and neighbouring countries.

It was agreed that only the first part of this meeting should be open to the public.
Summary of the Third meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman (closed meeting)

held in Conference Room number 6

on Tuesday, 5 May 1964, at 3:00 p.m.

Draft Terms of Reference

The Chairman asked for comments on the draft terms of reference prepared by the Secretariat from the discussion at the last meeting.

The representative of Costa Rica said the draft reflected very well the discussion at the last meeting but he noted in the Spanish translation that the last sentence of paragraph 7 on page 2 read "In particular it (the Committee) will interview political prisoners or persons held etc." instead of "expects" in the English text.

The Chairman said that the necessary correction would be made in the Spanish text.

The representative of Costa Rica suggested that it should be clearly stated that the Committee would make its own decisions as to who would accompany it on its mission. He also felt that a paragraph should be added to the effect that the Committee could publicize its visit, indicating its objectives and its intention to hear petitioners.

The representative of Nepal suggested paragraph 7 be amended by deleting the words "in particular" in the last sentence.

The Chairman said that the words "in particular" were used to emphasize that the nature of the Committee's work was to get information and to hear all points of view so that there would be no misunderstanding nor vagueness about the Committee's intention to interview all parties.

The representative of Nepal said he agreed with the intention of the phrase but felt this might frighten the Sultan if it gave him the impression that the Committee mainly intended to interview political prisoners. He also doubted the advisability of the last part of the sentence which stated that the Committee would decide who were the political prisoners. He felt the Committee would want to see people who might be useful to its work, whether political prisoners or not.
It also might be a burden if the Committee had to review all political prisoners and decide which to interview. He would suggest instead a phrase such as "prisoners or persons held in confinement who the Committee feels it desirable to interview" or perhaps "who it thinks would be useful in its work."

The representative of Nigeria said he agreed that the last sentence in paragraph 7 should be changed to mean that the Committee would interview those whose interview the Committee deemed to be useful.

The Chairman said this was in line with the suggestion made by the representative of Nepal and it seemed that all agreed to change the last sentence of paragraph 7 to read "In particular, it expects to interview political prisoners or persons held in confinement whose interview the Committee deems to be useful."

The Committee would next discuss the suggestion of the representative of Costa Rica about those accompanying the Mission.

The representative of Costa Rica said his idea was to make it clear that the Committee would be free to conduct its visits and interviews as it saw fit or believed appropriate, that it did not wish to be accompanied by other persons, and that in making such decisions it was acting in accordance with its terms of reference. Complaints had been made during the eighteenth session of the General Assembly in connexion with the report of Mr. Herbert de Ribbing to the effect that, in his visits to the area, a representative of the Imam could not accompany him. He did not want such complaints to be made against this mission.

The Chairman said that the Committee would agree that the second sentence of paragraph 7 be amended to read, "...the Committee will have complete freedom of decision as to where it will travel, whom it will interview, and whom it will allow to accompany it."

The Committee would next discuss the suggestion of the representative of Costa Rica that a sentence be added giving the Committee the right to make statements when it saw fit, on its activities both here at Headquarters and in visits to the area and to neighbouring territories.
The representative of Senegal said this idea was already covered in the rules of procedure adopted by the Committee, which said that the Committee could decide to make press releases either at Headquarters or during its visit to the area.

The representative of Nepal felt that a paragraph could be inserted under "methods of work" stating that the Committee could make its own rules of procedure, so these two documents would be related.

The Chairman said it was agreed that a paragraph be added to "Methods of Work" stating that the Committee would make its own rules of procedure.

He also thought it desirable to make some reference to financial provisions in paragraph 8. The Committee might not be able to visit some areas because of financial considerations. He asked for views on this idea.

The representative of Nepal asked whether this clause was not necessary in paragraph 7, too, which also mentioned visits to the area.

The representative of Costa Rica felt there was no problem here as the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to provide the Committee with all necessary assistance and it seemed it would be left to the Ad Hoc Committee to decide on the scope of the visit and to the Secretary-General to make available the necessary funds.

The Chairman said it was agreed that the paragraph should remain unchanged.

The Chairman said that the Committee should decide whether these terms of reference should be made public or not.

The representative of Nepal said he was in favour of making them public as it would strengthen the Committee's position in communicating with the Sultan.

The representative of Costa Rica wondered whether it might not be better to obtain permission to visit the territory before making public the terms of reference.

The representative of Senegal agreed with the representative of Costa Rica because he felt the Committee's task was not merely to publicize its report but also to carry out its work effectively. The Committee should therefore try to accommodate the known sensitivity of the Sultan.

The representative of Nigeria felt it would do more harm than good to publicize the terms of reference at this stage. He had no objection
to making them public, but not at this early stage.

The representative of Nepal explained that he had raised the question of principle but had not considered the matter of timing; this could be decided later.

The Chairman said the terms of reference as amended were adopted by the Committee. However they would not be publicized at this stage. He then asked for the opinion of the members as to whether the terms of reference should be brought to the attention of those from whom the Committee would seek invitations to visit the area. In particular, did the Committee feel it should attach the terms of reference when it wrote the Sultan or should it ask for permission to visit his country without his being aware of them.

The representative of Costa Rica believed that since the Committee wished to receive the Sultan's permission for a visit, the terms of reference should be used with discretion and tact. Rather than annex the terms of reference to any request to the Sultan, he would suggest using them with care, at a later stage in its negotiations with the Sultan. The question of timing was important.

The representative of Nepal agreed that the question of timing was important. The Committee should request a visit and make its terms of reference available when they were specifically requested. Much depended on how the question was approached — whether directly or through a Member State.

The representative of Nigeria felt that if the Committee wanted to contact the Sultan either directly or through a Member State it would have to make its position clear. It could be assumed that the Sultan was aware of the General Assembly resolution and of the creation of the Committee. Nevertheless, it should let the Sultan know exactly what it intended to do.

The representative of Senegal agreed that the Sultan should know the reason for the Committee's visit to the area since this was an official mission and not a private one as Mr. de Ribbing's had been. He therefore felt the terms of reference should be sent.

The Chairman understood from the discussion that the letter to the Sultan would be sent either directly or through another party after the
Committee knew the channels available. Its terms of reference would be referred to in general terms in the letter and if the Sultan requested an exact text of them they should be given to him.

Plan of work

The Chairman outlined a plan of work which he suggested the Committee might follow. He requested the Secretariat to prepare a draft plan of work based on these suggestions which the Committee could consider at its next meeting.

The representative of Costa Rica asked the Chairman whether he had received replies from the representatives of Member States which had special connections with the Sultan. He was in favour of contacting the Sultan through one of these countries. If this was not possible the Committee would have to send a letter directly to the Sultan.

The Chairman explained that his contacts with Member States having treaty relations with the Sultan had been informal and for the purpose of ascertaining what help could be expected from them all had shown a spirit of co-operation but none had indicated a willingness to act as a mediator. He therefore felt that the Committee would have to contact the Sultan directly. He asked the Committee to note that the letter should be addressed directly to the Sultan. At this point had now been decided, he would make further contacts to see what country would transmit the letter and then would report his findings to the Committee.

The representative of Nepal agreed that since none of the countries having treaty relations with the Sultan felt that they could influence him, the letter should be addressed directly to the Sultan.

The representative of Nigeria supported the suggestion that the letter be addressed directly to the Sultan and that contacts be made to find a country to transmit the letter.

The representative of Senegal also agreed that the letter should be addressed directly to the Sultan but thought that there would be difficulties in transmitting it. The Committee would have to find out whether there was a treaty providing for the external relations of the Sultanate. It was necessary to know whether the Sultan was represented abroad by the United Kingdom or another country. If there were no such treaty provision, action could be taken in accordance with Article 2.6 of the Charter of
the United Nations which provided that Non-Member-States should act in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

The Chairman said it had been decided to address the letter directly to the Sultan. He would see if any countries were willing to transmit the letter and if not, he would ask whether the Secretary-General would be willing to do so.

The representative of Nepal wondered whether the President of the General Assembly, the Chairman of the Committee or the Secretary-General should address the letter.

The Chairman asked the Secretariat for information on the precedents in the United Nations on such matters.

The Secretary said that he would give the Committee this information at its next meeting.

The Chairman asked the Secretariat to prepare a draft letter to the Sultan for consideration by the Committee at its next meeting.
Sir,

I have the honour to refer to the consideration of the question of Oman by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its eighteenth session and to resolution 1948 (XVIII) adopted by the General Assembly on 11 December 1963. It will be recalled that by this resolution the General Assembly decided to establish an Ad Hoc Committee on Oman and subsequently, the President of the General Assembly nominated Afghanistan, Costa Rica, Nepal, Nigeria and Senegal as members. At its first meeting the Committee did me the honour of electing me as its chairman.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Oman was established by the General Assembly to examine the question of Oman and was requested to report to the General Assembly at its nineteenth session. In pursuance of the mandate given to it by the General Assembly, the Ad Hoc Committee has begun its work and has considered the means it will employ in carrying out its tasks.

In keeping with the General Assembly resolution, the Committee intends to make a thorough and intensive examination of all aspects of the question, so as to enable it to report fully and objectively to the General Assembly. It is the earnest hope of the Committee that the information and the recommendations it is able to place before the General Assembly will enable a just and equitable solution to be found for this problem.

I am sure you will agree with the Committee that it should be able to acquaint itself, at first hand, with the situation in the area. For it is only through such a visit that the Committee would be able to make the observations, investigations and interrogations that would assist it in its work, in accordance with its terms of reference, a copy of which is attached.
For these reasons, the Committee believes that a visit to the area is necessary and has asked me to request your co-operation in facilitating such a visit. In making this request, the Committee would draw your attention to operative paragraph 2 of the resolution, in which the General Assembly calls upon all the parties concerned to co-operate with the ad hoc Committee by all possible means, including that of facilitating visits to the area. The Committee would add that your co-operation in this matter would not only be of immeasurable assistance to the Committee but would constitute a gesture of goodwill toward the United Nations.

The Committee therefore hopes that you will understand the spirit in which this request is being made and that, after you have given it your earnest consideration, you will find it possible to facilitate a visit of the Committee.

Accept, Sir, etc.
I. At Headquarters

(a) Preparation of a political history of Oman
Since the Committee may decide to include such a study in its report, the Rapporteur, with the assistance of the Secretariat, should prepare a draft for the Committee’s consideration at its meetings.

(b) Preparation of a history of the case in the United Nations
The draft already prepared by the Secretariat could be discussed. The amended text could then be prepared by the Rapporteur.

(c) Study of Treaties
Members could, perhaps, state their views in the Committee on the treaties relating to Muscat and Oman. It might be useful if members could indicate, in particular,

(i) which treaties are relevant to the question, and
(ii) what information each relevant treaty sheds on the question of status.

After hearing these statements, the Rapporteur could be asked to draft a paper for the Committee which would become the basis of a section of the report. Alternatively, a draft could be prepared by the Rapporteur which the Committee could consider.

(d) Study of the de Gissing report
Members could perhaps state their views on the report, paying particular attention to:

(i) its usefulness to the Committee in providing information, and
(ii) its deficiencies.

The Rapporteur could then prepare a draft on the basis of this exchange of views.
(e) Hearing of representatives of the parties concerned

Representatives of the parties concerned who are available in New York could be heard and questioned. In this connexion, it is probably important that, before questioning begins, the Committee's preliminary study of those matters referred to in (a) to (d) above should be fairly well advanced. This would not necessarily delay hearing statements, which could be heard as soon as is mutually convenient.

(f) Study of proposed visits.

The Committee will have to consider such matters as the time and duration of its visits, the itinerary, the arrangements to be made with governments, the staff required, etc. It will also have to consider the objectives of its visits.

II. In the area

The plan of work in the area and in the neighbouring countries will have to be worked out later.

III. General

In considering material presented by the Rapporteur, members will no doubt raise questions that cannot be answered or seek additional clarifications and information which is not available. It may be useful to note these down as points to be clarified by questioning the representatives of interested parties or petitioners or by future investigation by the Committee.
Summary of the Fourth Meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman (closed meeting)

held in Conference Room number 7

on Thursday, 7 May 1964, at 10:30 a.m.

Draft letter to the Sultan

The Chairman asked the Committee for general observations on the draft of the letter it was proposed to send to the Sultan.

The representative of Nepal wondered whether paragraph 4 fully indicated the scope of the Committee's work and thought perhaps it should contain the Committee's terms of reference. As an alternative, the last sentence of paragraph 2 and all of paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the terms of reference could be included in paragraph 2 of the letter.

The representative of Costa Rica suggested that it might be helpful if the second part of paragraph 4 were omitted as he did not think it was necessary to refer to the de Ribbing report. Furthermore, the sentence said that the Committee had studied the report and felt there were still a number of questions to be answered. As that was a comment of the General Assembly, not of the Committee, it should not be included.

He also suggested that the letter stress the fact that the Committee did not intend to interfere with the internal affairs of Kuwait and Oman, but only sought information which would be useful to Member States in their evaluation of the question in the United Nations.

The Chairman said if there were no objections on paragraph 1 it would be adopted without change.

He suggested that the first line of paragraph 3 be changed to read "in keeping with the General Assembly resolution", since the sentence as it now read - "wishes expressed in the General Assembly" - could be misconstrued to mean the wishes of certain members in particular. He felt reference to the General Assembly should be retained since it was a highly esteemed body and carried more influence than a committee or a person.

If there were no objections, paragraph 3 would be adopted as amended.
The representative of Nepal suggested that the last part of the 2nd sentence in paragraph 4, "outstanding points of doubt" be replaced by the words "its work". He believed that the Committee should either incorporate some of the terms of reference into paragraph 2 or attach them to the letter.

The Chairman said it was agreed to adopt paragraph 2 without change, so, if there was no objection, the Committee would agree to attach the terms of reference to the letter.

The representative of Nepal speaking for the representative of Costa Rica (momentarily absent) questioned the last sentence of paragraph 5. He wondered whether this would imply a threat if the Sultan did not cooperate. He suggested that the sentence end by saying "a gesture of good will toward the United Nations."

The Chairman suggested that the words "most desirable" in the first sentence of paragraph 5 be changed to "necessary". If these two suggested amendments were acceptable the Committee could agree to adopt this paragraph as amended.

The representative of Costa Rica suggested that the words "that its examination of the question will be incomplete unless" in the first sentence of paragraph 4 be changed in order to prevent a negative implication if the Sultan did not allow a visit. As it stood, it could put weapons into the hands of enemies of the Committee.

The representative of Nepal suggested that that part of the sentence should read "that it should be able to".

The Chairman agreed and said that paragraph 4 was adopted as amended. It would now read "I am sure you will agree with the Committee that it should be able to acquaint itself, at first hand, with the situation in the area. For it is only through such a visit that the Committee would be able to make the observations, investigations and interrogations that would assist it in its work in accordance with its terms of reference, a copy of which is attached."

Paragraph 6 was adopted without change.

Future work

The Chairman asked for authorization to make further contacts with countries to find one to transmit the letter to the Sultan.

He asked that the draft plan of work, which was available in English, be translated into French before the next meeting, which would be on
Monday. At that meeting the Committee would discuss a statement to be given to the press, a list of interviews to be held in New York and in the area and neighbouring territories, and how to proceed with contacting the Imam and authorities in neighbouring territories and countries.
**ROUTING SLIP**

Comments for the record should not be written on this slip, REFERRAL SHEET PT.108 should be used instead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO:</th>
<th>U Thant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>x YOUR INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY WE CONFER?</td>
<td>AS REQUESTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR SIGNATURE</td>
<td>FOR ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE AND FILE</td>
<td>REPLY FOR MY SIGNATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE AND RETURN</td>
<td>PREPARE DRAFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR COMMENTS</td>
<td>ATTACHRELATEDPAPERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATE:** 11 May 1964

**FROM:** G. K. J. Amachree
PRESS STATEMENT

Since its first meeting on 21 April 1964 the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman has held five closed meetings. In the course of these meetings the Committee has considered the scope of its work and has begun an examination of the documentation that is already available to it.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Oman is an official Committee of the United Nations, duly constituted by General Assembly resolution 1948 (XVIII) of 11 December 1963, and has been given specific tasks including that of reporting to the next session of the General Assembly.

The Committee has agreed that the mandate given to it by the General Assembly covers all aspects of the question of Oman. The Committee therefore intends to make an exhaustive study of any problem it deems to be germane to the issue. In particular, and in keeping with resolution 1948 (XVIII), it will study and evaluate the territorial, historical and political issues involved in the problem.

The Committee views its task as one of ascertaining the facts, making an evaluation of them and reporting fully and objectively to the nineteenth session of the General Assembly.

The Committee will give every opportunity to the parties directly concerned and to Member States concerned in the area and in the question to place their views before it and to discuss them in detail with the Committee.

In operative paragraph 2 of its resolution, the General Assembly called upon all the parties concerned to co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee by all possible means, including that of facilitating visits to the area. The Committee is looking forward with confidence to receiving this co-operation from the parties concerned, to enable it to carry out the tasks given to it by the General Assembly in the most effective and judicious manner. The Committee will announce its plans to visit the area when such plans are completed.
STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON OMAN

The following statement was issued today by Abdul Rahman Pazhwak, of Afghanistan, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman:

"Since its first meeting on 21 April 1964, the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman has held five closed meetings. In the course of these meetings the Committee has considered the scope of its work and has begun an examination of the documentation that is already available to it.

"The Ad Hoc Committee on Oman is an official committee of the United Nations, duly constituted by General Assembly resolution 1948 (XVIII) of 11 December 1963, and has been given specific tasks including that of reporting to the next session of the General Assembly.

"The Committee has agreed that the mandate given to it by the General Assembly covers all aspects of the question of Oman. The Committee therefore intends to make an exhaustive study of any problem it deems to be germane to the issue. In particular, and in keeping with resolution 1948 (XVIII), it will study and evaluate the territorial, historical and political issues involved in the problem.

"The Committee views its task as one of ascertaining the facts, making an evaluation of them and reporting fully and objectively to the nineteenth session of the General Assembly.

"The Committee will give every opportunity to the parties directly concerned, and to Member States concerned in the area and in the question, to place their views before it and to discuss them in detail with the Committee.

"In operative paragraph 2 of its resolution, the General Assembly called upon all the parties concerned to co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee by all possible means, including that of facilitating visits to the area. The Committee is looking forward with confidence to receiving this co-operation from the parties concerned, to enable it to carry out the tasks given to it by the General Assembly in the most effective and judicious manner. The Committee will announce its plans to visit the area when such plans are completed."

* *** *

11 May 1964
Summary of the Fifth Meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman (closed meeting)

held in Conference Room number 7

on Monday, 11 May 1964, at 10:30 a.m.

Draft plan of work

The Chairman asked first for general comments on the draft plan of work after which it could be discussed in detail.

The representative of Costa Rica felt that the political history of Oman which was to be prepared should contain the basic history of the social and economic conditions of the area as this was important for any evaluation of political events.

He suggested several places in the area which it would be useful and important to visit... Cairo, Kuwait, Dibrah, Bahrain, Qatar, Sur, Dubai, Abu Dhabi, the Trucial Coast States, and Jeddah in Saudi Arabia.

The representative of Nigeria suggested that the history should also contain an evaluation of religious aspects of life there. It had been brought out in Fourth Committee debates that the Imam of Oman was not only a political leader but also a religious leader.

He felt that it would be most desirable for the Committee to visit Muscat and Oman but, if it were not allowed to do so, it should visit as many of the neighbouring territories as it could afford.

The representative of Senegal said the problem of Oman was essentially a political one. With regard to the proposed study of treaties, he stressed the importance of having the treaty of Sib available for study as it was the principal one. He felt the Committee should not make comments on Mr. de Ribbing’s report in its report. He said the Committee would have to make decisions as to whom it would hear. It might be necessary to restrict its visit and invite petitioners to come to Oman or Cairo as it would be difficult to visit each adjacent territory.

The representative of Costa Rica said that it was important to have the backgrounds of the principal personalities involved in the problem. It would be helpful to have a summary of the testimony of petitioners who testified before the various Committees of the General Assembly. The Committee should make an approximate evaluation of the time which would be required for the discussion of treaties, hearing of petitioners and other work to be done.

The Chairman, in summarizing the preceding discussion, said it
was his understanding that, so far as point (a) of the draft was concerned, since the nature of the Committee’s work was political, it would prepare a political history of Muscat and Oman, which would include a background of the economic, social and religious conditions. The Secretariat and the Rapporteur should begin work on this document as soon as possible.

Point (b), a preparation of a history of the case of Oman in the United Nations, was essential. A first draft had already been prepared by the Secretariat. After discussion by the Committee, the Rapporteur would prepare it for the report.

Sections (i) and (ii) of point (c) were merely suggestions that the Committee should decide which treaties were relevant and what information each shed on the question of status; there was no suggestion of limiting the Committee’s discussion.

The Chairman invited the views of the members about the alternative plans suggested in point (c), namely whether the Rapporteur should prepare a draft for discussion or whether this draft should be prepared after a general discussion by the Committee.

After discussion, the Committee agreed that, since consideration of treaties involved interpretation and personal judgement, it would be preferable to have a general discussion first, which could serve as a guide to the Rapporteur in preparing a draft on this subject.

The Chairman said that the reference to Mr. de Ribbing’s report in point (d) was only a reminder to the Committee that in carrying out its tasks it should take note of the deficiencies of this report as well as the information contained in it.

Concerning point (e), hearing representatives of parties concerned, be believed that every opportunity should be given to them to put their views before the Committee. He also felt that the Committee should do as much as possible now.

The representative of Nepal said this raised the question of a timetable and whether these hearings would be in closed or public meetings.

The representative of Costa Rica felt the hearing of petitioners should be in public as this was not a question involving the points of view of delegations.

The representative of Nigeria agreed and said there would be no harm in hearing petitioners in public.
The representative of Senegal said he agreed there was no benefit in holding closed meetings in hearing petitioners, but he questioned the necessity of holding hearings in New York when the Committee intended to visit the area itself. He was not convinced that anything new would be gained as these petitioners had already appeared before the Special Political Committee and the Fourth Committee. The Committee must also take into account the psychological effect of hearing petitioners before going to the area. It might seem to the Sultan, for instance, that the Committee was trying to fix its views in New York.

The Chairman said all were in favour of hearing petitioners in New York and in the area and there was no harm in hearing them in public meetings. The only point was the division of work between Headquarters and the area. He understood the representative of Senegal to mean that the Committee should visit the area and deal with the parties concerned first and then hold hearings in New York. The Committee would be better prepared to question interested Member States after its visit to the area.

The representative of Nepal said this depended on the time of the visit to the area and whether there would be sufficient time to hold interviews after returning from the visit.

The representative of Senegal believed that since the opening of the General Assembly had been postponed to 10 November, the Committee had time available. It would take, perhaps, a week to hear petitioners. The point was one of the effectiveness of the Committee's work. To hear petitioners in New York first would compromise the Committee's work in the region.

The representative of Nigeria agreed that it would be desirable to hear petitioners after the visit to the area. He asked whether the hearings would be public.

The Chairman said that the Committee could decide at the time whether the meetings would be public or closed. It would have to bear in mind that petitioners might ask for closed hearings.

The representative of Nepal felt that the Committee should make the best use of its time and hear statements before going to the area. He reminded members that it was not only petitioners who were involved; the Committee would be mainly concerned with representatives of Member...
States. If Member States wished to make statements, it would be very difficult to refuse to hear them.

**Press statement**

The Committee then considered the draft press statement, which, after it had been amended, was approved.

**Letter from the representative of the Imam**

The Secretariat was requested to prepare a draft of a statement by the Committee in reply to this letter. It was agreed that the Under-Secretary be asked to send the reply.

**Letter to the Sultan**

The Chairman said that he was having difficulty in finding a country willing to transmit the letter to the Sultan. He asked for assistance from members of the Committee.

**Arrangements for visiting the area**

The Chairman asked the Secretariat to prepare for the next meeting, drafts containing lists of,

(a) political leaders whom the Committee might interview,
(b) petitioners, and
(c) places the Committee might visit.

The Chairman added that the Committee had already decided that it should visit Muscat (to see the Sultan), and Cairo (to see the Imam). It still had to decide which other places it might visit.
AD HOC COMMITTEE ON OMAN

Terms of Reference
Adopted by the Committee at its third meeting on 5 May 1964
And amended at its seventh meeting on 15 May 1964

Official status of the Committee
1. The Ad Hoc Committee on Oman is an official Committee of the United Nations, duly constituted by General Assembly resolution 1948 (XVIII) of 11 December 1963.

Range of activities
2. The Committee is directed by the General Assembly "to examine the question of Oman." Its range of study covers all aspects of the question. The Committee is to make an exhaustive study of any problem it deems to be germane to the issue. In particular, it is to study and evaluate the territorial, historical and political issues involved in the problem.
3. The Committee has three main functions:
   (a) to ascertain the facts,
   (b) to make an evaluation of the facts, and
   (c) to report to the General Assembly.

Methods of work
4. In ascertaining and evaluating the facts, the Committee will use all means at its disposal, and, in accordance with the resolution, expects the co-operation of all the parties concerned for assistance by all possible means, including that of facilitating visits to the area.
5. The principal means by which the Committee will ascertain and evaluate the facts of the question will be:
   (a) by a study of all relevant treaties, agreements and legal judgments relative to the question that the Committee may locate or that
may be made available,

(b) by a study of available historical and legal writings relevant to the question, and

(c) by direct contact with the parties concerned either in New York or in situ, or, if this is not possible, by a study of statements and written submissions made on their behalf. By the parties concerned, the Committee means:

The Sultan of Muscat and Oman,
The Imam of Oman,
Member States considered by the Committee to be concerned in the area and the question, and

Other parties as decided by the Committee.

(d) by discussions in the Committee with petitioners, who may be either individuals or representatives of organizations having a legitimate interest in the question, and who the Committee decides could be of assistance to it in its work.

6. In these terms of reference the Committee has used the titles of the parties concerned in accordance with conventional usage in United Nations documents. In corresponding with the parties concerned, the Committee will address them by the titles they ascribe to themselves without any prejudice to the position of the Committee in the question.

7. Information furnished to the Committee will be used in its report to the General Assembly, as it sees fit. The Committee may decide not to disclose certain sources of information only for the purpose of protection of individuals.

8. In order to perform this work, the Committee may visit the area and carry out an on-the-spot investigation. During its visit to the area, the Committee will have complete freedom of decision as to where it will travel, whom it will interview, and whom it will allow to accompany it. In particular, it expects to interview political prisoners or persons held in confinement whose interview the Committee deems to be useful.

9. The Committee will also make such other visits as it deems necessary for the proper fulfilment of its mandate, for the purpose of:

(a) discussing the question with the Governments of Member
States with interests in the question, and 

(b) hearing petitioners or interviewing persons who it 
believes to have information which would be of assistance to it,

10. The Committee will draw up its own rules of procedure.

Report of the Committee

11. The Committee will report fully and objectively to the 
General Assembly.

12. The report will contain a full account of the activities 
of the Committee and the measures taken by it in fulfilling its 
mandate.

13. The report will contain the facts ascertained by the 
Committee and its evaluation of them. The Committee hopes that this 
will provide an exhaustive study of the question of Oman which will 
enable the General Assembly, at its nineteenth session, to take a 
decision on the question of Oman in full knowledge of the facts.
Summary of the sixth meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman (closed meeting) held in Conference Room number 7 on Wednesday, 13 May 1964, at 10:30 a.m.

Draft statement concerning reply to HIMARY bin Sulaiman

The Chairman asked the members for their views on the draft statement concerning a reply to the letter received 4 March 1964, through the Under-Secretary from HINARY bin Sulaiman.

The representative of Senegal said the draft was satisfactory. It presented a very wise answer in that it used the same wording as the terms of reference, avoided commitment, yet was reassuring that every opportunity would be given to petitioners.

The representative of Nigeria agreed that the draft was an appropriate reply.

The representative of Nepal said the draft was in line with his suggestion at the last meeting to reply without commitment, although from the point of view of the Imam it would have been better if the Imam could have given the time and place of interviews.

The Chairman asked for suggestions as to the wording of the text and drew attention to the reference to HIMARY bin Sulaiman as 'Mr. bin Sulaiman and not referring to any other title. But as this was a Committee document it could make its own decisions as to the use of a title. He asked for members' views.

The representative of Nepal said that the title Mr. HIMARY bin Sulaiman had used in his letter, namely "Representative of the State of Oman", was a controversial one. If the Committee used it, it might give rise to difficulties. He suggested "Representative of the Imam of Oman."

The representative of Nigeria said if he could not be addressed as the Representative of the State of Oman then he should be addressed as the Representative of the Imam of Oman.

The representative of Senegal saw no reason why he should not be addressed as Representative of the State of Oman, but if this was not desirable he could be addressed as the Representative of the Imam of Oman.
The Chairman said that this question had a bearing on the title the Committee would use for the Sultan of Muscat and Oman. This was the title the Sultan used but exception to it had been taken by members of the General assembly. If the Committee decided to use this title, then Himyar bin Salaiman should be addressed as Representative of the State of Oman.

The representative of Nigeria suggested that the Committee use the title used by the author in his letter to the Secretary-General, so as to be consistent.

The representative of Nepal said that in previous documents and in the Committee's terms of reference the term Imam of Oman was used and he felt difficulties could arise over using the term State of Oman. It had not been decided whether there was a State of Oman.

The Chairman said he had brought up this point because he had been informed that the Sultan would not be likely to consider any letter which was not addressed to him as "His Highness, Said bin Tu'mur, Sultan of Muscat and Oman.

The representative of Senegal agreed with the representative of Nepal that the Imam of Oman had been referred to as such and not as Imam of the State of Oman. Therefore his representative should be addressed in similar manner.

The Chairman felt the author had deliberately signed the letter as Representative of the State of Oman. The letter he had addressed to Mr. de Ribiing last year was signed as Head of the Office of the Imam in Cairo.

The Committee perhaps could say "The Ad Hoc Committee on Oman has received the letter signed by Himyar bin Salaiman, Representative of the State of Oman, through the Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories and agrees to request the Under-Secretary to inform him that it has considered his letter of 4 March." But this did not solve the problem of how to address the Imam. It was possible that the Imam might send a letter to the Committee signed "Imam of the State of Oman". He pointed out that Imam meant head of state in a place like Oman.

The representative of Nepal said it would be best to follow the established United Nations terminology and be consistent. A change in titles would look significant and might be misconstrued.
The Chairman said that the Committee should choose its own terminology. He thought it would be best to use the terminology used by the parties themselves.

The representative of Nepal suggested that the Secretariat could do some research on this matter and let the Committee know what practices had been followed in the past. The Committee would then be able to take a decision for the future.

The Chairman called attention to the fact that the Secretariat’s research might provide an example of addressing the Sultan which may not be quite satisfactory for the dealings of the Committee. For instance the Fourth Committee had decided to refer to the Sultan in inverted commas. The Committee should bear this in mind when considering findings of the Secretariat.

The representative of Nepal felt the question of how to address the Sultan had already been answered in the draft letter. He did not feel that the Committee should pass judgement on what the reality was.

He felt that Rumiyar bin Saliman should be addressed as the Representative of the Imam of Oman so the Committee would not fall into the trap set by him when he used the title in his last letter. He would surely publicize any reply which referred to him as the Representative of the State of Oman and this might compromise the Committee’s position with the Sultan.

The Chairman pointed out that the Committee had not yet decided how to address the Sultan.

The Chairman, speaking as the representative of Afghanistan, said that this was a political matter and success could only be obtained through a diplomatic approach. In order to try to do everything possible to obtain permission to visit Muscat and Oman, he felt the Sultan should be addressed as “His Highness, Said bin Taimur, Sultan of Muscat and Oman.” This decision would be taken without prejudice to the Committee’s ultimate decision concerning status.

This same principle should be applied to addressing the Imam, who claimed equally to be head of the State of Oman. No one could accuse the Committee for dealing with all parties in the way most likely to obtain success. Both the Sultan and the Imam should be addressed as they wished. He repeated that this would be on the understanding that the Committee was not taking a position for or against any of the parties concerned.

The representative of Nepal agreed but felt that with regard to the
Imam, there was no need to refer to the State of Oman because the term Imam of Oman had been accepted and already had the advantage of usage.

The Chairman said the Committee would take up this matter again at its next meeting after it had heard the views of the Representative of Costa Rica.

**Proposed timetable**

The Chairman said that in arranging its timetable the Committee would try to meet the difficulties of all members. It was understandable that members had other important duties and commitments. First, the Committee should fix the time of a visit to the area. The Committee could use the time preceding the visit for the preparation of documents and studies.

The representative of Nepal distinguished between hearing statements of Member States and organizations and individuals. He felt the Committee should hear statements of Member States in New York before visiting the area.

The Chairman felt the work of hearing statements would start with the Sultan, followed by the Imam and his representatives and then other political leaders or petitioners. It was important to fix the time for the visit first and then it could be decided how much time and work could be done before leaving.

He thought the Committee could plan to make its visit at the beginning of September. It would also be necessary to decide on the duration of the visit. Once the Committee decided this it would plan what could be done within that time.

The representative of Nigeria recalled that in the financial estimates presented to the Fourth Committee by the Secretary-General a visit of three weeks had been suggested. He felt it was a wise idea to decide how much time the Committee could spend so as to know how to fit in its work.

The Chairman asked for suggestions as to the approximate number of days the Committee should be in the area.

The representative of Nepal suggested that a maximum of four or five weeks be allowed. He pointed out that time should be allowed to hear petitioners in London and to hold discussions with the United Kingdom Government.
The Chairman said the question of discussions with the United Kingdom Government should be considered very carefully. If the Committee was to hear the views of the United Kingdom here at the United Nations, he wondered whether any purpose would be served by having discussions in London.

The representative of Nepal said it seemed desirable to have discussions with the Foreign Office. The Committee would be in London anyway and since it would have just been to the area it would no doubt be in a position to have fruitful discussions with the Foreign Office. Furthermore, the Foreign Office could send any instructions it thought necessary to the United Kingdom Mission in New York after it had heard the Committee's views.

The representative of Nigeria agreed that it might be useful to have discussions with the United Kingdom Government.

The representative of Senegal felt it was better to obtain information from a Government than from a Mission.

With regard to the duration of the mission, the evaluation of the visit was most important. Because of the difficulties of the representative of Nigeria the Committee should limit its visit so as to ensure that he could be present when the Committee evaluated its visit. He felt that the Committee should go only where there would be an adequate number of petitioners to justify a visit.

The Chairman suggested that the Committee decide on a duration of fifteen days with an extra five days if that became essential. The Committee would use all fifteen days as working days.

The representative of Nepal said the airline schedules might delay the Committee and therefore it should not be rigid. He felt the Committee should indicate a maximum of four weeks so as to have adequate time to fully accomplish its work in the area.

The Chairman suggested that the Committee compromise and decide on a visit of three weeks, although this would not be rigid. Much depended, for instance, on the reply by the Sultan.
Possible hearings

The representative of Senegal noted that the names of the United Arab Republic, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and the United Kingdom appeared on both the list of "possible hearings in New York" and the list of "places the Committee may wish to visit." He suggested that if the Committee was going to these countries it might take advantage of its visit to interview representatives of those Governments, instead of hearing their representatives in New York.

The Chairman said that the Committee would accept the principle that it would, as far as possible, avoid any repetition of contacts. There was also the question of courtesy calls and entertainment while in these countries which the Committee would try to limit as much as possible. The Committee should bring these points to the attention of representatives here before it left so as to avoid any embarrassment.

The Chairman said that he would take it that the Committee agreed to the names listed. Other names would be added later as they became known. The Committee would discuss the list of "places the Committee might wish to visit" at its next meeting which would be held on Friday at 10:30 a.m.

He asked the Secretariat to inform the representative of Costa Rica of the discussion at this meeting.
Comments for the record should not be written on this slip, REFERRAL SHEET PT.108 should be used instead.

TO:  
The Secretary-General
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27 May 1964

FROM:  
Godfrey K.J. Amachree
Summary of the ninth meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman (closed meeting) held in Conference Room number 7 on Monday, 25 May 1964, at 10:30 a.m.

The representative of Costa Rica suggested that the Committee not meet again before the following Monday in order to allow time for the Rapporteur and the Secretariat to begin preparation of documents which had been requested.

The Chairman said it was agreed that no other meetings would be held that week.

He said that the letter to the Sultan of Muscat and Oman had been mailed and that the Secretariat would inform the Committee when it became known that the Sultan had received the letter. If the Sultan did not reply, the Committee should wait a minimum of three weeks from the time the Sultan was known to have received the letter before considering further steps to be taken.

The representative of Costa Rica suggested that the Committee wait until two weeks before its visit to the area to take further steps if the Sultan did not reply to the letter. This would give him a chance to reply and would not give the appearance that the Committee was being too hasty.

The representative of Senegal said that if no reply was received by the end of June it would be obvious that the Sultan did not choose to co-operate and to wait longer to consider what other steps to take would be going too far to accommodate him.

The Chairman said that the Committee agreed that if no reply was received by the end of June it would take up the matter again at its first meeting in July.


The Committee agreed to the following amendments to the working paper:

Paragraph 1: Add a reference to the fact that this was the first time the question of Oman had been before the United Nations.

Paragraph 3: Add that the representative of Iraq made his statement "on behalf of the sponsors of the item". The Committee agreed that it would accept the principle of naming representatives when they spoke on behalf of a group or when a new proposal was made.
Paragraph 4: Move the phrase "in opposing the inscription of the item on the Security Council agenda" to the beginning of the sentence.

Paragraph 5: List the voting in the Security Council.

Paragraph 7: Move the first sentence, as paragraph 7, to follow

Paragraph 6: Renumber all remaining paragraphs.

Paragraph 8: Insert the word "some" before "others stated that, etc."

Paragraph 10: Footnote the vote of the Special Political Committee to give the document number of the record of the meeting. The Committee agreed that this principle would be followed for all votes mentioned in the working paper.

Paragraph 11: Add the phrase "because it did not receive the necessary two-thirds vote" to the end of the first sentence.

Paragraph 12: Explain in footnote 2 that the request for inscription of the item on the agenda and the explanatory memorandum were in the same document.

Paragraph 11: Add the number of the document mentioned.

Paragraph 15: Add the word "sufficient" in the first sentence before the word "information". Delete the first seven words of the second sentence, which would make this sentence read, "Moreover, the information on the question came only from, etc.". The Secretariat was asked to find out whether the suggestion of the representative of Peru represented the first time this suggestion had been made in the Special Political Committee and if so this should be noted.

Paragraph 17: The Secretariat was asked to find the text of the telegram from the Sultan of Muscat and Oman if possible and to include it in the text, and also to mention the mandate given by the General Assembly to Mr. da Ribbing.

Paragraph 16: Add that the vote was a roll call vote.

Paragraph 22: Change the word "exclusion" to "inclusion". Add the sentence, "A discussion took place as to which Committee should deal with this item and it was decided that it would be allocated to the Fourth Committee". Mention the relevant document in a footnote.

Paragraph 21: Replace the two phrases (1) "supported the Arab States in their contention" and (2) "supported the United Kingdom contention" by the word "stated" in both cases.
Summary of the eighth meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman (closed meeting) held in Conference Room number 7 on Tuesday, 19 May 1964, at 3:00 p.m.

The Chairman announced that he had signed the letter to the Sultan of Muscat and Oman which would be transmitted by the Secretary-General as soon as possible. He asked for comments on the suggested list of places to be visited.

List of places to be visited

The representative of Costa Rica said it was necessary to find out who would be available for interviews, and the importance of each person and of the information he had. In his list, he had included places where Omanis were living, some of whom were in exile. Before deciding to go to these places, it would be necessary to know who these people were and whether they had information that would be of assistance to the Committee.

The representative of Senegal said the Committee would have to justify visiting a particular place on the basis of the number and importance of petitioners there. He suggested that perhaps the representatives of particular countries, especially Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, could give the Committee some idea of the quality and importance of petitioners in their countries.

The Chairman, speaking as the representative of Afghanistan, said it was agreed that the Committee should visit Muscat and Oman and that, if allowed to do so, it should visit as many places within the Territory as possible. Cairo should be visited on the condition that the Imam was there at the time. Otherwise, the Committee would have to replace Cairo by the Imam's place of residence.

He understood there were people in Kuwait who would have information for the Committee, and, after ascertaining that these people would be able to assist the Committee, Kuwait should be maintained on the list. The Committee should also go to Jeddah in Saudi Arabia, and to London where there were some organizations and people to be interviewed.

He suggested that the list should contain only the principal places to be visited - Muscat, Oman, the residence of the Imam, Kuwait, Jeddah and London. Other places could be added as the Committee received more information on petitioners.
The representative of Nigeria said the Committee should limit its visits to those places that were absolutely necessary. However, he would not like to exclude Cairo if the Imam was not in residence there. As he understood it, there were Omaniis in Cairo who might wish to get in touch with the Committee.

The Chairman explained that Cairo, if it were not the residence of the Imam, would come within the category of other places the Committee might decide to visit when it had ascertained that there were people there to be interviewed.

The representative of Costa Rica noted that the Committee had agreed to limit its final list of places to be visited to those where the greatest number of people were concentrated. He agreed that conversations should be held with the representatives of interested countries to find out the number of people in their countries to be interviewed. The Committee could then make its own selection.

The Chairman said it was agreed that the preliminary list should include Muscat, Oman, Cairo, Kuwait, Jeddah and London. The Committee would choose other places in accordance with the information it received about the desirability of a visit.

The Chairman informed the Committee that he had asked a number of delegations interested in the question of Oman, to provide the Committee with a list of political leaders and people who might be of assistance to it. The suggestions received would be put at the disposal of the Committee. He had made it clear that the Committee was under no obligation to accept these suggestions, but would consider them all.

Other Matters

The Chairman suggested that the Committee might consider the preparation of a list of the principal questions to be asked in interviews. Such a questionnaire should be based on the questions to which the General Assembly had sought answers and which would supply information needed for the Committee's report. The questionnaire could contain the basic questions to be put to the persons the Committee would be interviewing. In this way duplication could be avoided. Of course there would be other questions and members would be free to ask them at the proper time.
The representative of Senegal agreed with this suggestion and felt that it was important to have questions as a guide to the Committee in its work, both here and in the region. As the Secretariat had had experience in preparing such questionnaires, he suggested that they be asked to prepare a working paper.

The representative of Costa Rica supported the proposal of the Chairman and the suggestion of the representative of Senegal. He expressed some concern that if the list was included in a document and prepared over a long period of time, it might become known to the parties concerned which could lessen its effectiveness. The longer the Committee delayed the preparation of such a document, the more useful it would be. If possible, it should be prepared immediately before the trip.

The representative of Nigeria agreed that the publishing of the questions should be delayed.

The representative of Nepal said the preparation of a questionnaire could best be done at the end of the Committee's study of the available material. This was what had been envisaged in the Committee's draft plan of work. In any case, it should be made clear that the members of the Committee would be free to seek pertinent information by questioning.

The Chairman wanted to make it clear that this would not be a rigid questionnaire nor would members be prevented from asking any questions they wished. The list would contain questions designed to seek information, not ones that would be put for the purposes of investigation. He felt that it was desirable to have a list of general questions prepared and since these would be general there might not be any danger in publishing them. He agreed that the Secretariat should prepare the questionnaire and suggested that it be ready three weeks before departure. The list could, of course, be added to by the Committee as its work progressed.

The representative of Nepal said that as he understood it, the questionnaire would be a list of points on which further information was necessary in order to assist the Committee in its main task.

The next meeting was set for 10:30 a.m. on Monday.
Summary of the seventh meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman (closed meeting)
hold in Conference Room number 7
on Friday, 15 May 1964, at 10:30 a.m.

Reply to letter from Mr. Himyar bin Sulaiman

The representative of Costa Rica thanked his colleagues for waiting for his views before reaching a decision on this matter. He found the reply to Himyar bin Sulaiman acceptable in substance and form. Concerning the question of the form of addressing the parties concerned, he felt the Committee should make it very clear by an amendment to the terms of reference or in some other way that it would use the most current titles used at the United Nations when discussing the question of Oman and that by doing so it would not mean the Committee was prejudging the issues. In this way, the Committee would be free to answer letters with the titles it always used and would be able to avoid having to use the titles used by the writers.

The representative of Nepal said it was important to be consistent with United Nations practice. He preferred to address Mr. Sulaiman as Representative of the Imam of Oman, or if not, simply Mr. Himyar bin Sulaiman would be acceptable. The Sultan should be addressed as the United Nations had consistently addressed him, namely Sultan of Muscat and Oman. Regarding the Imam, he had not yet used the term Imam of the State of Oman, and since Imam of Oman meant the same thing, he could be addressed as Imam of Oman.

The Chairman said the Committee might be confronted with new titles chosen by correspondents. It should take a decision and apply it consistently. The Committee was a body specially established to consider this question and could make its own decisions on this matter.

The representative of Nigeria said it would be unwise to attribute a title to someone which he did not claim. Himyar bin Sulaiman might not represent the Imam. He felt that the Committee should make it clear that it would answer correspondence in exactly the same terms used by the writers and that this would not mean that the Committee recognized these titles.

The representative of Senegal felt that the Committee could not assume the competence to recognize or reject titles used by correspondents as this was up to the General Assembly to decide after the Committee's
The report had been submitted. In order to avoid confusion it should consistently follow the usage of the United Nations.

The Chairman said that it was the consensus that the Committee should make its position clear on the use of titles.

The Committee had also agreed that it was not its function to recognize or reject a title. In corresponding with a person the Committee would use the title used by that person, it being understood that this in no way prejudged any of the issues. He asked the members whether this decision should take the form of an amendment to the terms of reference.

After a discussion in which all members participated, the Committee agreed to add the following paragraph to the terms of reference as a new paragraph after paragraph 5:

"In these terms of reference the Committee has used the titles of the parties concerned in accordance with the conventional usage in United Nations documents. In corresponding with the parties concerned, the Committee will address them by the titles they ascribe to themselves, without any prejudice to the position of the Committee in the question."

The Chairman then said that having made this decision on the question of principle, the Committee could now turn to the reply to Mr. Himyar bin Salaiman. The draft could be amended to read "The Committee agrees to request the Under-Secretary to inform Himyar bin Salaiman, Representative of the State of Oman, that it has...."

It was so decided.

Proposed timetable

The representative of Costa Rica, speaking in the capacity of Rapporteur, expressed concern over holding hearings after the Committee's return from the area. He was afraid this would not leave sufficient time for the consideration and preparation of the report. He also felt that the Committee could not fix a rigid schedule for its visit because much would depend on how efficiently the Committee could work and whether the people to be seen could be brought together in one area. It might be said, tentatively, that a visit of three or four weeks should be sufficient to complete the investigation.
The Chairman said plans depended a great deal on whether the Committee would be admitted to Muscat and Oman or not. He said he had made contacts with the five countries having relations with Muscat and Oman and had found great willingness to co-operate. The Netherlands had already submitted the text of a treaty and the United States intended to do so. The United Kingdom would help with any documents they thought would be of assistance to the Committee and had offered to make statements and answer questions. India had not found any documents not already available to the Committee and the French delegation had not received a reply from Paris yet. He did not believe that any delegation was in a position to transmit the letter to the Sultan.

There were two alternatives to be considered, to request the Secretary-General to try to find a channel of transmittal other than by a Member State, or to send it by ordinary post. He had information that if a letter was sent by post to the Sultan and a copy given to a certain delegation they would be able to inform the Committee as to whether the Sultan had received the letter. If the Committee agreed on a method of transmittal, the letter should be sent that day.

The representative of Senegal thanked the Chairman for his efforts on behalf of the Committee. He felt it was urgent to send the letter as soon as possible so the Committee could plan its work. He suggested that the letter be sent to the Sultan directly by either the Secretary-General or the Chairman of the Committee. The letter should be registered.

The Chairman pointed out that it was not his suggestion to send a copy of a certain delegation.
He felt the letter should be sent through the Secretary-General as this would give it an extra stamp of importance.

The representative of Costa Rica said that all had agreed that the letter would be a Committee letter signed by the Chairman and forwarded by the Secretary-General.

The representative of Nepal asked for views on sending a copy to the delegation mentioned.

The Chairman said as he had dealt with the delegation as one of the countries having treaty relations and had avoided prejudging the case...
This had only been informal information he had
passed on to the Committee. The Committee therefore would not send
a copy to that delegation.

The Chairman said that the Committee would discuss items 2 and 3
of the agenda at its next meeting, which would be on Tuesday at 3 p.m.
**TO:** The Secretary-General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROVAL</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>YOUR INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAY WE CONFER?</td>
<td>AS REQUESTED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR SIGNATURE</td>
<td>FOR ACTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE AND FILE</td>
<td>REPLY FOR MY SIGNATURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE AND RETURN</td>
<td>PREPARE DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR COMMENTS</td>
<td>ATTACH RELATED PAPERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATE: 23 June 1964

FROM: Godfrey K.J. Amoahree
Copy of cable dated 20 June 1964 from Said bin Taimur, Sultan of Muscat and Oman, addressed to His Excellency Abdul Rahman Fanhaw, care of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

YOUR EXCELLENCY WE THANK YOU FOR YOUR LETTER OF 18th MAY WHICH WAS RECEIVED ON 8th JUNE. AS YOU KNOW ON A NUMBER OF OCCASIONS WE HAVE SENT MESSAGES TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY REMINDING THE DISTINGUISHED DELEGATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS THAT WE HOLD SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR ALL MATTERS WITHIN THE SULTANATES OF MUSCAT AND OMAN, WHICH HAS BEEN A SOVEREIGN AND INDEPENDENT STATE FOR OVER 200 YEARS. WE HAVE ALSO REMINDED THE DISTINGUISHED DELEGATES THAT WE HAVE NOT YET THOUGHT IT NECESSARY TO JOIN THE UNITED NATIONS. THE RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO WHICH YOU REFER CONCERNS MATTERS WHICH ARE WITHIN OUR JURISDICTION AND IS THEREFORE AN INFRINGEMENT UPON OUR DOMAIN WHICH WE UNDERSTAND, THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS ITSELF RESERVES TO OUR SOVEREIGN COMPETENCE. FOR THESE REASONS WE REGRET THAT WE CANNOT AGREE THAT YOUR COMMITTEE SHOULD VISIT ANY PART OF OUR TERRITORIES.
Dear Brother,

I am taking advantage of Ambassador Harof's return to renew, in writing, the assurances of my friendly sentiments.

Your presence at our conference in Cairo was a very positive factor. Thank you again for the attention you are giving and the interest you are taking in the rapid development of Africa.

With my highest consideration, accept, Sir, my fraternal greetings.

(initials)
UNATIONS
GENEVA

MALKOWSKI FROM HARASIMIAN. YOUR 179. SECURE WILL BE HAPPY
TO CONTRIBUTE BRIEF GENERAL PREFACE TO FIRST VOLUME OF UNCTAD,
SINCE I AM LEAVING NEW YORK FOR ASIA AND FAR EAST THIS EVENING.
I SUGGEST THAT DRAFT MAY BE PREPARED BY YOU AND CLEARED WITH
FREDRIK AND DE SIKHES AND FORWARD TO BOLZENNETT. WARM REGARDS.

cc: Mr. Bolz-Bennett
Mr. Lesieur

C.V. Harasimhan, Chef de Cabinet
YOU MAY WISH TO TAKE THIS MATTER UP WITH SEEGEN AND DISCUSS IT WITH
WHEN HE ARRIVES HEADQUARTERS DOWNEY ACTION. SEEGEN SHOULD FEAR THE
EXCLUSION IN FIRST VOLUME SHOULD HEAD BALTIMORE, HEAD OFFICE BALTIMORE,
BY TWENTY A MIST. BEST REGARDS =

READER +
Comments for the record should not be written on this slip. REFERRAL SHEET PT.108 should be used instead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO: The Secretary-General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY WE CONFER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR SIGNATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE AND FILE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE AND RETURN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATE: 7 Aug. '64  
FROM: G.K.J. Amachree
Mr. Bruce Turner, Controller
7 August 1964

Godfrey E. J. Amachree, Under-Secretary
Department of Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories

Ad Hoc Committee on Oman - Financial Provisions

1. At its meeting yesterday, the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman established by General Assembly resolution 1948 (XVIII) of 11 December 1963 took a number of decisions concerning its visit to the area. As these decisions affect the budgetary provisions for the Committee I am forwarding them to you for the necessary action.

2. It will be recalled that, in establishing this Committee, the General Assembly approved a budgetary allocation of $20,000, it being understood that any expenditure in excess of this amount was to be met by recourse to paragraph 1 of the resolution relating to unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the year 1964 (A/5658).

3. The Committee has decided that it will be necessary for it to visit London, Cairo, Damascus, Kuwait and one other centre in the Persian Gulf. The Committee will leave New York on 27 August and will return on 21 September.

4. The Committee was also informed that, in accordance with the General Assembly's decision, the Secretary-General intended to designate four members of the Secretariat to accompany the Committee on its mission, namely a Principal Secretary, a Political Affairs Officer, an Interpreter and a Secretary/Stenographer. After considering this information, the Committee decided that, in view of the tasks that it had been called upon to carry out on behalf of the General Assembly, the number of staff which the Secretary-General intended to designate was not sufficient, and that, in particular, a Press Officer and another Secretary/Stenographer should be provided. The Committee also considered that there should be sufficient finance to provide for hiring of assistance locally including an Arabic-English interpreter. The Secretary of the Committee pointed out that the Secretary-General had made these designations in accordance with the financial arrangements approved by the General Assembly which had been based on four members of the Secretariat accompanying the Committee, and that should the Committee wish to add to the staff, it would have to seek the concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Budgetary and Administrative Matters. The Committee then requested the Secretary to take the necessary action to see that its decision on the question of staffing was communicated to the appropriate authority.

.../2
5. With reference to the assignment of a Press Officer, the Committee considered it important that one staff member should be available to handle relations with the press at each of the centres it would be visiting. This officer would be responsible for seeing that the Committee's itinerary was fully publicised in the area, for seeing that statements to the press were distributed to the various communications media, for arranging interviews, and for collecting and analysing reports in the local press of the Committee's activities. It was pointed out that the services of the United Nations Information Centres would be at the disposal of the Committee in London and Cairo. However, there would be no such services available at the other places at which the Committee would be holding meetings. It may be possible to arrange for the services of an officer from one of the United Nations Information Centres in the Middle East to accompany the Committee on its visit beyond Cairo. In this connexion I have been in touch with the Office of Public Information at Headquarters and I have been informed that it may be possible to provide the services of an Arabic speaking press officer from their centre at Beirut, but that the cost of this officer's travel however, would have to be borne by the Committee's budget.

6. With reference to an extra Secretary/Stenographer it was pointed out by the Committee that it would need full records of the statements made to it and that it would be hearing statements almost constantly for a period of about three weeks. The Committee felt that it would be impossible, and indeed, unreasonable, to expect one secretary to take down and type all these statements, and that without regard to any other consideration, one secretary was insufficient. It considered, therefore, that, as a minimum, these and other secretarial duties should be shared between two secretaries.

7. For your information, I should like to recall that the staff provided for recent missions of this nature serviced by this Department has been as follows:

(i) **Sub-Committee on Aden 1969**
   - **Duration:** 2 weeks
   - **Places visited:** Cairo, Sana, Taiz, Jeddah, Baghdad
   - **Staff members (4):** Secretary of the Committee, Political Affairs Officer, Interpreter, Secretary/Stenographer

(ii) **Visiting Mission to the Pacific Islands**
   - **Duration:** 6 weeks
   - **Places visited:** various Pacific Islands
   - **Staff members (4):** as for (i), except and Administrative Officer instead of an interpreter
(iii) **Sub-Committee on Southern Rhodesia 1964**

Duration: 1 week  
Places visited: London  
Staff members (3): as for (i), but no interpreter.

(iv) **Sub-Committee on Aden 1964**

Duration: 1 week  
Places visited: Cairo  
Staff members (4): as for (i)

8. In view of this experience, it is my view that neither a Press Officer nor an additional Secretary/Stenographer is necessary for this Committee's mission. I have every confidence that the staff members I shall recommend shall carry out all the functions required of them to the full satisfaction of the members of the Committee.
LT

HIS EXCELLENCY ABDUL RAHMAN PAHZWAK C/O
SECRETARY GENERAL UNITED NATIONS NEW YORK

YOUR EXCELLENCY WITH REFERENCE TO YOUR EXCELLENCY'S
LETTER OF JULY 24TH AS ALREADY INDICATED IN MY PREVIOUS
TELEGRAM I REGRET THAT I WOULD BE UNABLE TO RECEIVE
MORE THAN ONE MEMBER OF YOUR COMMITTEE AND PROVIDED THAT
I RECEIVE IN ADVANCE THE DETAILS OF THE MATTERS UPON WHICH
YOU REQUIRE OUR COMMENT

SAID BIN TAIMUR SULTAN OF MUSCAT AND OMAN

24TH
1. The Ad Hoc Committee on Oman established by General Assembly resolution 1948 (XVIII) of 11 December 1963 has decided on its plans to visit the area. The Chairman of the Committee will leave for London on 27 August 1964 for talks with the Sultan of Muscat and Oman. The remainder of the Committee will join the Chairman in London on 1 September 1964 and thereafter will visit Cairo, Kuwait and Damman for the purpose of interviewing persons and organizations who have expressed the wish to provide the Committee with information and to place their views before it.

2. My recommendations as to the staff members who will accompany the mission as its secretariat are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Secretary</td>
<td>Mr. J.A. Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affairs Officer</td>
<td>Mr. Kyaw U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Miss N.L. Wright</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The Office of Conference Services has been requested to provide an interpreter, whose name will be submitted to you in due course.

4. I should be grateful for your approval of these recommendations.
AD HOC COMMITTEE ON OMAN LEAVES LONDON FOR DAMMAM

(The following was received from the United Nations Information Centre in London.)

The Ad Hoc Committee on Oman yesterday left London for Dammam, Saudi Arabia.

While in London, the Committee had talks with officials of the Foreign Office.

The Chairman of the Committee, Abdul Rahman Pazhwak (Afghanistan), also had a number of meetings with the Sultan of Muscat and Oman.

* *** *

* Other members of the Committee are: Fernando Volio (Costa Rica), Rapporteur; Ram C. Malhotra (Nepal); Ali Monguno (Nigeria); and Abdou Ciss (Senegal).
23 September 1964

Excellency,

I received your kind letter of 21 September. I am distressed to learn that the staff resources made available for the work of your Committee proved inadequate. I am looking into the matter and shall send you a further communication as soon as possible.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

U Thant

His Excellency
Mr. Abdal Rahma Pashwak
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Chairman of the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on Oman
Permanent Representative of Afghanistan
to the United Nations
200 East 42nd Street, 17th Floor
New York, N.Y. 10017

cc: Mr. Amachree
September 21, 1964

Your Excellency,

I have returned from the Mission to London, Damascus, Kuwait, and Cairo in the service of the United Nations in connection with the question of Oman. Since I will have to leave New York again to represent Afghanistan in the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Countries which will be held on the first of October in Cairo, I find it necessary to draw Your Excellency's attention to the importance the members of the United Nations ad hoc Committee on Oman and myself attach to the proper preparation of the report of the Committee to the General Assembly.

While I appreciate the cooperation of the members of the Secretariat who accompanied the Committee on its visit to the area, the Committee was not given enough staff to enable it to work in more adequate and convenient conditions. The request of the Committee from the Secretariat was not met in this connection. The department concerned did not inform me before the departure of the Committee from New York of the decision they had made about the staff so that I could bring the matter to Your Excellency's attention at that time. This is indeed most regrettable. However, the Committee will have to prepare its report as adequately as possible. The assistance and cooperation of the Secretariat in this matter is required most urgently. I have brought this matter to the attention of the department concerned through Mr. Miles, the principal Secretary of the Committee. I enclose a copy of my letter addressed to him.

I request Your Excellency to pay personal attention to this matter as you do to all matters. It is not a pleasant task to take your personal time on a matter of routine which should have been handled by the department concerned, and I am sure Your Excellency understands this. I must say it is not my disappointment which has compelled me to address this letter to you, but my duty and the responsibility put on the shoulders of the members of the Committee to fulfill its task in full accordance with the resolution of the General Assembly.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurance of my highest consideration.

Chairman
of the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on Oman
September 21, 1969

Dear Mr. Miles,

As you are aware, I shall have to leave New York to represent Afghanistan in the preliminary conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Countries which will be convened on the first of October in Cairo before the Conference of the Heads of State or Governments of the Non-Aligned countries. Although I shall try to keep in touch with you during my short stay in New York, I thought it would be better to bring the following points to your attention in your capacity as the principal Secretary of the United Nations ad hoc Committee on Oman, and through you to the attention of the department concerned.

1. All interviews with the Sultan of Muscat and Oman, the authorities of the Government of the United Kingdom, together with the information promised by them, to be submitted to the Committee, should be ready in verbatim by October 10.

2. The verbatim record of the interviews with the Imam of Oman and the members of the Higher Council of the Revolutionary Council of Oman in Damascus should be ready by October 10. The members of the Committee should be informed to send in corrections if any. I personally have returned the copies I was given with the corrections.

3. All interviews with groups of petitioners and interviews in Damascus, Kuwait, and Cairo should be prepared in verbatim record.

4. All written petitions received by the Committee in all the places it visited should be translated in full before October 10 by a translator of the United Nations Secretariat to be ready at least in one of the working languages of the Committee before October 10.

I am sure that other documents and papers necessary for the work of the Committee, to start the evaluation and discussion of the information it has gathered and prepared, will also be available to the members as soon as possible.

I wish to express my appreciation of the cooperation the Committee received from you and other members of the United Nations Secretariat who accompanied the Mission from the Headquarters and those who assisted the Committee in London and
in Cairo. However, I would like to add that if it were not for the shortage of personnel, the members of the Secretariat and the Committee would have worked under more convenient conditions. Therefore, it is necessary for me to draw the attention of the department concerned, through you, that adequate staff should be put at your disposal to enable the Committee to start its work properly and without any delay.

I have written a letter in this connection to the Secretary-General and have drawn his attention to the assistance and cooperation of the Secretariat with the Committee to fulfill its task as required by the General Assembly.

Sincerely,

Rahman Pashwak
Chairman
of the United Nations
ad hoc
Committee on
Oman

Mr. John Miles
Room 33270
United Nations, New York

cc: The Secretary-General
My dear Ambassador,

I should like to revert to your letter of 21 September concerning the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman and to my acknowledgement of 23 September informing you that I was looking into the matter you had raised and would communicate with you further.

As you are aware, the question of the number of staff assigned to committees established by the General Assembly is a matter on which the General Assembly itself decides, after reviewing information provided by the Secretary-General and after recommendations have been made by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. Once this decision has been taken, my discretion in the matter is confined to the selection of the particular staff members who are to be assigned to the Committee.

In this case, the information concerning staffing and related costs which I submitted to the General Assembly was based on experience with similar Committees in the past and on the need to plan our work within the limits imposed on all of us by the well-known financial difficulties with which the Organization is faced. Financial stringency is a factor which is affecting all aspects of our work at the present time and imposes on all of us added difficulties in carrying out our tasks.

I feel that it is within this context that one must view any difficulties which your Committee and the Secretariat experienced during your mission. I can give you my assurance that, now that the Committee is back at Headquarters, everything possible will be done to assist the Committee in the preparation of its report and I have every hope that the work will be carried out competently and to your satisfaction.

Before concluding, may I express my sincere appreciation for your deep interest in this matter which has prompted you to raise it with me.

Yours sincerely,

His Excellency
Mr. Abdul Rahman Faznav
Ambassador Extraordinary and
Plenipotentiary
Chairman of the United Nations
Ad Hoc Committee on Oman
Permanent Representative of Afghanistan
to the United Nations
200 East 42nd Street, 17th Floor
New York, N.Y. 10017

U Thant
cc: Mr. Amachree
Date: 18 June 1971
FROM: M.E. Checko
DE: Officer-in-charge, PSCA
General

The Sultanate of Muscat and Oman occupies the south-eastern part of the Arabian peninsula and is surrounded by the Trucial States, Saudi Arabia, Southern Yemen, the Arabian Sea and the Gulf of Oman. It has a total area of approximately 82,000 square miles (220 square kilometres).
The total population is estimated at 750,000. The Sultanate is composed of 2 provinces: the Dhofar (population - 40,000) and Oman province. The capital of the Territory, Muscat, has a population of nearly 60,000.

Following the British withdrawal from Aden, the Kuria Muria islands were retroceded to the Sultanate in 1967.

While the United Kingdom has always maintained that the Sultanate was independent, the United Nations General Assembly, in a number of resolutions on the question of Oman, without specifically designating Oman as a non-self-governing Territory, had taken the position that Oman falls under the scope of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It was therefore also within the scope of the Special Committee of Twenty-Four.

However, the World Health Assembly, on 13 May 1970, decided by 94 votes with 3 against and 10 abstentions, to admit Oman to full membership of the World Health Organization which is open only to States.1/

Military, Economic and Political Developments

There are two British air bases in the Sultanate, one at Masirah and the other at Salalah in Dhofar. The Masirah air base is believed to be, after Singapore, the most important British military establishment east of Suez. The Sultanate has a small air force consisting of eight light jet aircraft flown by seconded Royal Air Force officers. The Sultanate's army (entitled Sultan's Armed Forces), is a British armed and officered army of about 7,000. There are more than 100 British officers, most of them on provisional leave from the British Army and are recruited under

---

1/ The resolution calling for admission had been sponsored by 13 States, 10 of them were Arab States. The 13 sponsors were:
Algeria, Ethiopia, Iran, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mauritania, Morocco, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, the United Arab Republic and Yemen.
Albania and Southern Yemen voted against.
Saudi Arabia was among the 10 abstainers.
three years contract, with possibility of renewal. In a statement made by the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Defence in the House of Commons on 25 March 1970, it was said that a total of 40 officers of the Royal Marines, the Army and the Royal Air Force and seven Army and other ranks have been serving with the Sultan's armed forces on secondment.

As for the mercenary group, most of its junior officers are Pakistani. The Prime Minister of Oman is reported to be giving preference in the recruitment to non-British officers such as French, Belgians, Czechs and Turks, "provided they know English and can do the job".

The Commander-in-Chief of the Sultan armed forces is General John Graham who receives orders from Colonel Hugh Oldman, the Defence Secretary for Oman. The Army is the only organized force in the Territory. Civil administration is virtually non-existent. Most of the civil functions have been assumed by the Sultan's armed forces. In exchange for their support of the Sultan against local and foreign adversaries, British political agents have continued to enjoy considerable influence. They in fact hold the power: military bases, foreign policy, the Army, the banks, oil investments, and foreign trade are in British hands.

From 1955 to 1960, the British forces fought to defend the throne of the former Sultan, Said bin Taimur, against a separatist movement led by Imam Ghaleb, a political and spiritual leader of Oman province. It had been speculated at that time that in case of secession, an important British oil concession would have been transferred to an American oil company, the Aramco, which operates in neighbouring Saudi Arabia. The suppression of this rebellion led by Imam Ghaleb was long and bloody.

---

1/ He is also the centre of active Intelligence networks.
Most Arab States then supported the Imam. The situation in Oman was discussed in the United Nations and the British Government was urged to cease all interference with the internal affairs of the Territory. In this connexion, the General Assembly adopted a number of resolutions, the latest in Dec. 1970. Subsequently, fewer regular British Army troops were involved as such according to a new formula, forces were seconded and paid direct allegiance to the Sultan.

The former Sultan, who ruled for thirty-eight years, was said to have followed tribal patterns of government. He was convinced that progress was only a penetration of foreign influence detrimental to tradition; that, in general, it was a carrier of revolution in any field. He opposed modern education. For a population of 750,000, there were, up to the beginning of this year, only three primary schools. He authorized one hospital, at Matrah, owned by the Protestant American Mission. The whole Territory had ten medical doctors assigned to public health. It is reported that the rate of infant mortality is one of the highest in the world: 30%. It is also said that newspapers were forbidden, as well as projection of films, etc. He himself delivered entrance and exit visas. In 1958, he left the capital Muscat and there-after remained secluded in his palace at Salalah.

The only major source of revenue of the Sultanate is the royalties paid by the Petroleum Development (Oman) Ltd. which amount to 50 million pounds sterling annually. The amount paid is 50 times higher than the total amount collected in taxes. The company's oil concession covers three quarters of the Territory of the Sultanate. The company is owned by Shell (85 per cent of the shares) in association with a French company, "La Compagnie Française des Petroles (10 per cent), and the Gulbekian Group (5 per cent)
The old annexation of the European Settlements (crossed off are the A) of the Territory (shown in light gray).
The production of oil has kept increasing¹. Large scale production and exportation (which started 3 years ago) of the discovered oil made it necessary to create an infrastructure, to involve local manpower, etc...

The negative attitude of the ex-Sultan was a serious obstacle to modern operations. The ruler had to adjust or disappear. Besides, the medieval conditions under which the Territory has been kept had long since created deep discontent.

The brutal repression of a tribal rebellion in 1963 gave birth to an organized revolutionary movement, the "Liberation Front of Dhofar" which claims Marxist-Leninist orientation. The Front, which started the armed struggle on 9 June 1965, turned more and more radical. At its second Congress held in September 1968, the Front entitled itself: "Popular Front for the Liberation of the Arab-occupied Gulf". Its activities were not therefore to be limited to the Territory of Oman but to extend to the whole Persian Gulf area².

¹ In 1969 it reached 16.4 million tons, compared with 12.1 million tons in 1968 and 3.2 million tons the year before. The proven oil reserves are estimated at over 680 million tons. In 1970 Oman exported 17 million tons of oil.

² According to the report in the Christian Science Monitor (1 June), for the first time in a year an Omani regular battalion has pushed into the western highlands of Dhofar to challenge the rebels on their own ground, near their sanctuary and base in the neighbouring state of the People's Republic of South Yemen. The Royal Army commanded by British Brig. Gen. John Graham, is running a race against the approaching four-month Indian Ocean monsoon, during which most operations on the coast must cease. Every year since the war began as a purely nationalist uprising against the tyranny of ex-Sultan Shih bin Taimur in 1964, the rebels have used the cover of the monsoon for increasingly hit-and-run operations along the coast.

The stakes in the war are more than just the security of Salalah, Oman's...
The economic and strategic interests of Great Britain and the United States in the area were directly at stake after these developments. Peking took a public stand in the support of the Front. According to reports, the revolutionary army has within it several officers and political agents trained in Peking. It has now under its control two-thirds of the Dhofar Province where it has been able to create an efficient popular administration.

In the other Province of the Territory, Oman Province, partisans of the former Imam Ghaleb (who had been driven out of the country in 1959 by the Sultan's Armed Forces, and took refuge in Saudi Arabia) were considered to second largest city, or the hinterlands of the country. The opponents of the present sultan, Qabus bin Said, are reported to be receiving arms and training from mainland China in an aim to spread "people's governments" northward to the Strait of Hormuz, through which pass 60 per cent of the oil supplies to western countries and into the Gulf states which supply this oil.

This raised the war to a dimension far beyond that implied by the small forces involved: a 6,500-man Royal Oman Army and a few thousand more gendarmerie against about 1,000 full-time "hard-core" fighters.

It is reported that neither Sultan Qabus, nor his uncle, Prime Minister Tarik bin Taimur, nor the approximately 200 British and Commonwealth officers who run the war can foresee the final outcome.
be a sort of a transition toward another newly organized revolutionary movement constituted by young militants. The new revolutionary organization, "The National Democratic Front for the Liberation of Oman and the Arabian Gulf" proclaimed with a doctrine stressing anti-monarchism and anti-imperialism. It is reported to have arms at its disposal.

It seems that this organization came to the knowledge of the British in Oman only after it had made its first strike early in June 1970. After an attempted attack on the British military camp of Izki on 11-12 June 1970, the British found evidence that the new organization existed and had a widespread network, that it had very close links with the "Popular Front of Dhofar" and that it was supported by Moscow.

Those developments were regarded with much apprehension in the neighbouring Emirates. The revolutionary disturbance, it was feared, might well extend to Dubai, Abu Dhabi, Qatar, Kuwait and even Iran. It has been reported that the leaders of these countries exercised pressure on the British Government with the view to taking action toward the only conceivable means to fight the spread of revolution - the removal of the Sultan so as to permit action to improve the economic condition of the local population and open the way for social and political advancement.

Sultan Said bin Taimur was held to be responsible for the backwardness, stagnation and isolation of the country. His departure was considered a necessity. In fact, shortly after the attempted attack on Izki military camp and the discovery of the revolutionists' plans, dispatches from Kuwait, the Iranian Press, as well as later, the Economist, mentioned the imminent "abdication" of the Sultan and his replacement by his son Quabus (born in 1940).
According to the official version on the afternoon of 23 July 1970, an armed group led by close friends of the Sultan burst into the Sultan's office. The old Sultan resisted arrest and opened fire. In the gunfight which continued across the corridors of the palace, he was seriously wounded. In what was taken for a very explicit symbol, he refused to abdicate in the presence of any of his compatriots and would sign the historic document only in the presence of a Briton. He signed the paper in the presence of Colonel Turnhill, Commander of his personal guard. On the same day, he left the Sultanate for Great Britain on board a RAF aircraft. In London, the event was considered as "happy mutation". At Muscat, the President Director-General of the Petroleum Development (Oman) Ltd. issued a communiqué saluting with enthusiasm this "historical event".

In fact, since the coup of 23 July 1970, great efforts have been made to lay down the foundation of a modern State and to bring social and economic improvements to the condition of the people. Schools are being built at a great rate. At the end of this year 42 elementary schools (6 for girls) and 3 high schools will be ready. The population is now 95% illiterate. Medical care has become completely free and there are plans for 9 new hospitals in addition to the one existing.

The head of the new Government, Prime Minister Tariq bin Taimur, is a brother of the former Sultan. Up to the age of 16 he lived in Turkey and Germany. In 1937 he served in the army in Oman and in India. In the 1950's, he directed the military operations against the rebellion of Imam Ghaleb in the mountains of Oman. However, he did not enjoy the total confidence of the Sultan who later placed him under house surveillance in Muscat. After two years he managed to cross the boundary in secrecy.
and requested the hospitality of the Sheikh of Abu Dhabi. Four years later, he started an open political struggle against his brother. In an interview reported in the London Sunday Times of 12 November 1966, he had announced the formation of a political movement aimed at overthrowing the Sultan Said bin Taimur and founding a Constitutional Monarchy. By his background, experience and relations, he could be defined as the leader of the "bourgeois" opposition hostile both to the feudal despotism, and to the Marxist-Leninist ideas proposed by the guerrillas of Dhofar. While having the total support of merchants and businessmen, he lacks that of the chiefs of tribes, who look at him with caution.

Most of the officials in the new Government are intellectuals who came back to the country after long voluntary exile.

In a recent interview to newspapermen, the Prime Minister expressed the feeling that perhaps he was only a transitional Prime Minister. He is criticized by the young intellectuals who studied abroad for his sympathies for the "big international capital" and his weakness toward the retrograde forces of the interior. As for the traditionalists and hidden partisans of the "Ancien Régime", they see in him a dangerous reformist.

The Prime Minister does not have full powers. In principle, he is responsible for the Information, Public Health, Education, Economic and Social Affairs. His nephew, the new Sultan Qabus has, with his British advisers, the exclusive control of Defence, Interior, Finances and Oil.

Sultan Qabus has been educated in Europe. He followed courses at the military academy of Sandhurst and served in the British regiment in Germany.
The objectives of the new Sultan and his government are two-fold: modernization of the country and liquidation of the Marxist-Leninist guerilla movement in the Dhofar. The second task limits the means to be allotted to the first. According to reliable reports in Muscat the Army costs approximately half of the oil revenues, that is, more than 25 million pounds sterling, whereas Education and Public Health for example received 2 million pounds each for the current year.

As stated previously, the revolutionary movement in the Dhofar is not the only one in the country. It is not considered to be the most dangerous in the long run. It is speculated that the Dhofar guerillas would certainly be extinguished if the leftist regime of Southern Yemen (Aden) were to collapse. A greater danger is seen in the revolutionary movement of the Oman province where pro-Soviet communists operate (the Democratic National Front for the Liberation of Oman and the Arabian Gulf). In the opinion of General Graham, Commander-in-Chief of the Sultan's armed forces, "Russians are more dangerous than the Chinese because of their better knowledge of the area and greater experience in subversion".

Despite the change of Sultan and the multiple efforts made, the Territory has not yet succeeded in gaining large international recognition. An Oman delegation, composed of ministers made a tour in February-March in Arab countries to request support for the admission of Oman in the Arab League. It failed to get any substantial result. It seems that many Governments have made it known that the Oman Government had first to clarify the nature of its relationship with the United Kingdom.

The United Kingdom for its part is faced with a dilemma: it had already renounced continuing to hold complete monopoly in Oman, convinced
that in the long run a friendly regime in Oman could find stability only in a more diversified society and with a less dependent State. It is thus making efforts to help consolidate a more liberal regime and to gain international recognition for it. The latter could be achieved only when a less dependent relationship is established. But the new regime would be too vulnerable without British involvement, and Great Britain could not take the risk of losing one of its last strongholds in a strategic area fabulous for its oil wealth. Such a risk is made real by the existence of the quasi-revolutionary environment.

North of Oman, the United Kingdom has been encouraging the formation of a Union of Arab Emirates. The plan was prompted by the prospect of the British withdrawal from the area, which is expected to be completed by the end of 1971. The insecurity of the Rulers and uncertainty about the attitudes of Iran and Saudi Arabia, which not long ago had territorial claims in Bahrain (Iran) and Abu Dhabi (Saudi Arabia), had at the time reinforced the idea of creating the Federation. The Federation, which was established in March 30, 1968 has a provisional and exceedingly loose character: no single head, no permanent capital and no central administration.

According to recent reports, the present Oman Government is very cold towards entering the Federation. In an interview, Prime Minister Tariq said to the Christian Science Monitor (2 June 1970) that "Oman's own urgent need to modernize will keep it out of any Persian Gulf Federation."

---

The Supreme Council is the highest organ of the Federation (the decisions are taken at the unanimity by the 9 Rulers). Subordinate to the Supreme Council is a Federation Council. In October 1968, the Supreme Council decided in principle to establish a unified army, to draft an overall development plan and to prepare a permanent constitution. Other decisions were reached in principle concerning the flag, common currency
The neighbouring Emirates, Qatar and Abu Dhabi have, in 1970, adopted constitutions making each of them "an independent State". In both constitutions it is mentioned that the State is a member of the Union of Arab Emirates. Efforts are being made by these Emirates to gain international recognition. They would probably apply for admission in the Arab League before seeking membership in the United Nations. Bahrain will certainly do the same.

and the common postal services. In October 1969 the talks held by the 9 Rulers were reported to have collapsed because of disagreement on points concerning the future structure of the Federation. A meeting of the deputies of the Rulers of the Trucial States was held in June 1970 to prepare for conference of the Supreme Council of the Federation. In a communiqué issued on 24 June, a number of agreements had been announced. In 1971 despite hopes and efforts, no development has occurred.