



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 8th 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 SOUTH 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)

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

UN LIBRARY  
NOV 6 1980  
UN/SA COLLECTION

\* 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.8  
15 October 1980  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.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.109/611; ST/CTC/12)

1. Mr. FOURATI (Tunisia) said that the presence of the delegations of Zimbabwe and of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines gave the peoples that were still subject to colonial domination and racial discrimination cause for hope.
2. Although 20 years had elapsed since the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the problem of decolonization had not been resolved, and the anachronistic status of certain territories was due, at least in part, to the activities of foreign interests, which were being intensified particularly in southern Africa, thereby delaying the liberation of colonized peoples. Those activities, characterized by the exploitation of the natural and human resources of the territories, were incompatible with the principles of the United Nations Charter. The General Assembly had repeatedly pointed out that such activities were a major impediment to the achievement of the legitimate aspirations of peoples still under colonial domination and had asked all Governments which had not yet done so to take legislative, administrative and other measures to prevent their nationals from participating in the exploitation of the territories' resources.
3. The Special Committee had described in detail in its report (A/35/23 (Part III)) every aspect of those foreign interests, which played a key role in maintaining colonialism, racism and apartheid in southern Africa. In spite of all decisions and all appeals, those interests were continuing their activities and intensifying their collaboration with the Pretoria régime, thus helping it to stay in power and encouraging it to intensify its policy of repression and continue its acts of aggression against neighbouring countries. In their thirst for profit, some foreign companies were wantonly exploiting irreplaceable resources, totally disregarding the rights and interests of the African population.
4. It was clear from the working paper (A/AC.109/611) that in Namibia, the Territory illegally occupied by South Africa where the system of apartheid prevailed, foreign interests were, with encouragement from Pretoria, engaged in large-scale exploitation of the Territory's resources. The mining industry - the most important sector of the economy and the main source of foreign exchange, accounting for two thirds of the gross national product - was wholly controlled by South Africa and foreign companies. South Africa was pocketing hundreds of millions of rands in foreign exchange, and only the white population had benefited from the tremendous increase in the gross domestic product in the previous 15 years. More than 25 per cent of the gross domestic product was exported each

/...

(Mr. Fourati, Tunisia)

year in the form of royalties and dividends to foreign, particularly South African, shareholders. Conditions for the African population, in contrast, were worsening daily. Foreign capital was concentrated in the mining sector, but it had infiltrated all sectors of the economy, from fishing to diamond production. However, in playing along with Pretoria, those economic interests were, in fact, sacrificing more lasting and more secure benefits for the sake of short-term gain. They should show greater foresight, because southern Africa belonged to the Africans and apartheid was bound to disappear sooner or later.

5. The best course might well be to try to find a new approach to those problems with a view to expediting their solution on the basis of the principles of the Charter and the right of peoples to self-determination. The United Nations must redouble its efforts to put an end to the situation by ensuring that the resolutions which had been adopted on the subject were strictly observed and by using more effective means to combat the interests that were exploiting the resources of colonial Territories. The Security Council should not hesitate to take the steps provided for in the Charter to put an end to the Pretoria régime's political oppression, which threatened to lead to a conflagration of incalculable consequences. The States which had so far prevented the Security Council from taking action should associate themselves fully with the adoption of such measures, since the international community, and particularly the major Powers, needed to respond to Pretoria's challenge with a coherent strategy.

6. Miss VALERE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that the item under consideration was of practical significance to the Committee since its members were entrusted with the task of formulating proposals for the elimination of the remaining manifestations of colonialism. The Committee should therefore examine the issue objectively and adopt a constructive approach in its attempt to isolate those activities which constituted an impediment to the implementation of the Declaration in the non-independent Territories within the purview of the Committee.

7. With the accession of Zimbabwe to independence, Namibia was the last bastion of colonialism in Africa. Although the Territory had at times appeared to be on the verge of achieving self-determination and independence, all moves in that direction had been systematically thwarted by the activities of foreign economic interests and the racist policies of an illegal régime which continued to occupy the Territory with impunity. It was ironic that the decolonization of the Territory should have been consistently blocked by the dilatory manoeuvres of an illegal administering authority. Intent on safeguarding its own economic interests, South Africa was openly defying all resolutions and decisions of the Organization calling for an end to its colonial domination of Namibia. In exchange for the opportunity to exploit the Territory's mineral and human resources and to protect their investments, foreign economic interests had, overtly and covertly, supported South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. As a result, the political future

/...

(Miss Valere, Trinidad and Tobago)

of the African majority in Namibia was enmeshed in a complex network of institutionalized racism, apartheid and exploitation by foreign economic interests.

8. Namibia was a classic example of the adverse effects of the activities of foreign economic and other interests on the socio-economic and political structure of a colonial Territory. In its report on the activities of transnational corporations in southern Africa (ST/CTC/12), the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations stated that projects under South African administration had sought less to develop the Namibian economy than its own economy. The Special Committee of 24 likewise pointed out in its report (A/AC.109/611) that foreign economic interests made no contribution to the economic development of the Territory as a whole. There was a legitimate fear that the plundering of Namibia's mineral resources would pose a grave threat to the economic viability of the Territory after it achieved its independence. Because of the policy of apartheid which South Africa had imposed on the Territory, Namibians did not share in the wealth generated in the economy and were regarded as nothing more than a reservoir of cheap labour.

9. The hearings on uranium held earlier in July 1980 by the United Nations Council for Namibia had disclosed that South Africa's trump card was its control of the Territory's uranium reserves, since the growing need for that mineral seemed to be compelling other foreign economic interests operating in the Territory to attempt to ensure that the Territory's political future was decided to their own advantage. Even more disturbing was the disclosure that some of the 18 foreign-based companies which were involved in the exploitation of uranium in Namibia had secretly agreed to make their facilities and resources available to South Africa in the event of civil unrest. There was no need to go into the implications of such a revelation. South Africa already had at its disposal the means to develop its nuclear-weapons capability.

10. South Africa's major trading partners were contributing to the perpetuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia and the system of apartheid in southern Africa. To condone the activities of foreign economic interests in southern Africa was therefore to condone the crime of apartheid. No Member of the United Nations should wish to stand accused of being a party to such a crime. The exploitation of Namibia's human and material resources violated the very principles of the United Nations. The Organization should take immediate, concerted and positive action to terminate the illegal activities of South Africa and its collaborators in Namibia and enable the people of Namibia to attain self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Trinidad and Tobago supported all efforts to that end.

11. If she was emphasizing the Namibian situation, it was because she viewed foreign economic activities as particularly detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants of the Territory. Her delegation would not hesitate to condemn those foreign economic, financial and other interests which hindered the process of self-determination and independence, in other colonial territories, but it did not

/...

(Miss Valere, Trinidad and Tobago)

systematically condemn the activities of foreign investors in all territories under colonial administration. The economic development of some of those territories was heavily dependent on the injection of foreign capital; foreign investments which were not used as a means of exploiting the material and human resources of territories, that were designed to assist in their development, could play a significant role in their quest for economic self-sufficiency.

12. Mr. EVRIVIADES (Cyprus) said that it was a pleasure for him to welcome the delegations of Zimbabwe and St. Vincent and the Grenadines to the Committee. He hoped that the Namibian and Sahrawi peoples and those of all other colonial territories would also become Members of the United Nations in the near future.

13. The question of the activities of foreign interests had been discussed by the Committee for nearly two decades. None the less, it was still a pressing issue because the activities of foreign economic and other interests lay at the very root of colonialism and neo-colonialism and continued to be an impediment to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and to hinder the efforts undertaken by the United Nations and other institutions to eliminate racism, racial discrimination and apartheid.

14. His delegation's approach to the item under discussion was based on two rudimentary premises: first, that the right of the peoples of dependent territories to use their natural resources in their best interest was inviolable, and, secondly, that sovereignty over a non-self-governing Territory was never vested in the administering Power but in the indigenous people of that Territory. Consequently, the administering Powers could not and should not deprive the colonial peoples of their inherent right over their natural resources and should ensure that their own economic and other activities in no way impeded the granting of independence to the Territories concerned. Sadly, that was not the case, and it was self-evident that foreign economic and other interests were impeding the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and other relevant resolutions. Colonialism was characterized by the exploitation of man by man in all fields, and it was unforgivable that peoples should be made to suffer as a result of man's deliberate actions, especially the system of apartheid. While the world community had repeatedly condemned that system, it was disturbing to see certain countries aiding the South African régime. The most salient reason why independence had not been attained in Namibia was probably foreign economic involvement in the region, which enabled the South African régime to entrench and strengthen itself. Thus the indigenous population continued to be oppressed, and acts of aggression against Angola, Botswana, Mozambique and Zimbabwe were on the rise.

15. The recent hearings on Namibian uranium clearly showed how the illegal occupiers of Namibia, in collaboration with certain economic interests, continued to plunder systematically the natural resources of that Territory. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, his delegation strongly condemned that exploitation and called once again for the implementation of the resolutions and decisions adopted by the United Nations, including Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, which had been endorsed by the General Assembly. Collaboration with the Pretoria régime violated the decisions

/...

(Mr. Evriviades, Cyprus)

of the international community and perpetuated South Africa's domination over the people of Namibia. Cyprus scrupulously abided by its commitment to isolate South Africa, with which it had no relations whatsoever. That was why it supported the imposition of mandatory economic sanctions, including a comprehensive oil embargo, against the Pretoria régime under Chapter VII of the Charter.

16. Some delegations maintained that foreign investments in colonial territories should be treated on a par with investments in independent countries. However, investment in colonial territories, undertaken without the consent of the population, and investment in sovereign States on the basis of equality and mutual benefit could hardly be equated.

17. Moreover, the military activities of the colonial Powers especially the maintenance of military bases, constituted a severe impediment to the independence of the territories concerned. Finally, the Territories of the Caribbean and the Pacific had the inalienable right to make use of their natural resources and determine their own economic development as they saw fit.

18. His delegation hoped that the Committee could adopt a resolution which, while remaining steadfast to the principles enshrined in the Charter, General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and all other relevant resolutions, would command the widest possible support.

19. Mr. KHALAF (Somalia) said that he was gratified to welcome the delegations of Zimbabwe and of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines to the Committee. The presence of Zimbabwe, in particular, was the fruit of its unrelenting struggle against colonialism. That struggle should be pursued in Namibia and other territories until colonialism in all its forms had been eliminated.

20. However, it was not enough to condemn colonialism to make it disappear. Despite many resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and other international bodies, foreign economic interests were continuing to exploit the natural resources of Namibia, in violation of international law. The United Nations had repeatedly expressed its concern about such activities and had requested all Members of the Organization to put an end to their economic, financial or trade relations with the illegal racist régime of South Africa. It was deplorable that certain Member States were continuing to ignore those appeals and to co-operate with the South African régime. It was, in fact, their aid that made it possible for South Africa to continue to impose its apartheid system in the region. The international community should do everything possible to put an end to racial discrimination and the apartheid system in southern Africa.

21. Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) said that he shared the deep concern of the majority of the international community over the activities of foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. His delegation vigorously and categorically condemned the illegal occupation of Namibia and considered that that Territory should achieve sovereignty and independence while

/...

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

preserving its territorial integrity. He was particularly concerned over the continued existence of certain factors which should occupy the attention of the Committee: the lack of political will on the part of the countries which dominated the economy of Namibia, the huge profits repatriated by certain economic groups and South Africa, and the unrestrained exploitation of the non-renewable resources of that Territory.

22. The Committee should not limit itself to expressing pious wishes but should strive for Namibia's attainment of sovereignty, under the leadership of its authentic representatives, as soon as possible. Joint, effective action should be undertaken.

23. Mrs. WADIBIA (Nigeria), welcoming the new Members of the United Nations, said that the admission of Zimbabwe into the United Nations demonstrated that no force could deny a people its inalienable right to freedom and independence.

24. Some speakers had claimed that not all foreign economic interests harmed the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories. They had explained that they had abstained or voted against the relevant resolution adopted at the thirty-fourth session because they thought that the African Group, which had submitted that resolution, had not drawn a sufficiently clear distinction between the situation in southern Africa and that obtaining in other Non-Self-Governing Territories. The African Group, which considered itself the mouthpiece of its brothers on the African continent and in other Territories still under colonial domination, recognized that, in certain cases, foreign investment did benefit Non-Self-Governing Territories. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that some foreign economic interests promoted rather than deterred colonial domination, colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination. Furthermore, while sovereign, independent States were free to forge trade, cultural and sports links with other sovereign, independent States, that was not true of the Non-Self-Governing Territories which by their very nature, were not able to resist the pressure and abuses to which they were subjected.

25. The Committee should carefully consider the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It should, of course, recognize the advantages which such Territories obtained from those activities, yet should condemn them when they contributed to the exploitation of peoples and ran counter to their aspirations.

26. In addition to the report prepared by the Secretariat (A/AC.109/611) many other sources had documented the role played by foreign interests in Namibia. Several seminars had been held on the subject, and had reached the following conclusion. Transnational corporations, which promoted the development of the South African economy and which, motivated by the quest for profits, exploited the abundant and cheap labour force and the vast mineral resources of South Africa and Namibia, had become the accomplices of the South African apartheid régime. Those corporations had stimulated the industrialization of the South African economy and had strengthened the economic and political power of the white racist minority, without enhancing the political and social status of the black population. Thus,

/...

(Mrs. Wadibia, Nigeria)

South African blacks had been forced to herd themselves into overcrowded townships with high crime rates, infant mortality and sickness, or to become migrant labourers in their own country, shorn of political rights, and the victims of the pass laws.

27. It had also been established that transnational corporations actively undermined all international measures to promote freedom and human dignity in South Africa and Namibia. In order to counter the oil embargo imposed by all the member countries of OPEC, and the mandatory arms embargo decreed by the Security Council in resolutions 421 (1977) and 418 (1977), which enjoined all States to refrain from any co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field, transnational corporations had provided funds to the South African racist régime to finance its public expenditure and allow it to meet its own needs in the field of energy. The Fluor Corporation of California had received two contracts totalling more than \$4 billion to expand South Africa's installations for converting coal into oil. Other transnational corporations had established an arms industry in South Africa in partnership with the racist régime, while still others had organized an undercover arms trade with that country. By assisting in the implementation of its nuclear plans by transferring technology and by providing capital in the form of investments, credits and loans, transnational corporations had also helped South Africa to acquire a nuclear weapons capability.

28. The various seminars had also rejected the argument that transnational corporations could become instruments for the promotion of freedom and equality through their economic involvement in South Africa and Namibia. The "Sullivan principles" and other codes of conduct adopted to improve working conditions for South African workers had had the practical effect of legitimizing current and future investments at a time when the régime faced an economic crisis and shortage of capital, and had deflected criticisms of the obnoxious apartheid régime. They did not challenge the system of apartheid in any way whatsoever.

29. Nevertheless, it was comforting to note that certain States and organizations had taken steps to remedy that tragic situation. The National Council of Churches had withdrawn \$60 million from the Citicorp of New York. The United States had ordered an arms embargo against South Africa and had suspended nuclear collaboration with that country. The Netherlands Parliament had declared itself in favour of an international oil embargo against South Africa. The Swedish and Norwegian Governments had adopted policies to discourage corporate reinvestment in South Africa, and the Canadian Government had taken legal action against the Space Research Corporation.

30. While his delegation, in common with others, hoped that the Committee would reach a consensus on the matter during the session, it was more important for the Governments of all Member States to demonstrate the necessary political will, in the interests of freedom, justice and respect for human dignity, to implement any resolution emerging from the Committee's debates.

/...

31. Mr. ISAACS (Observer, Pan Africanist Congress of Azania) said that South Africa was not a sovereign, independent State, but rather a colonial Territory in which the indigenous African population had been dispossessed of its lands and was currently under the domination of the white racist Government. Azania comprised two nations: one made up of the repressive white minority and the other of the black, Coloured and Asian oppressed majority. The white South African bourgeoisie had a semi-colonial relationship with Western imperialism, since 80 per cent of its economy was controlled by imperialist interests, in particular the United Kingdom, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Switzerland. Consequently, while the colonialism of the white colonists was the main enemy of the Azanian people within the country, imperialism was its main external enemy.

32. Since foreign investments were essential for the development of the South African economy, the white political class had committed itself to reforming the system of apartheid in order to dispel the fears of revolutionary change which would deprive the imperialists of their economic and other influence in the country.

33. Apartheid was essentially a system in which a minority of some 4.5 million whites were determined to perpetuate the bondage of approximately 26 million people. To that end, that minority had seized 87 per cent of the land, seeking not only to confine the African majority to the remaining 13 per cent, but also to deprive it of its rights of citizenship and make it a foreign people in its own land. Thus, apartheid was not simply a symptom of the ingrained racism of whites, but also a carefully planned system for the exploitation of workers. The Pretoria régime had been able to maintain that system for so long in defiance of international opinion and the resolutions adopted by the world community basically through foreign capital and the activities of foreign and other economic interests. Thus, after the massacres of Sharpeville in 1960 and Soweto in 1976, there had been a flight of capital and £46 million had been taken out of the country. South Africa had been on the point of collapse and was only able to recover because of the intervention of foreign capital, particularly from American banks such as Chase Manhattan and First National City Bank.

34. Foreign economic intervention had been accompanied by diplomatic and political protection within the United Nations and other international bodies as soon as steps had been taken to impose mandatory economic sanctions against the racist South African régime. Certain people claimed that the blacks would suffer the most from the imposition of such sanctions. Those who held that opinion pointed out that the economic growth of the country would undermine the system of apartheid since the demand for qualified manpower would require employing blacks in that category which was traditionally reserved for whites. That argument was totally unfounded: if one considered, for example, the period from 1961 to 1971, a period of unprecedented growth in South Africa, 94 new repressive laws had been enacted and the influx of foreign capital had in no way brought about the elimination of apartheid, nor even one of its aspects, namely racial segregation in employment.

(Mr. Isaacs, PAC of Azania)

35. The foreign interests which invested in South Africa were not concerned about the fate of the black majority, but simply wished to reap large profits by shamelessly exploiting the black work force; in that way, they strengthened the military and economic power of the Pretoria régime which was able not only to pursue its policy of repression and economic exploitation, but also to attempt to destabilize southern Africa and commit acts of aggression against neighbouring States, especially Angola, Zambia, Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zimbabwe.

36. In spite of the adoption of the "Sullivan principles" and of the EEC code of conduct designed to regulate the activities of corporations investing in South Africa, it was deeply disturbing to note that, according to information provided by the Times of London on 20 June 1980, 33 British corporations were paying South African black workers wages below the poverty level. For those reasons, the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania rejected any attempt to reform the system of apartheid and any measures such as the adoption of codes of conduct for transnational corporations, since they did not attack the underlying root of the evil. A radical restructuring of South African society accompanied by a redistribution of the wealth and power of the country was required. The struggle of the national liberation movement did not aim at improving the lot of blacks within the existing political, social and economic framework, but rather at the total elimination of the colonialist system of apartheid.

37. The international community had an important role to play in that regard by supporting the struggle for national liberation and self-determination and imposing mandatory economic sanctions, especially an embargo on the delivery of oil to South Africa. The Committee should continue to condemn colonialism and neo-colonialism in southern Africa and denounce the activities of transnational corporations which ran counter to the rights of peoples to self-determination and independence in Namibia and Azania.

38. Lastly, on behalf of the national liberation movements in general and PAC in particular, he wished to express his gratitude to the countries which had already taken unilateral measures in support of people struggling for their national liberation and independence, namely the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries - especially Sweden, Norway and Denmark - Argentina and the Seychelles.

39. The CHAIRMAN recalled that during the general debate on agenda item 86 a certain number of representatives had suggested that the Committee should submit to the General Assembly a draft resolution capable of eliciting the broadest possible support. Consultations had been held between the officers of the Committee, the Chairman of the Committee of 24 and the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia for the purpose of elaborating a preliminary text to serve as a basis for discussion within the Committee. As soon as the preliminary text was available, it would be distributed to all the members of the Committee in order to allow them to undertake the necessary consultations. That, of course, should not prevent the members of the Committee from submitting proposals of their own. The consideration of agenda item 86 would resume at a later meeting following those consultations.

/...

## REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

East Timor (A/C.4/35/3 and Add.1-5)

40. Mr. WAYARABI (Indonesia) said that the process of decolonization in East Timor had been carried out in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV). The people of East Timor had exercised the right to self-determination in a free and democratic manner in accordance with their own traditional practices and customs. The decision to join the Republic of Indonesia had been transmitted to the Government of Indonesia by the duly elected representatives of the people of East Timor on 31 May 1976 and, in accordance with the legislative procedures of the Republic of Indonesia, East Timor had been officially integrated into Indonesia on 17 July 1976. It was obvious, therefore, that granting a hearing to the so-called petitioners would serve no useful purpose and would only further the personal ambitions of a handful of individuals who opposed the will of the majority of the people of East Timor.

41. His delegation considered that the Committee should reconsider the guidelines for granting requests for hearings. Those requests should only be accepted when submitted by parties directly involved in the matter under consideration. Private individuals and representatives of organizations should only be heard if the Committee was certain that their statements would truly contribute to a better understanding of the situation. If the Committee became accustomed to granting all requests, the door would be open to all sorts of abuse. His delegation, therefore, expressed its strong opposition to hearing the "petitioners" in question.

42. Mr. SAID (Malaysia) associated himself with the statement of the representative of Indonesia. It would be a waste of time to grant a hearing to petitioners on a question which had already been settled.

43. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to grant the following requests for hearings: those of Mr. Paulo Pires /União Democrática Timorense (UDT)/ (A/C.4/35/3), Mr. Michel Robert (Ligue française pour les Droits et la Libération des Peuples) (A/C.4/35/3/Add.1), Mr. Roque Rodrigues (Frente Revolucionária de Timor Leste Independente (FRETILIN)) (A/C.4/35/3/Add.2), Ms. Maureen R. Berman, Executive Director of the International League for Human Rights (A/C.4/35/3/Add.3), Mr. Benedict R. O'G. Anderson, Professor at Cornell University (A/C.4/35/3/Add.4) and Mr. James Dunn, President of the Human Rights Council of Australia (A/C.4/35/3/Add.5).

44. It was so decided.

Namibia (A/C.4/35/4)

45. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had received a request for a hearing on Namibia from the Reverend G. Michael Scott and suggested that the request should be granted.

/...

46. It was so decided.

Western Sahara (A/C.4/35/5 and Add.1-10)

47. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had received a request for a hearing on Western Sahara from Mr. Hakin Ibrahim (Frente POLISARIO) (A/C.4/35/5) and suggested that the request should be granted.

48. It was so decided.

49. The CHAIRMAN suggested that consideration should be given to requests for hearings from the following: the deputies of the Saharan provinces of the Kingdom of Morocco (A/C.4/35/5/Add.1), Mr. Khalli Hanna Ould Errachid, Secretary-General of the Parti de l'Union nationale Sahraoui (A/C.4/35/5/Add.2), Mr. Douihi Mohamed Rachid, Secretary-General of the Front de libération et de l'unité (A/C.4/35/5/Add.3), Messrs. Leili Mohamed Salem, Amara M'Hamed Ben M'Barek, Mohamed Laaribi and Mohamed Kher (A/C.4/35/5/Add.4), Messrs. Ahmed Mahmoud, Sid Alem Ould Sidi Salah, Abdelbaqi Mohamed and Ali Rezma, representatives elected by the communes and by the occupational chambers, Dakhla (Morocco) (A/C.4/35/5/Add.5), Mr. Zarouali Brika of the Front de libération du Sahara (A/C.4/35/5/Add.6), M. Habbouha Habib, President of the Association of Former Members of the Moroccan Liberation Army in the Saharan Provinces (A/C.4/35/5/Add.7), Mr. Haj Khatri Ould Sidi Said El Joumani, President of the Sahrawi Assembly (A/C.4/35/5/Add.8), Mr. Bohoy Sidi Ahmed, Political Commisar of the MOREHOB Liberation Movement (A/C.4/35/5/Add.9) and Mr. Ahmed Rachid, Secretary-General of the Mouvement des originaux de la Sakita el-Hama et du Rio de Oro (A/C.4/35/5/Add.10).

50. Mr. SEMICHI (Algeria) said that his country had always followed a consistent policy on the question of support for liberation movements struggling to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations and within the framework of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

51. It had always adhered to the principle that no petitioner should be denied the right to seek the support of the international community in his struggle to recover his rights. He reminded the Committee that in 1979 his delegation had stood firm when efforts had been made to deny liberation movements the welcome which peoples under colonial or foreign domination were entitled to expect from the Organization.

52. His delegation would not oppose any request for a hearing. It wished nevertheless to remind the Committee that as a rule petitioners came to complain of obstacles to their liberation, but that the requests for hearings contained in the documents before the Committee came from individuals who claimed from the start to be Moroccan; the Committee could not therefore apply its guidelines to them within the context of Western Sahara because the Sahara's colonial status was negated by the petitioners' qualifications. The United Nations and the Organization of African Unity were well aware of the background to the abortive decolonization of the Western Sahara and Morocco's responsibility on the matter was a matter of

/...

(Mr. Semichi, Algeria)

record. The statements of the petitioners would reflect positions identical to those of the Moroccan delegation and would employ the same justifications against the will of the international community, for Morocco continued to refuse to discuss the real problem, namely, decolonization.

53. Mr. RASON (Madagascar) strongly supported the representative of Algeria. His delegation, in principle, never opposed a request for a hearing as the statements of petitioners served to clarify the work and decisions of the Committee. He reminded the Committee, however, that any request for a hearing should be examined in the context of the relevant agenda item, which, in the case of the decolonization of the Western Sahara, was item 18 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

54. Mr. MRANI ZENTAR (Morocco) reminded the Committee that his delegation had never opposed a request for a hearing, both as a matter of principle and because the members of the Committee had a right to hear anyone who wished to assist it in its work. Nevertheless his delegation had very strong reservations regarding the representative character of the so-called Frente POLISARIO which claimed to speak on behalf of the populations of the Sahara. The movement had been created after the decolonization of the Sahara and was organized and encouraged from the outside.

55. Mr. SEMICHI (Algeria), speaking on a point of order, reminded the Committee that it had already taken a decision to hear the representative of the Frente POLISARIO and that there had been no objection. He could not therefore understand why the question had been reopened and considered that the comments of the representative of Morocco were out of place.

56. The CHAIRMAN said that there was no question of the Committee going back on its decision.

57. Mr. MRANI ZENTAR (Morocco) said that he agreed fully with the decision which the Committee had taken. If his delegation had had any objections to the decision as such, it would have asked to speak at the time. It merely wished to express its very strong reservations regarding the representative character of the so-called Frente POLISARIO in respect of the populations of the Sahara.

58. In fact there were other petitioners on the issue. Ever since Morocco had been falsely accused over the Sahara, certain interests had been trying to prevent the truth from reaching the Committee. His delegation was surprised that reservations should have been made in respect of delegations which had recently been heard by the Organization of African Unity as well as by the Special Committee and to which the Administrative-Secretary-General of OAU had recently forwarded the recommendations of that Committee. It would like to be informed on what grounds an attempt was being made to prevent certain individuals from providing the Committee - which was entitled to know what was really happening in the Sahara - with information of the utmost importance. The delegations came neither from Algiers nor from foreign camps, but from within the Sahara and their purpose was to make the truth known to the Committee.

/...

59. Mr. AHMIDA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) endorsed the statement of the representative of Algeria and said that, as a matter of principle, all petitioners should be heard so that they would all have an opportunity to present their points of view. With respect to the question under consideration, the Committee should hear the legitimate representatives of the people of the Sahara rather than representatives who claimed to be from Morocco.

60. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to grant the requests for hearings contained in documents A/C.4/35/5/Add.1-10.

61. It was so decided.

62. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that a communication containing a request for hearing had been received and would be distributed as a document of the Committee (A/C.4/35/3/Add.6).

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.