



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 5th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 86: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/35/SR.5
9 October 1980
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 86: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/35/23 (Part III), A/AC.109/599-601 and 611)

1. Mr. BRAIZAT (Jordan) welcomed the admission of Zimbabwe and of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines to the United Nations. The presence of those two friendly countries in the international community constituted a victory for the countries struggling for the exercise of their rights to self-determination and independence and would give a new impetus to the Fourth Committee's work to accelerate the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.
2. There seemed to be an emerging tendency for certain delegations to assert that the activities of foreign interests in colonial countries had some positive aspects. For his own part, he categorically rejected such assertions, believing that those activities were carried on mainly in areas deprived of the right to self-determination, in which the peoples were subjected to a system of dependence, hegemony and exploitation. Foreign companies, systematically exploiting the resources of the countries in which they carried on their activities, were maintaining in those countries a state of underdevelopment and economic dependence which was part of the reason why the wide gap between North and South, between industrialized and developing countries, was growing even wider.
3. In that connexion, one could mention in particular the case of Israel, which was exploiting the natural and human resources of the occupied Arab territories and had, since 1967, been pursuing a policy of systematic annexation. It was clear that in establishing more settlements in the Arab zones, the Israeli Government wanted to deprive the Palestinian people of its right to self-determination and independence, not only by absorbing its economic potential but also by destroying its religious and moral structures, and therefore its national identity.
4. His delegation believed that the activities of foreign economic and other interests constituted a new form of colonialism and racism. It supported all the resolutions and recommendations adopted by the United Nations with regard to decolonization and the elimination of racism and apartheid. It was in fact urgent to put an end to the activities of foreign monopolies in the colonial countries, above all in South Africa and in the occupied Arab territories.
5. Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) congratulated the delegations of Zimbabwe and of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, which had recently become independent and been admitted to membership in the United Nations. Their

/...

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

participation in the work of the Committee would no doubt make an important contribution to the formulation of important decisions with regard to the final elimination of colonialism, racism and apartheid.

6. The United Nations had been dealing for many years with the question of the plundering of the resources of colonial Territories by foreign economic and other monopolies, which constituted one of the main obstacles to the speedy and complete implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In its many resolutions, the General Assembly had categorically condemned such plunder, reaffirming the inalienable right of colonial peoples to self-determination and independence and their right to exploit their natural resources as they saw fit. However, the Western countries continued to exploit those resources and flout the relevant decisions of the United Nations and were refusing to take legislative, administrative or other measures to limit the activities of their nationals and companies that were doing serious harm to the interests of the peoples of southern Africa and other colonial Territories.

7. It was through the support of NATO member countries that South Africa was able to strengthen its economic and military potential. It was well known that nearly 2,000 transnational companies maintained trade relations with the South African régime and that hundreds of United Kingdom and United States companies were continuing to increase their investments in South Africa's economy. During the period 1972-1978, 382 banks in 22 countries had granted Pretoria loans amounting to more than \$5 billion, and at the end of 1977, according to the data of the Centre against Apartheid, Western investments in South Africa had amounted to \$24.5 billion.

8. Everyone was aware that South Africa was one of the world's richest mineral regions, and the extraction of its minerals enabled many Western companies to reap considerable profits at the cost of the inhuman exploitation of the local African workers. The wages paid to Africans in Namibia were in fact still extremely low, since, according to the document published in 1980 by the United Nations Centre against Apartheid, non-white workers received wages only one-twentieth as high as white workers.

9. In document A/AC.109/611, concerning the activities of foreign interests in Namibia, the Special Committee of 24 had indicated that for the 15-month period ending 31 March 1978, the Anglo American Corporation had reported consolidated investment income of 326 million rand and net profits of 241 million rand, its authorized capital being valued at 30 million rand and its total assets at 2.1 billion rand. Moreover, most of the profits of companies carrying on activities in Namibia was regularly repatriated, to be paid to foreign stockholders, instead of being reinvested locally.

10. Desiring to protect its interests in South Africa, Western capital was forming an alliance with Pretoria's military and political apparatus. In that connexion, mention could be made of a secret agreement between the administration of the South

/...

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

African branch of General Motors, the United States automobile-manufacturing company, and the racist South African Government. Under that agreement, General Motors installations, which Pretoria regarded as being of vital importance, would be placed under the direct protection of South African military authorities in the event of "disorders". A similar agreement had been concluded with regard to the Rössing mine between the local officials of the branch of that United States company and the South African authorities in the Territory of Namibia, which they were illegally occupying.

11. It was clear that the major Western Powers had enormous means for exerting effective economic pressure on the Pretoria régime and persuading it to end its racist policy of apartheid and its illegal occupation of Namibia. It was sufficient, in that connexion, to mention one example. Everyone knew that South Africa had to import almost all the oil it needed. Five large oil companies - Shell, British Petroleum, Caltex, Mobil and Total - shared the delivery of almost all the imported oil and 86 per cent of the South African market. There were also other fields of the South African economy in which transnational companies played an appreciable role and could exert pressure on South Africa. But the Western countries' central objective remained the exploitation of the natural and human resources of colonial Territories and not their accession to independence.

12. The Western countries sometimes tried to justify their refusal to break off economic relations with the South African régime by invoking "constitutional" or "legal" limitations which allegedly prevented their Governments from effectively controlling the activities of their transnational companies in southern Africa. But it was known that in international relations "limitations" of that kind disappeared as soon as the Governments of those countries declared an economic blockade against progressive and revolutionary régimes.

13. Foreign monopolies, chiefly those of the colonial Powers, continued to play a preponderant role in the economy of small colonial Territories. They were pillaging the Territories' natural resources and preventing the development of a national consciousness among the population, thereby impeding the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization.

14. The situation prevailing in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Micronesia), administered by the United States of America, was an eloquent example in that regard. During the debate on the question at the forty-seventh session of the Trusteeship Council, representatives of the Micronesian people had emphasized the worsening of the social and economic situation in the Territory and its total economic dependence on the administering Power. They had expressed the concern of the indigenous population with regard to unemployment, lack of water and electricity, lack of appropriate medical equipment and the like. The Council's visiting mission, which had traveled to Micronesia in March 1980, had been forced to conclude that the United States was not giving the needed attention to the Territory's economic development. Instead of preparing the population for the exercise of its right to self-determination and independence and for economic and social progress, the policy pursued by the United States in the Territory had

/...

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

brought about a stagnation of the Micronesian economy, which now depended entirely on the administering Power.

15. The international community was particularly concerned about the military activities of the colonial Powers in small Territories. For many years, the United Nations had been calling on those countries to desist from such activities, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on decolonization.

16. The military bases of the Western Powers on many islands in the Pacific, Indian and Atlantic Oceans and the Caribbean served as staging points for combating national liberation movements and maintaining the military presence of those countries and were an impediment to the strengthening of world peace and security.

17. The presence of military bases in Guam, Micronesia, Diego Garcia, Bermuda, the Turks and Caicos Islands and other Territories was a major obstacle to the exercise by the peoples of those Territories of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Declaration on decolonization.

18. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries resolutely supported the liberation forces struggling against colonialism, racism and apartheid and against imperialist exploitation. Soviet policy was based on the principles of proletarian internationalism, of Marxist-Leninist ideology, which rejected all forms of oppression of man by man, of subjugation of one nation by another. The total elimination of all bastions of colonialism and racism was one of the priority tasks which the Twenty-fifth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had set itself.

19. The year 1980 marked the twentieth anniversary of the adoption by the United Nations of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Although during the past two decades the overwhelming majority of colonial peoples have been able to accede to independence, the United Nations still had much to do to bring about the full and speedy implementation of the Declaration. On the occasion of that anniversary, the Committee should, in the view of his delegation, adopt an effective resolution aimed at putting an end to the economic and other activities of foreign monopolies which were impeding the elimination of colonialism, apartheid and racism. The States Members of the United Nations must be called upon to cease all economic, financial and other assistance to the South African racist régime and to implement strictly all the relevant decisions of the Organization. His delegation unreservedly supported the African States in their demand for the immediate withdrawal of foreign capital from Namibia, South Africa and other colonial Territories. The General Assembly should also be recommended to ask the Security Council for the immediate application of comprehensive sanctions against the South African régime, in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

20. Mr. CHAN (Australia) said that there was a need to consider in a proper perspective those colonial situations in which foreign economic and other interests were thwarting progress and development by exploiting human and economic resources with little or no heed paid to the real interests of the people of a Territory.

/...

(Mr. Chan, Australia)

21. Southern Africa required particular attention in that respect. There had, admittedly, been one considerable advance during the past year with the establishment of an independent and democratically elected Government in Zimbabwe. But in Namibia the economy was still mainly under the control of foreign economic interests based in South Africa, although other foreign elements were involved. The consequence was that fundamental decisions about such questions as priorities in economic development and regulation of investment were not in the hands of the indigenous population but were made by outsiders, with the result that the interests of the Territory were ignored. The people of Namibia could only achieve control of their economy if they first attained political control. His delegation was fully committed to an internationally accepted solution to the problem of Namibia and supported the Security Council and the Secretary-General to that end.

22. His Government was strongly opposed to the South African régime's policies of apartheid and considered that the majority could never be truly free or have full control over its destiny until the political and economic injustices in the country were brought to an end.

23. While the Committee had to concentrate on the activities of foreign interests in Territories where the people were deprived of their legitimate rights, it must also concern itself with other Non-Self-Governing Territories, the majority of which were small Territories in the Pacific and the Caribbean.

24. It was particularly in respect of those Territories that his delegation took issue with the assertion that all such activities were detrimental to the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories and constituted a barrier to self-determination. Accepting that as valid would mean that no foreign investment or development assistance should be provided to dependent Territories anywhere. In fact, the responsible introduction of suitable investment and resources quite frequently had an important role in economic development and industrialization in dependent Territories. It was usually accompanied by the introduction of new technology, job skills and managerial expertise, without which it would be difficult for dependent Territories, particularly small Territories in the Pacific and the Caribbean, to establish a viable and diversified social and economic structure. The strengthening of the economy was unquestionably a positive step towards decolonization.

25. What was crucial, in any examination of the activities of foreign economic and other interests, was a sensitivity by administering Powers and foreign investors to the aspirations and real needs of the people of Non-Self-Governing Territories. The dangers of too great an economic dependency and the harmful consequences of investment bent only on profit-taking must be avoided. But if those precepts were followed there was no reason why all foreign economic activity in dependent Territories should be the object of total condemnation; indeed, to pursue that course would be at odds with many resolutions of the Special Committee and the Fourth Committee enjoining administering Powers to provide, in consultation with the Governments of the Territories concerned, bilateral and multilateral assistance.

26. No draft resolution had yet been submitted, but there was a possibility that, as in previous years, the Committee might be asked to consider a text which did not

/...

(Mr. Chan, Australia)

take sufficient account of the differences between the situation in southern Africa and that in other dependent Territories. Moreover, his delegation would not be able to support a text which selectively condemned certain countries. Accordingly, the resolution formulated at the current session should eschew sweeping generalizations that dismissed all foreign economic and other interests, so that it might command wide support. A more balanced approach had been noticeable in the resolution adopted at the preceding session, and it was desirable that that process should be continued.

27. Mr. YERE (Ivory Coast) said that, as settlement of the Namibian problem entered a decisive phase, the question of the activities of foreign interests became even more important. With the prospect of Namibia's accession to independence, foreign interests felt threatened and were trying to make all the profits they could before the date of independence, as could be seen from the shocking figures cited by some delegations. However, the debate on the question must continue to be realistic; all interests without exception which were exploiting and pillaging the natural resources of Namibia, including Western companies, should be denounced. But Western companies were not the only ones on trial, and the Committee should get out of the rut of scoring ideological points in its discussions.

28. Moreover, multilateral external aid, so necessary to countries which had already become independent, was of vital importance for Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was therefore essential, if the interests of the innocent were to be preserved, not to strike indiscriminately at all foreign interests. Lastly, the General Assembly's condemnations should not refer to States by name, since a resolution which was realistic and which brought countries together instead of dividing them would have better prospects of being implemented.

29. Mr. SCHRÖTER (German Democratic Republic) pointed out that the issue regarding the activities of foreign economic and other interests had been on the agenda of the Fourth Committee for many years. That was fully justified, taking into account the fact that millions of people in Territories under colonial domination continued to be denied their legitimate rights and were still the object of ruthless exploitation by imperialist monopolies. The work of the Committee had helped people in those territories to understand what were the real causes of their distress, and condemnation of the activities of transnational corporations was now world-wide.

30. Twenty years had passed since the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which had been proposed by the USSR. Results had been achieved in the process of decolonization, with Zimbabwe and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines adding a new chapter by gaining their independence.

31. However, the international community had not yet completed its work, particularly where South Africa was concerned. The reason was that, despite United Nations resolutions, foreign monopolies were continuing to exploit the people and resources of South Africa and Namibia, thus helping to maintain the colonial and racist régime and constituting an obstacle to the independence of Namibia.

/...

(Mr. Schröter, German Democratic Republic)

32. It had been proved that the embargo on arms supplies to South Africa was being constantly violated. The manufacturers could be inferred from the types of weapons supplied; the major exporters were known. According to the publications of the Special Committee against Apartheid, there had been an increase in the number of corporations with interests in South Africa and in the total investment in that country. There had also been an unprecedented increase in imports of arms. According to The Wall Street Journal, Citicorp had recently granted a \$250 million loan to South Africa, and banks in the Federal Republic of Germany had carried out a large share of the credit transactions with South Africa, which to date totalled an amount of \$1.64 billion.

33. It was obvious that the States within whose jurisdiction the corporations mentioned fell, by tolerating or even encouraging those activities, bore some responsibility. There had been attempts to deny the facts, norms of conduct had been adopted, and the social mission of the transnational corporations had been praised; but the fact remained that the repression of workers and the pillage of natural resources continued. The International Seminar on the Role of Transnational Corporations in South Africa (A/34/655), held in November 1979, had inter alia rejected the contention that transnational corporations could become instruments for the promotion of freedom and equality through their economic involvement in South Africa. The Seminar had considered that arguments of that type were pretexts for legitimizing investments and perpetuating the system of apartheid.

34. It should be remembered that transnational corporations were indirectly supporting South Africa in its policy of aggressive acts, which were a threat to international peace and security. South Africa's acquisition of a nuclear capability had been facilitated by those corporations. Referring to collaboration with the racist régime, the President of the African National Congress of South Africa had stated that the NATO countries bore the main responsibility for South Africa's emergence as an imperialist State and policeman. The improving technological base of South Africa led to intensified exploitation of the people, growing profits and expanding possibilities for the domestic production of military equipment.

35. In the light of those developments, it was imperative to cease all military, economic and political support of the racist régime, to expand the 1977 embargo on arms supplies to South Africa and to institute an oil embargo. The German Democratic Republic was advocating the complete and enduring international isolation of the apartheid régime. It maintained its solidarity with the just liberation struggle of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa and supported their national liberation movements.

36. Mr. MAPP (Barbados) welcomed Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, his country's closest neighbour, whose recent admission to membership of the United Nations was an example of the inexorable march of all peoples towards self-determination. He also welcomed Zimbabwe, whose saga typified the quest for freedom of human beings everywhere.

37. Barbados advocated the severance of economic links with the Pretoria régime and had long since backed its words with action. Barbados was also in favour of

/...

(Mr. Mapp, Barbados)

destroying the links between the exploiters of the private sector and the whole apparatus which sustained the evil system of apartheid.

38. At the current session the attention of the Committee would no doubt be focused on Namibia. The South African régime had resorted to a succession of ruses and diversionary tactics in order to delay implementation of the United Nations plans for Namibian independence and present a fait accompli to the international community. Those who sought to avoid a bloody confrontation had gone to all lengths in the use of moral pressure, appeal and suasion to impress on the racist régime that time was not on its side. The result of those efforts were to be found in the voting patterns of the Committee over the past six years. Yet, a consensus and a peaceful solution remained much more desirable than hostilities.

39. It was therefore regrettable that some States, whose myopic self-interest prevented them from backing their words with action, were ensuring the economic ascendancy of the dominant racist clique and classes supporting the Pretoria régime. It was the duty of all who believed that people mattered more than any material consideration to send a strong and unanimous message to the predators of South Africa and their allies that the time was ripe for the full emancipation of the people of Namibia and South Africa.

40. After referring to the programme of activities to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of resolution 1514 (XV), he stressed that the price of liberty was still perpetual vigilance. There were two potential dangers which must be avoided at all costs. Firstly, it was necessary to guard against the probability that the administering Powers - which, by their policies of self-aggrandizement and exploitation, had left the infrastructure of their colonial territories in an extremely weakened state - would wish to pull out before making any attempt to strengthen such infrastructures. The Turks and Caicos Islands was a case in point. Secondly, it must not be assumed that the unwillingness of some Administering Authorities, in the Caribbean in particular, to grant autonomy to the populations they administered would change one jot or tittle without continuous pressure on the part of the Committee.

41. In conclusion, he quoted from a Fourth Committee report which stated that economic and other activities which prevented the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) obstructed efforts towards the elimination of colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa and other colonial Territories and violated the rights and the political, economic and social interests of the peoples of those Territories; they were consequently incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

42. Mr. GARCIA-ALMEIDA (Cuba) observed that the colonial status of the Territories that had not yet exercised their right to self-determination and attained their independence meant that the impact of foreign economic interests could not be beneficial. It was only when colonial countries had become independent that foreign economic interests could, in some circumstances, coincide with domestic interests, as an agreement that was satisfactory to all the parties was then possible.

/...

(Mr. Garcia-Almeida, Cuba)

43. He regretted that some countries continued to flout Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on Namibia, and he denounced those who attempted to justify their actions by invoking constitutional or legislative provisions, which, they stated, prevented them from monitoring effectively the activities of their corporations in South Africa. No pretext could justify the shirking of responsibilities by countries which maintained relations with the illegal régime of South Africa.

44. Now that the national liberation movement headed by SWAPO was intensifying its struggle in Namibia, the complicity of foreign economic interests in the oppression of the Namibian people was becoming more and more evident. A secret agreement had been reached between a South African affiliate of General Motors Corporation and the racist régime; under it the enterprises belonging to General Motors would be placed under South African military control if there was any trouble. The Council for Namibia had recently revealed that the British company Rio Tinto Zinc Corporation, Ltd., had subscribed to an emergency plan for carrying out paramilitary operations against SWAPO in Namibia. Some corporations had resorted to ridiculous camouflages; they concluded agreements through third countries or South African affiliates in order to obtain Namibian uranium or to prospect in Namibian territory. Others sought to conceal the decisive influence of their Governments, as in the case of Compagnie française des pétroles; that company was alleged to be independent but effective control of it was in the hands of the French Government. Another example was GFSA, an affiliate of Consolidated Gold Fields, Ltd., of the United Kingdom, in which the United Kingdom Government held almost half the shares; it was recognized as the third largest South African enterprise.

45. Most countries had recognized that the only way to put an end to the racist Government's defiance of the international community was for the Security Council to impose stringent economic sanctions on South Africa. It was impossible to embark on the road towards a negotiated solution since the main beneficiaries of foreign economic activities in Namibia were against it. Accordingly, it was necessary to take steps to inform public opinion of the support that certain countries which posed as champions of human rights gave to the racist South African régime. The document prepared by the secretariat of the Special Committee (A/AC.109/611) showed clearly that the foreign interests established in certain Western countries (Canada, France, Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States of America) continued to plunder greedily Namibia's natural resources without benefiting the exploited population and without contributing in any way to the Territory's economic development. In fact, instead of considering those activities under the item on interests that were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence, it would be more proper to consider them as activities which help to perpetuate the colonial system and apartheid, as stated in the declaration on foreign investments in South Africa adopted by the OAU Council of Ministers at its thirty-fifth ordinary session, in June 1980.

46. As the process of decolonization advanced, General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) had been interpreted in the most extraordinary manner so as to ensure

/...

(Mr. Garcia-Almeida, Cuba)

that the question of the self-determination of Territories occupied for geopolitical and economic reasons was settled to the advantage of the administering Powers. In many Territories - Puerto Rico, Belize, Tokelau, Bermuda, Diego Garcia, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Micronesia, Guam and Montserrat - those administering Powers were seeking to forestall the awakening of the people and to impede economic development initiatives. In Puerto Rico, for example, the outward appearance of economic growth and a high standard of living concealed a vast network of colonial prerogatives which enabled American investors to transform the population into a reservoir of cheap labour which, unable to find a way of earning a livelihood in the island had to go abroad to improve its standard of living. The existence of such a dependent and corrupt infrastructure was alienating the Puerto Rican people and preventing them from acceding to independence.

47. His delegation believed that the military activities of the racist South African régime and other colonial Powers were part and parcel of the activities of foreign economic interests. In recent years, South Africa's military budget had increased considerably and recruitment of "volunteers" into the armed forces had intensified, enabling South Africa to station 100,000 soldiers in Namibia to fight SWAPO and the front-line States.

48. The racist régime, using intimidating and coercive tactics, was recruiting indigenous soldiers, who accounted for 20 per cent of the South African troops, to combat SWAPO and to give the impression that the Africans opposed the struggle for national liberation. At the same time, the South African régime was pretending that an internal settlement was a viable solution, playing down the extent to which SWAPO, the sole authentic and legitimate representative of the Namibian people, did in fact represent the people.

49. South Africa was preparing for all-out war by pursuing a global strategy which required co-ordination of all sectors of the racist régime's economy and society. The report of the world campaign against military nuclear collaboration with South Africa revealed that South Africa's military strategy was to threaten its African neighbours that it would resort to atomic weapons with a view to undermining their solidarity with and support for the liberation struggle headed by SWAPO.

50. But for the assistance of many countries, South Africa would not have been able to make preparations to become a military Power. Those same countries, unable to tolerate the Socialist Soviet State, had transformed Hitlerite Germany into a military Power that had challenged the world order. To disregard Security Council resolutions on the arms embargo against South Africa and on terminating all co-operation, particularly nuclear co-operation, was very dangerous. His delegation endorsed the resolution adopted by the OAU Council of Ministers recently in Freetown, Sierra Leone, entrusting the African Group with the task of requesting a meeting of the Security Council to take effective steps against the racist régime and to apply the sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter, should

/...

(Mr. Garcia-Almeida, Cuba)

South Africa continue to oppose the efforts of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to secure immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and of the plan for the Territory's independence. It also supported the OAU decision calling for an extraordinary session of OAU to consider the situation and to take the necessary steps to liberate Namibia in the event that the Security Council did not adopt the anticipated measures.

51. As international tension escalated, military bases and activities in the small territories in the Caribbean, Atlantic and Pacific became a threat to peace. The statements made by the military commanders of such bases left no doubt as to the priority which those Governments gave to their strategic interests, to the detriment of the interests of the inhabitants and of their commitments to the United Nations. In that connexion, he cited the case of Guam and the Turks and Caicos Islands. He also denounced recent military manoeuvres carried out by the United States in Guantánamo military base which were tantamount to an attempted military invasion. More and more countries were realizing that military bases and activities were an obstacle to implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, held in Havana in September 1979, had adopted important resolutions on foreign military bases, denouncing them as a threat to peace and security in the regions in which they were located, and stating that they should be dismantled in order to put an end to interference in the domestic policy of States, as demonstrated by the final phase in the war of liberation of the Nicaraguan people and the threat that loomed in the face of the victory of the progressive revolutionary movement in El Salvador.

52. In brief, his delegation believed that on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence, the Assembly should adopt specific measures designed to dismantle military bases and to ban military manoeuvres in colonial Territories and should require the administering Powers to submit plans for decolonization with a view to putting an end to colonialism in the 1980s.

53. Mr. ISMAIL MANSOR (Malaysia) recalled that Malaysia had always unequivocally supported the struggle of peoples under colonial domination for fundamental freedoms and for the opportunity to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence in accordance with the United Nations Charter. In that connexion, Malaysia had always firmly opposed the activities of foreign economic interests and others which exploited the Non-Self-Governing Territories and it had always supported United Nations resolutions on that subject.

54. His delegation noted with deep concern that those resolutions continued to be flouted openly by the foreign economic interests which exploited the colonial Territories, denying those peoples their rightful share in the exploitation of their natural resources. The shameless exploitation of human and material resources in Namibia by the racist South African régime in collaboration with its Western partners, the continued support which foreign economic interests gave South Africa

/...

(Mr. Ismail Mansor, Malaysia)

in its illegal occupation of Namibia and the repatriation of huge profits from that Territory could only be deplored.

55. His delegation also wished to express its deep concern at the nuclear collaboration between South Africa and Western transnational corporations. Their active exploitation of the nuclear raw materials of Namibia would certainly help South Africa to develop a nuclear bomb. Such a development would necessarily constitute a grave threat to peace and security in Africa, if not the world.

56. The activities of foreign economic interests had certainly strengthened colonial domination which, in turn, had led to the perpetuation of the policy of racial discrimination and to the denial of the fundamental rights of colonial peoples, including the right to self-determination. Clearly, no United Nations resolution, however drafted, would bring about the desired changes, as long as foreign economic activities continued to collaborate with the colonial régimes. The time had come for all Member States of the United Nations to take appropriate concrete steps to put an end to the activities of foreign economic interests in the colonial territories.

57. Mr. FLITTNER (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, took strong exception to the statement of the representative of the Ukrainian SSR at the previous meeting to the effect that the Federal Republic of Germany had provided South Africa with coast guard vessels and missile-launching destroyers. When the Security Council had adopted a resolution for an embargo on arms deliveries to South Africa in December 1963, the Federal Republic of Germany had not been a full member of the Organization but his country had nevertheless supported that decision in a declaration which had constituted an international commitment and had taken appropriate measures. In 1977, as a member of the Security Council, his country had participated actively in the drafting and adoption of resolution 418 (1977) regarding the obligatory arms embargo and had scrupulously implemented the decisions of the Security Council on that question.

58. The arms to which the representative of the Ukraine had referred could only be exported when accompanied by an authorized permit. No permit had ever been issued by the Federal Republic of Germany for the export of the arms in question. His delegation reminded the Committee that the Security Council had established a Committee to supervise the arms embargo and the implementation of the Security Council's decisions and that the Secretary-General had requested all Member States to keep him fully informed on all matters within that Committee's competence. If the Ukrainian delegation had information which supported its allegations, he would like to know why it had not yet implemented paragraph 2 of resolution 421 (1977) which had requested States to provide the Committee with all information at their disposal. As the Ukrainian delegation had not furnished such information, it would seem that the allegations represented no more than a malicious propaganda effort.

/...

59. Mr. FEITH (Netherlands), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he had not read the text of the statement of the representative of the Ukraine but that he was familiar with the press release which had been issued on the subject. According to the press release, arms imported from the United Kingdom had been transported in ships and, in particular, in Netherlands ships. Such allegations were without foundation and moreover were completely outside the issue which was the subject of the debate. His Government had always complied with the decisions taken by the Security Council in its resolution 418. His delegation would like to know what violations of the arms embargo the representative of the Ukrainian SSR had had in mind. In the meantime, he would refer the representative of the Ukraine to the reply which had been sent by the Netherlands to the inquiries of the Committee responsible for supervising the embargo and which had set out the position of the Government of the Netherlands.

60. Mr. MACLAY (United Kingdom) supported the statements of the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Netherlands.

61. Mr. KILANDOGY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that there was no doubt that companies in the Federal Republic of Germany were co-operating with South Africa in the military field, as the Economic and Social Council document had clearly shown. According to the document in question, 32 companies in the Federal Republic of Germany were co-operating with South Africa in the military field. The consequences of such co-operation were set out in the report which had been submitted to the General Assembly on the implementation of the United Nations resolutions on apartheid which had been supported by the Special Committee against apartheid. Those facts had been confirmed by the information media, including those of Western countries.

62. The press release had not reflected accurately the thrust of the Ukrainian delegation's proposals, the substance of which had been that arms had been transported in ships of the Federal German Republic and the Netherlands. There had been no question of the Netherlands supplying arms.

63. Mr. FLITTNER (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking in the exercise of the right of reply, said that he was not in a position to answer regarding the companies mentioned in a number of Economic and Social Council documents; the Ukrainian delegation had not however supported its accusations against the Federal Republic of Germany and its reply was not satisfactory.

64. Mr. FEITH (Netherlands) said that he also had not been satisfied by the reply of the Ukrainian delegation. He categorically rejected the allegations of the Ukrainian delegation which had once again accused the Netherlands of having violated the arms embargo against South Africa. Moreover, such allegations were not founded on information furnished by the Security Council Committee which had been set up to implement resolution 418 but on reports supplied by petitioners during hearings of the Special Committee against apartheid.

65. He wished to make two further comments: first, the Special Committee against apartheid was not competent to examine cases of violations of the arms embargo

/...

(Mr. Feith, Netherlands)

against South Africa; second, if the Netherlands had indeed violated the embargo, the representative of the Ukraine should specify the deliveries to which he had referred and the dates when they had taken place.

66. Mr. McCALL (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right to reply, took strong exception to the remarks of the Soviet delegation concerning the alleged role of United States economic interests in southern Africa, in particular in South Africa. On the question of the alleged contribution of the United States to the military capabilities of the régime, the United States had approved and consistently supported the arms embargo against South Africa imposed by Security Council resolution 418 (1977). In regard to the economic situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, it had to be remembered that the Trust Territory, as a strategic trust, was the responsibility of the Security Council. The Trusteeship Council had been designated to oversee the administration of the Territory and had considered its economic situation on a regular basis; the United States had co-operated fully with the Trusteeship Council in that connexion.

67. On the question of greater safeguards to protect the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories against foreign economic interests, the activities of the Soviet Union should not be overlooked in so far as that country, while professing dedication to principles of conservation, had engaged in predatory fishing practices off the Namibian coast to such an extent that those important resources had been seriously depleted to the serious detriment of the Namibian people. According to the statistics of the International Commission for the Southeast Atlantic Fisheries, the Soviet catch in northern Namibian waters had increased to 747,000 metric tons in 1978 from 293,000 tons the previous year and by 40,000 metric tons, to 430,000 tons, in central Namibian waters.

68. As for the activities of transnational corporations, he noted that the issue of disinvestment was a difficult one; the effective contribution of foreign economic interests to the economic progress of South Africa was a subject of debate among South African blacks. In addition, he believed that the Soviet Union was itself intimately connected with foreign economic interests in South Africa, since it sold a large part of its diamond production through the Central Selling Organization (CSO), a cartel controlled by De Beers of South Africa. That corporation marketed non-polished Soviet diamonds; in fact, according to United Nations economic data, Soviet exports of such diamonds had totalled approximately a half-billion dollars annually since 1976. Besides, according to trade statistics published by South Africa, direct trade between the COMECON countries and South Africa amounted to over 30 million rand during the first 10 months of 1978.

69. Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), exercising his right of reply, reaffirmed that all the facts mentioned by his delegation concerning economic co-operation of the United States with South Africa were irrefutable.

70. As for the statement by the representative of the United States that the Fourth Committee was not competent to study the issue of Micronesia, it should be

/...

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

pointed out that it was not the first year that the question had been examined both by the Special Committee of 24 and the Fourth Committee.

71. Contrary to the statements by the representative of the United States, the situation in Micronesia was far from being idyllic. The facts were there to prove that the administrative Power had not fulfilled its obligation to promote self-sufficiency in the Territory.

72. The claims made by the United States delegation that the Soviet Union had been over-exploiting the fishing resources off the coast of Namibia and South Africa were a serious distortion of the facts.

73. The Soviet Union was a member of the International Commission for the Southeast Atlantic Fisheries and abided by the Commission's decisions governing exploration and exploitation activities of resources in that region. It was in favour of maintaining quotas to prevent the depletion of certain species for the last three years, contrary to the allegations of the American delegation, it had even reduced by 25 per cent the catches of certain fish and had stopped fishing for some other species.

74. As for the accusations made by the United States representative, who claimed that the Soviet Union was carrying on trade relations with South Africa, such statements had absolutely no basis in fact. The Soviet Union had repeatedly stated that it did not carry on any sort of relations with the apartheid régime; that was an irrefutable fact.

75. Mr. MACLAY (United Kingdom), exercising his right of response, categorically rejected the absurd accusations against his country made by the Ukrainian delegation and pointed out that the United Kingdom had always applied the arms embargo against South Africa.

76. Miss WADIBIA (Nigeria) emphasized that the Special Committee against Apartheid did not claim to have competence to examine the question of violations of the arms embargo against South Africa. The Committee received information from nationals and organizations of certain Member States on activities which ran counter to United Nations resolutions.

77. Mr. IVANNICHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, in order to clear up any misunderstanding, he would be pleased to transmit the text of his delegation's speech during the preceding meeting to any delegation requesting it.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.