



FOURTH COMMITTEE
28th meeting
held on
Monday, 19 November 1979
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 28th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOYA (Benin)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 92: 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 SOUTHERN RHODESIA AND 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 ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

* 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.4/34/SR.28
7 December 1979
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 92: 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 SOUTHERN RHODESIA AND 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/C.4/34/L.23 and L.25)

1. Mr. TANAKA (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Afghanistan had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23.
2. Mr. DABBASHI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that, as originally formulated, draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23 had reflected the views of OAU as expressed in earlier resolutions and also the views of most of the African States. The sponsors had, however, agreed to delete the phrase, "as well as certain Latin American countries" at the end of paragraph 7. They trusted that, by the time the General Assembly met at its next session, no third world country would be collaborating with the racist régimes.
3. Mr. OUATTARA (Mali) reiterated that his delegation was not a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23.
4. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina) said that his delegation had proposed the amendment to the draft resolution which the sponsors had seen fit to incorporate in order to broaden support for the draft resolution and to do justice to the Latin American region, which felt solidarity with Africa.
5. Mr. TEBAPE (Botswana), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that, although his delegation was concerned about the activities of foreign interests in countries where an oppressed majority did not have any say over its country's resources - as was the case in Territories in southern Africa which were subject to apartheid and other forms of racial discrimination - because of its geographical location in relation to South Africa, it could not support the paragraphs of the draft resolution calling for an oil embargo and sanctions against South Africa. Botswana had on many occasions drawn the attention of the international community to its plight as a land-locked country which depended on routes through South Africa for its economic survival, and, at its recent meeting in Monrovia, OAU had only recognized that situation in its resolution on the subject. His delegation would abstain in the vote for the reasons he had just given.

6. Mr. HAJIDIN (Thailand) said that his country had always supported United Nations efforts to eliminate racial discrimination and exploitation in Territories under foreign domination. However, it believed that paragraphs 7 and 8 of the draft resolution before the Committee were arbitrary and selective in their condemnation of certain Member States. As there was not to be a separate vote on those paragraphs, his delegation would be unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole and would have to abstain.

7. Mr. FLITTNER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation appreciated the effort made by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23 by splitting into two separate paragraphs (5 and 6) what had been a single paragraph in the corresponding resolution adopted at the thirty-third session, thereby recognizing, at least in principle, that foreign economic interests could have very different political, social and cultural implications depending on the circumstances. His delegation still could not, however, associate itself with the indiscriminate condemnation of all activities of foreign interests in southern Africa, as it could not agree to the underlying assumption that civilian trade relations with a foreign country necessarily encouraged that country's political or social system. His country did not believe in a policy of ostracism and did not believe that the interests of peoples suffering from political oppression could best be served from outside by cutting off all relations with their countries.

8. The Federal Republic of Germany wished to reject once again the accusation that it collaborated with South Africa in the military and nuclear fields. His country had been applying a voluntary embargo on arms exports to South Africa since 1963, and was now scrupulously implementing Security Council resolution 418 (1977). It had voluntarily renounced the manufacture of certain types of weapons as early as 1954, was making every endeavour to promote an effective non-proliferation policy and it had repeatedly called on the South African Government to accede to the Treaty on non-proliferation. His delegation was astonished that some countries which maintained otherwise friendly relations with his country were lending credence and support to unjustified accusations such as those contained in paragraphs 7 and 8, when his country had repeatedly denied those accusations.

9. His delegation also categorically rejected the accusation that it maintained relations with Southern Rhodesia, and reiterated that it had scrupulously implemented all Security Council resolutions on sanctions against that country.

10. Finally, his delegation wished to dissociate itself clearly from the accusations made against the United Kingdom in paragraph 14.

11. Mr. MANSFIELD (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23 because it rejected the basic premise that the activities of foreign economic interests were necessarily harmful to colonial Territories. Many of the delegations which had made blanket denunciations of such economic activities had, in the Special Committee of 24, urged the administering Powers to strengthen the economy of the Territories under their jurisdiction through diversification, so as to reduce dependence upon any one activity.

(Mr. Mansfield, United Kingdom)

It would be an exercise in total self-deception to believe that such a request could be met without the help of "foreign economic interests".

12. It was his Government's firm contention that foreign economic interests were essential to the economic development of dependent Territories. Moreover, in Territories under United Kingdom administration, such interests were controlled in order to ensure that they provided the maximum benefits for the local inhabitants. His Government therefore categorically rejected the absurd generalization in the sixteenth preambular paragraph.

13. With regard to paragraph 7, he wished merely to point out that, although his Government's attitude to the policy of apartheid was well known, South Africa was not a colonial Territory and did not therefore fall within the purview of the Committee.

14. His delegation rejected the insinuation in paragraph 13 that the United Kingdom was supplying Zimbabwe with oil and, in connexion with paragraph 14, he wished to point out that it was the United Kingdom Government which had commissioned the Bingham Report and had made it available to the Committee on sanctions.

15. With regard to other references to the situation in Southern Rhodesia, he wished to remind the Committee of the efforts being made at Lancaster House to find a permanent solution to the problem of Southern Rhodesia. It was regrettable that the draft resolution made no mention of the enormous progress that had been made, nor of the high hopes for final success which the Committee surely shared.

16. Mr. ISUTSUMI (Japan) said that, at its previous session, the General Assembly had adopted a resolution on the item under consideration in which it had condemned Japan, among other countries. His delegation had therefore been forced to vote against the draft resolution, because it did not reflect the efforts which Japan had made to co-operate in international action to solve the problems in southern Africa and, moreover, because it believed that the condemnation of countries by name was detrimental to over-all efforts to solve those problems.

17. His delegation faithfully complied with the United Nations resolutions concerning Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and Namibia. Most recently, in a letter dated 10 August 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, his Government had explained its position and had protested the reference to Japan in the report of the United Nations Seminar on Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa, contained in Security Council document S/13157. That letter would be circulated in due course as a document of the United Nations.

18. The Government of Japan did not permit direct investment in South Africa by Japanese nationals or bodies corporate, in spite of its general policy of maximum liberalization of direct investment abroad. As for providing financial loans to South Africa, a report entitled "Bank Loans to South Africa: 1972-1978" contained some references to Japanese involvement in that regard, although the Japanese

(Mr. Isutsumi, Japan)

Government had called on Japanese banks and their branches abroad to refrain from extending any loans to South Africa and no loans to South Africa had been recorded for those banks. It was also not true that Japan had participated in the issue of credits to South Africa or that Japanese corporations had acquired South African bonds: with one exception, all the transactions mentioned in the report had actually been conducted by local corporations established under the local laws of the countries concerned and supervised by the authorities of those countries, with the result that they came outside Japanese jurisdiction. At the same time, the investigations carried out had confirmed that even those local corporations mentioned in the report no longer possessed the credits or bonds in question.

19. In view of the above, his delegation could not support draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23, although it endorsed most of the views contained therein.

20. Mr. FOBE (Belgium) said that once again the question of the activities of foreign interests in colonial Territories had been stated in an unsuitable way, as it was obvious that not all foreign interests contributed in exactly the same way to fulfilling the ambitions of non-self-governing peoples. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23 would have done well to remember that point and to insist on the duty of the administering Powers to promote the welfare of the local population in the political, economic and social fields. The reports of the missions 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 showed that the administering Powers themselves shared that concern. It would therefore have been better if the draft resolution had simply reaffirmed those principles, instead of raising polemical issues, including selective condemnation and superficial judgements.

21. For its part, Belgium attached great importance to maintaining the kind of relations with Pretoria which enabled a critical dialogue to be carried on. His delegation would therefore vote against draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23.

22. Mr. HEINEBACK (Sweden) said that his country took strong exception to anything which prejudiced the interests of the indigenous people in dependent Territories and their endeavours to free themselves from economic and social misery, colonial oppression and the indignities of apartheid. Consequently, it condemned those activities of foreign economic interests which had such harmful effects. Although resolution A/C.4/34/L.23 pointed to many dangers which might arise from the existence of foreign economic and other interests in colonial Territories, it contained certain paragraphs, such as paragraphs 7 and 8, which were not fully acceptable to his delegation.

23. Moreover, despite a number of generalizations in the text, the draft resolution was an important step in the right direction in comparison with the previous year's resolution, in so far as it drew a distinction between foreign economic interests in southern Africa and in other colonial Territories. However, the wording of some paragraphs failed to take account of the reservations traditionally expressed by Sweden concerning the division of competence between the main organs of the United Nations. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote.

/...

24. Mr. HUTCHINSON (Ireland) said that draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23 did not fully reflect the position of his Government with regard to the item under consideration, as it failed to take a balanced and reasonable view of the fact that the activities of foreign economic interests, if properly conducted, did not necessarily have harmful effects on Non-Self-Governing Territories. In his delegation's view, it was for the administering Powers to ensure that enterprises operating in Territories under their administration did so in a manner which was in keeping with the long-term interests of the colonial Territories. However, his delegation was opposed to the singling out of certain countries for condemnation, and to the uniform rejection of political, diplomatic, economic and military relations with South Africa.

25. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) said that his country maintained no relations with the Government of South Africa and had always supported all the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, including the 1952 resolution establishing the Commission to study the racial situation in the Union of South Africa in the light of the purposes and principles of the Charter, and the 1962 resolution establishing what was now the Special Committee against Apartheid. His Government had also been the first in Latin America to ratify the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. His Government acknowledged the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, and took the view that apartheid was a crime against humanity. It had also rejected recognition of the bantustans.

26. In the view of his delegation, the minority racist régime of South Africa, which was in open rebellion against the entire United Nations legal system, constituted a case of deliberate and intolerable action contrary to the very essence and principles of international law. Ecuador therefore favoured the reaffirmation of the rights of the people of South Africa, and supported draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23.

27. Mr. GRAHAM (United States of America) reminded the Committee that his delegation had expressed the hope that it would be able to take part in consultations designed to produce a balanced resolution containing an objective assessment of the role of foreign investment in Non-Self-Governing Territories. Regrettably, the sponsors of the draft resolution had failed to take that into account.

28. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution under consideration, although it recognized that paragraph 6 represented a positive effort to meet the objection constantly advanced by the United States that the activities of foreign economic and other interests were not necessarily prejudicial to the interests of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories. The draft resolution condemned the United States and other Western nations, overlooking the fact that there were other countries maintaining relations with South Africa, and presented an incomplete, inappropriate and erroneous list of countries. The United States also opposed the call for the adoption of economic and oil sanctions against South Africa as it did not consider that such sanctions would be effective.

(Mr. Graham, United States)

29. In conclusion, his delegation urged members of the Committee to reject draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23, which had been drafted behind closed doors and had not succeeded in achieving consensus in the Committee.

30. Mrs. MAULA (Samoa) said that her delegation would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23 but for certain paragraphs, such as paragraph 7, in which some countries were criticized and no mention made of others. On the other hand, she felt it was important that the régimes in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia should be made to see the error of their ways, preferably through dialogue, and she sincerely hoped that the talks concerning Zimbabwe now going on in London would serve as an example in solving the problems in South Africa.

31. Mr. BROCHENIN (France) said that from the discussions on the subject of the activities of foreign interests, it would appear that the world was divided into two categories of nations: the Western countries, which were accused of being colonialist thieves, and the others, which were inspired wholly by pure motives. Such a view of things was clearly mistaken, especially in the modern world in which the multiplicity of relationships was leading to increasing interdependence.

32. For its own part, France repudiated apartheid, and had just proved it by refusing to receive the South African national rugby team. French enterprises operating in South Africa had to respect the Code of Conduct of the European Economic Community, and the French Government had not permitted investments in Namibia since 1976. His country applied the arms embargo imposed by the Security Council in 1977, as well as the sanctions against the Salisbury Government.

33. Köberg was an electric power station which would be completed in two or three years time and which would run on 3 per cent enriched uranium, whereas the manufacture of nuclear weapons required 93 per cent enriched uranium. Moreover, the plant would be placed under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency, a United Nations organ, and the irradiated fuel would be transported to France for treatment. It could therefore not be maintained that the Köberg nuclear power station was capable of being used for military purposes.

34. France's relations with South Africa were similar to those maintained with other States with régimes differing from its own. Such relations were based on respect for the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State and did not constitute approval of the conduct of such States in the field of human rights. Moreover, France co-operated with many countries, especially African countries; under the Lomé Convention, it collaborated with over 60 States in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean and the Pacific.

35. Although it had to be recognized that some enterprises at times sought to take advantage of particular circumstances and it was right to condemn them for so doing, his delegation found it regrettable that the debate in the Committee had once again served as a pretext for ideological arguments, and he expressed the hope that all countries which professed to maintain good relations with his country would abstain from supporting the draft resolution.

/...

36. Mr. RYABONYENDE (Rwanda) said that his delegation's position had already been frequently stated in the Fourth Committee and in the General Assembly. Rwanda condemned activities of foreign interests in the colonial Territories which impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, as well as the collusion of large, medium and small States with South Africa in the political, diplomatic, economic, military or nuclear fields, in flagrant violation of General Assembly resolutions. His country was one of those which scrupulously complied with the General Assembly sanctions against such régimes.

37. His delegation was convinced that the Committee should adopt the recommendation of the Special Committee on decolonization. Unfortunately, in paragraphs 7 and 8 of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23, the sponsors condemned some Member States for their collaboration with the régimes in southern Africa and deliberately omitted to mention other countries which were equally guilty. His delegation would like to request the Special Committee to submit to the General Assembly as complete a list as possible of States which collaborated with the régimes in southern Africa. Despite the fact that his delegation was in general agreement with the draft resolution, its reservations with regard to paragraphs 7 and 8 would compel it to abstain in the vote.

38. Mr. FEITH (Netherlands) said that although his Government was concerned that the process of decolonization had not yet reached the stage of full implementation, it was appreciative of and supported the search by the five Western countries for an agreement on early independence for Namibia on the basis of elections supervised by the United Nations.

39. With regard to the dependent Territories elsewhere in the world, the Netherlands was confident that the administering Powers concerned would continue to co-operate with the United Nations with a view to offering those peoples an early opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination.

40. On the activities of foreign economic interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization, he rejected the notion that those interests were ipso facto detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories. In his opinion, cases in which foreign companies had been found guilty of harmful practices should be clearly exposed, but it should also be noted that in many cases such companies had contributed to the economic development of the Territories where they operated.

41. Furthermore, the Netherlands had serious reservations concerning the scope of the agenda item in the final hours of the decolonization process, for what was being discussed could apply only to Namibia and Non-Self-Governing Territories outside Africa. Rhodesia, as was well known, had been subject to a total economic boycott. Anything else in the draft resolution was therefore extraneous to the subject under consideration.

42. His delegation would once again have to vote against the draft resolution since, for the reasons explained, it could not support sweeping and unwarranted condemnation of all foreign operations, nor could it allow some of the partners of

(Mr. Feith, Netherlands)

the Netherlands in the European Communities or other countries with which it had friendly relations to be singled out for criticism in that regard.

43. Finally, the draft resolution condemned all forms of collaboration with South Africa; in the opinion of the Netherlands, the mentioning of South Africa in that context was unjustified since it could not be considered a Non-Self-Governing Territory.

44. Mr. SERAFINI (Italy) noted that the draft resolution before the Committee was based on the assumption that foreign economic interests and other economic activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories were generally detrimental to the interests of the people of such Territories. However, that approach was misleading and, even in the slightly different version contained in operative paragraphs 5 and 6 of the current year's draft, it failed to draw an acceptable distinction between economic activities that were truly detrimental and those which, on the contrary, were beneficial to the indigenous populations and played an indispensable role in promoting their economic and social progress and in preparing them for political independence.

45. The importance of economic assistance and the contribution of foreign investments and technologies to the development of Non-Self-Governing Territories had been recognized by the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Second Committee, as well as by the Special Committee of 24 itself in recommendations to the Second Committee.

46. His delegation also rejected the sweeping and arbitrary charges against a number of countries, including Italy, of alleged collaboration with South Africa in the diplomatic, political, economic and military fields.

47. Turning to paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, he noted that his country maintained diplomatic relations with practically every other country in the world and he found it surprising that such relations could be construed as signifying approval of the policies of each of them. Moreover, the very existence of diplomatic relations between some Western countries and South Africa was one of the basic conditions for the continuation of the current negotiations aimed at finding a solution to the problems of Namibia and Rhodesia. Similarly, in the case of South Africa economic relations were in fact the Western countries' main tool for exerting pressure to promote a peaceful transition from the apartheid system to a multiracial society.

48. His delegation firmly rejected the false allegation of military co-operation between Italy and South Africa, which ignored the relevant and detailed information provided by the Italian Government to the Special Committee against Apartheid and the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) and which was based on transactions that had taken place prior to the adoption of Security Council resolution 311 (1972).

(Mr. Serafini, Italy)

49. A solution to the serious and complex problems of southern Africa required the full co-operation of all Member States, particularly countries which might be capable of influencing the course of events in the area, and for that reason it was highly regrettable that the Fourth Committee preferred year after year to approach the question through unrealistic statements and resolutions. It was to be hoped that a more constructive attitude would one day prevail, allowing the Committee to make a positive contribution to solving the remaining problems of decolonization.

50. For the reasons mentioned his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23.

51. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that although he supported draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23 on the whole, he considered that to be fair it would be necessary for all parties maintaining relations with South Africa and Southern Rhodesia to be named. Otherwise, his delegation would prefer that no country be named. For those reasons his delegation would abstain in the voting.

52. Mr. MONG (Papua New Guinea) said that although his delegation would vote for the draft resolution under consideration, he wished to place on record its reservations concerning the twelfth and fifteenth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 12, 15, 16 and 17. It also had strong objections to operative paragraphs 7, 8, 13 and 14 and would vote against them if they were put to the vote separately.

53. As to the countries named in paragraphs 7, 8, 13 and 14 of the draft resolution, his delegation had reason to believe that there were countries from Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa collaborating in one form or another with the minority racist régimes of southern Africa, and it would therefore be better either to name all the countries concerned or not to name any of them.

54. Although a large number of the multinational corporations whose activities were impeding progress in Zimbabwe and Namibia had headquarters in the countries named in the draft resolution, the Governments of two of those countries had made every effort to create an amicable atmosphere conducive to a negotiated settlement for majority rule in Zimbabwe, for ultimate decolonization and for the immediate granting of independence to Namibia.

55. Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Guatemala) said that he was in agreement with the principles set forth in the draft resolution under consideration, since traditionally his country had always been against racial discrimination and economic exploitation and could not accept nuclear proliferation for aggressive purposes.

56. On the other hand, it considered the listing of some countries in the operative part of the draft inappropriate and improper, and it rejected the generalizations in the text, which lacked the clarity required for a resolution on the problems and situations at issue.

57. His delegation would therefore abstain in the voting.

58. Mrs. CASTILLO (Dominican Republic) said her delegation would vote for the draft resolution under consideration because it thought it was appropriate in view of the continuing social injustice and denial of the inalienable right of the peoples of southern Africa to be masters of their own territories and their own natural wealth.

59. Her delegation would refrain from commenting on paragraphs 7, 8 and 14 because it did not have sufficient facts to form an opinion with regard to them.

60. Mr. VARELA (Costa Rica) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23 because it wished to be associated with the just struggle for liberation of colonial peoples and Territories and because it condemned every form of racial discrimination and collaboration with racist régimes.

61. However, his delegation did not endorse the condemnations set forth in paragraphs 7 and 8, because, in its opinion, they discriminated against specific countries. If a separate vote were taken on those paragraphs, his delegation would abstain.

62. Mr. ERAN (Israel) said that his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23

63. Although his delegation had clearly stated, on numerous occasions, its rejection of every form of racial discrimination, it had also pointed out, time and again, that it could not lend its support to resolutions that singled out certain countries for political reasons which had nothing to do with the issues dealt with in such resolutions. Israel had in the past emphasized that its trade with South Africa was minimal and had rejected all allegations concerning the existence of military and nuclear co-operation with that country. By the same token, Israel categorically denied the existence of any form of relationship or co-operation with the régime of Southern Rhodesia, and it reaffirmed its adherence to all the relevant United Nations resolutions. That position was on record in United Nations documentation.

64. Mr. AUGUSTE (Saint Lucia) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, because it believed that only through total condemnation by the international community and the implementation of strong measures against anyone who persisted in violating the relevant resolutions of the United Nations could the prevailing situation in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia be rectified.

65. However, in his opinion, the general aim of such resolutions should be to achieve the purposes towards which they were directed, and, in that connexion, the statements made by the representatives of the United States and other countries were particularly pertinent. Those statements drew attention to the need to respect the proper methodology, so as not to afford some countries an opportunity to use that situation in order to avoid casting an affirmative vote. However, the fact that the proper methodology had not been used did not mean that practices detrimental to colonial peoples should be condemned any less strongly.

(Mr. Auguste, Saint Lucia)

66. His delegation hoped that, in future, greater attention would be paid to the language and form of resolutions and, more important, to the objective to be attained.

67. In conclusion, he said that his delegation would have taken a different position if the paragraphs citing specific countries had been set forth in a separate resolution.

68. Mr. SEKYI (Ghana) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23, which was rightly aimed at checking the activities of those foreign and other economic interests which sabotaged the process of self-determination or obstructed the struggle against colonialism, racism and apartheid in southern Africa. Although the text had been criticized on the ground that it failed to distinguish sufficiently between those economic interests that were responsible for such activities and those that were not, it was clearly indicated, both in the preambular and in the operative paragraphs, that the condemnation applied to any activities which actually impeded the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) and activities which were detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants of southern Africa and of other areas.

69. The argument was frequently heard in debates and resolutions on that subject that exploitation was limited to southern Africa and should not be mentioned in connexion with the Caribbean or the Pacific. If all investments in southern Africa were exploitative, that did not mean that all investments elsewhere were beneficial. In southern Africa, apartheid and the racist minority régimes encouraged, and almost enforced, the ruinous exploitation of natural and human resources through private investment. Elsewhere, the laissez-faire attitude of the administering Powers allowed private investment to earn excessive profits at the expense of everything else, including the rights and interests of colonial peoples, as was correctly stated in the penultimate preambular paragraph.

70. The draft resolution had also been criticized for singling out certain countries as the principal - though not the only - collaborators with South Africa in specific spheres of activity. However, the draft was dealing with a fact which the General Assembly could not ignore, particularly in view of the huge volume of documentation before it showing that that group of countries constituted by far the most important source of investment in apartheid in the form of military supplies, capital goods, all types of fuel, industrial, military and nuclear technology, and so forth. Nor could it ignore the fact that some of those countries were the only ones whose vetoes had consistently protected apartheid from the effective measures which the Security Council might have taken under Chapter VII of the Charter. That position was generally defended on the ground that negotiations of one kind or another had been opened with the apartheid régime and that the adoption of measures in accordance with Chapter VII should therefore be delayed. However, that argument had worn quite thin from frequent use. It was not possible indefinitely to continue substituting talks for effective measures against the illegal occupation of a United Nations Territory. As in the case of Southern Rhodesia, his delegation did not understand why talks and effective action could not go hand in hand.

(Mr. Sekyi, Ghana)

71. The effect of all those activities was to encircle the apartheid régime with a cordon of defence which enabled it to survive and to defy the entire world. It was impossible not to assume that those countries which permitted or engaged in such activities actually desired the survival of apartheid. That was the situation to which paragraphs 7 and 8 referred.

72. It had also been asserted that some countries, being subject to the rule of their laws, could not prevent their nationals from emigrating to become mercenaries for Ian Smith or nuclear technologists in the service of Botha. Yet countries no less subject to the rule of law had been known to prevent their nationals effectively from all communication with their neighbours. It might also be relevant to cite the example of Sweden, which had recently adopted legislation to halt further investment in the apartheid régime by its nationals.

73. In conclusion, he drew attention to the fact that paragraph 14 did not refer in particular to the Government that had commissioned the Bingham inquiry but to its predecessors, whose activities had brought about that inquiry.

74. Mr. REINA (Colombia) said that his country would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23 because on the whole it reflected the basic argument of agenda item 92. However, it did not support paragraphs 7 and 8, and were a separate vote taken on those paragraphs, his delegation would abstain. He asked to have his delegation's reservations reflected in the summary record of that meeting of the Committee.

75. Mr. BEKALE (Gabon) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on resolution 33/40, which concerned the subject under discussion, for the same reasons that had prompted it to formulate its express reservations concerning the relevant paragraph of the Declaration of the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana, which had selectively condemned certain States for their collaboration with South Africa. That type of condemnation did not seem consistent with the objective of ensuring that draft resolutions received the broadest possible support. Moreover, it should be remembered that many members of the Committee expected a great deal in the way of co-operation by the countries named in the resolution and that, as the International Monetary Fund had made clear there were many other countries which, whatever the nature of the régime, would take advantage in one way or another of that part of the African continent. It must be determined whether the objective was confrontation or co-operation with those who could provide part of the solution to the problem before the Committee.

76. At Belgrade, the Special Committee of 24 had committed all States and all international and non-governmental organizations to combine their efforts with a view to achieving a just settlement in Southern Rhodesia and Namibia as soon as possible; and nowhere was it said that some States should be made to occupy the bench of the accused.

77. His delegation encountered some difficulties in supporting the draft resolution and would therefore abstain in the voting on it.

/...

78. A recorded vote was taken on the amended version A/C.4/34/L.25 of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bolivia, Botswana, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Denmark, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ivory Coast, Lesotho, Malawi, Norway, Oman, Paraguay, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta.

79. The amended version (A/C.4/34/L.25) of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23 was adopted by 86 votes to 15, with 32 abstentions.

80. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it supported the idea behind it, which coincided with his Government's policy of resolute support for United Nations efforts to bring about the termination of all forms of collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa and the illegal régimes of Southern Rhodesia and Namibia. That policy had been expressed in many ways, in particular by the fact that the Philippines did not maintain relations of any kind with those régimes.

81. Nevertheless, his delegation had reservations regarding some of the paragraphs, which in its view served no useful purpose. If the paragraphs had been put to the vote separately, his delegation would have abstained during the voting.

82. Mr. KENSIL (Suriname) said that although the provisions of paragraph 7 were important, his delegation had reservations on some parts of that paragraph and on paragraph 8. If the paragraphs had been put to the vote separately, his delegation would therefore have abstained during the voting.

83. Mr. ULRICHSEN (Denmark) reaffirmed his country's well-known support for any realistic step, compatible with the Charter of the United Nations, to implement General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in all Territories under colonial domination, including Southern Rhodesia and Namibia, and any effort to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa.

84. For the same reason, his delegation did not hesitate to condemn those activities of foreign economic interests that impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and believed that South Africa, because of its inhuman policy of apartheid, its support of the Rhodesian minority régime in open violation of United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia, its illegal occupation of Namibia and its continued refusal to co-operate with the United Nations on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), bore the principal responsibility for the explosive situation prevailing in southern Africa.

85. However, his Government deeply regretted the fact that such an important matter had been brought up by means of the resolution just adopted, which detracted from the seriousness of the issue and tended to pervert the original and worthy objectives of the agenda item. His Government believed that selective references and totally unjustified accusations against explicitly named countries were detrimental to the achievement of those objectives. Furthermore, the sweeping condemnation contained in paragraphs 7 and 8 was, in his delegation's view, so arbitrary and indiscriminate that in reality nearly all States Members of the United Nations, including his own country, were implicated. Denmark categorically rejected such allegations and condemnations; for that reason, and because of its reservations regarding a number of other paragraphs, it had abstained during the voting.

86. Mrs. MORRISON (Lesotho) said that her delegation supported the general concept behind draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23, which the Committee had just adopted. Unfortunately, since most of the preambular and operative paragraphs posed problems for her delegation, it had been forced to abstain during the voting.

87. Mr. LAL (Fiji) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it agreed with its basic intent and supported the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination and independence. However, it believed that those activities which contributed to the progress of peoples and facilitated the achievement of their independence must continue to receive support. His delegation therefore had reservations regarding paragraphs 7, 8 and 14. It was counterproductive to single out specific countries, since the list was in fact incomplete. If the paragraphs had been put to the vote separately, his delegation would not have been able to support them.

88. Mr. LØVALD (Norway) said that his country had traditionally given its support to the resolutions on foreign economic and other interests in colonial countries, including southern Africa. Lately, however, there had been a tendency in the Committee to polarize views unnecessarily on the question, diminishing the effectiveness and impact of the United Nations in that field. Additional controversial elements had been injected at the current session, including an attempt explicitly to condemn more countries. His delegation had hoped that the resolution for the current session would have been more issue-oriented instead of concentrating even more on certain elements which divided the Committee and which, as a result, would weaken the thrust of the draft. In some respects, however, the resolution had become more balanced, since it no longer contained a blanket condemnation of all foreign economic activities in colonial Territories. On balance, therefore, his delegation had abstained during the voting.

89. Mr. MONSALVE (Chile) said that his delegation had abstained during the voting on draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23 because of its reservations regarding the mention in paragraphs 7 and 8 of some countries with which Chile maintained diplomatic relations. In its view, that discriminatory and unjust reference was not in accord with the spirit or the goals of the Charter and was not necessary for achieving the true objectives of a draft resolution on the matter.

90. His delegation had taken note with interest of paragraph 6, in which a clear distinction was made between the current situation in southern Africa and the conditions in the other Non-Self-Governing Territories, and considered it a constructive step forward.

91. Mrs. ÜNAYDIN (Turkey) said that her delegation had abstained during the voting on draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23, in spite of its full endorsement of the essence and spirit of that document. Her Government was totally opposed to the activities of foreign economic and other interests which tended to perpetuate colonial situations. Turkey maintained no relations whatsoever with South Africa; it had abstained during the voting because it rejected in principle specific condemnations such as those contained in paragraphs 7 and 8. If the language of those two paragraphs had been different, her delegation would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

92. Mr. de ALBUQUERQUE (Portugal) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.23 because of its over-all approach to the problem of foreign economic activities in colonial countries. Although some positive action was contemplated in the draft resolution, it lacked the necessary balance and could fail to achieve its ultimate objective - the well-being of the populations of the colonial Territories.

93. His delegation would have preferred a more constructive approach instead of a sweeping condemnation of certain countries and of the activities of all foreign economic and other interests, and it could not agree with the language and content of parts of the text. It was not in favour of the total isolation of South Africa and considered it essential to maintain a constant and direct dialogue with the Pretoria Government, so that through persuasion and the use of strong and effective pressure, fundamental changes in the country's political and social structure could

(Mr. de Albuquerque, Portugal)

be introduced, thus creating the necessary conditions for the total eradication of apartheid and racial discrimination.

94. Mr. CARR (Jamaica) said that, although he had reservations regarding the wording of paragraphs 7 and 8, his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because of its general thrust.

95. Mr. SALONEN (Finland) said that, while he strongly condemned the activities which had perpetuated apartheid and colonial domination, his delegation had felt obliged to abstain in the vote because of the objectionable elements contained, inter alia, in paragraphs 7, 8 and 14, which included an arbitrary listing of countries as well as decisions which lay solely within the field of competence of the Security Council.

96. Mr. VAYENAS (Greece) said that his delegation had wanted to vote for the draft resolution but had felt obliged to abstain because of the wording of paragraphs 7, 8 and 14.

97. Mr. JUWANA (Indonesia), Mr. ULIS (Malaysia), Mr. MRA (Burma) and Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil) said that, although they had voted for the draft resolution, they objected to paragraphs 7 and 8 and would have abstained if those paragraphs had been voted on separately.

98. Mr. GELAGA-KING (Sierra Leone) strongly supported the statement of the representative of Ghana.

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

Question of Guam (continued) (A/C.4/34/L.24/Rev.1)

99. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the revised draft resolution on Guam (A/C.4/34/L.24/Rev.1) and announced that New Zealand and the Philippines had joined the list of sponsors.

100. Mr. TANAKA (Secretary of the Committee) said that, with reference to paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.24/Rev.1, the considerations set out in document A/C.4/34/L.12 were also applicable in respect of the administrative and financial implications of the current proposal.

101. Mr. CHAO WEI (China) said that the Government and people of China had always given strong support to peoples struggling for self-determination and independence, and his delegation would accordingly vote for draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.24/Rev.1. Nevertheless, as China opposed the establishment of military bases and installations on foreign soil by any super-Power, his delegation had reservations on the paragraphs which referred to military bases.

/...

102. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve the revised draft resolution without a vote.

103. It was so decided.

104. Draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.24/Rev.1 was adopted unanimously.

105. Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not opposed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.24/Rev.1 on the understanding that it reflected the reaffirmation of the right of the people of Guam to self-determination and independence. Nevertheless he had serious reservations regarding paragraph 10, in which the presence of United States military bases in Guam was mentioned. In fact, for some considerable time past, the United Nations had been urging colonial and military Powers to end their military activities and to eliminate bases in such Territories, but the colonial Powers had ignored that request and had not only refused to implement the relevant resolutions but had even increased their military activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories. Their presence had contributed to the lack of progress, resulting from colonial domination, and to the fact that the population had remained in a situation of dependency; thus, the existence of such military bases represented a threat to international peace and security and stood in the way of peoples seeking to achieve self-determination.

106. Mr. HAYDAR (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the administering Power should increase its efforts to diversify the economy of Guam, to free its people and to grant them full independence. Notwithstanding that reservation, his delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.24/Rev.1.

107. Mr. RASON (Madagascar) said that, although his delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.24/Rev.1, he wished to make it clear that it could not accept the second part of paragraph 10 as the presence of military bases represented a serious obstacle in the way of the implementation of the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

108. Mr. NEYTCHIEV (Bulgaria) said that, although he had joined the consensus, he felt obliged to express serious reservations, as a matter of principle, regarding the paragraphs of the resolution which referred to the presence of military bases on Guam.

109. Mr. PEŇAŽKA (Czechoslovakia) said that, in his delegation's view, the presence of military bases represented an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration, and consequently he had reservations regarding paragraph 10 of the resolution just adopted.

110. Mr. LE ANH KIET (Viet Nam) said that, while his delegation had not opposed the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.24/Rev.1, he wished to stress that it had reservations on paragraph 10. Viet Nam opposed the presence of military bases in colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories, not only because peoples were thereby prevented from exercising their inalienable rights but also because such a presence represented a threat to peace and security in the region.

111. Mr. PÉREZ NOVOA (Cuba) said that, although he had agreed to join the consensus on the draft resolution regarding Guam, he wished to stress that he had reservations on certain paragraphs and, in particular, on those referring to military bases. It was very clear to Cuba that such bases represented an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration and, from its own experience, Cuba was aware of the serious threat which they represented to peoples, particularly when such bases were maintained against their will.

112. Mr. MADEIRA (Mozambique) said that his delegation had reservations regarding paragraph 10 of the resolution just adopted by consensus.

113. Mr. DABBASHI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) repeated his delegation's reservations to paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.4/34/L.24/Rev.1. In his view there was no question that the presence of military bases represented an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization.

114. Mr. MIR MOTAHARI (Iran) said that, although his delegation had not opposed the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution regarding Guam, it had reservations on paragraph 10, as the presence of military bases represented in itself an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration.

115. Mr. AL-JBORI (Iraq) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution regarding Guam but wished to remind the Committee of Iraq's well-known position regarding military bases in colonial Territories. He therefore expressed reservations, as he considered that such bases represented an impediment to the independence of colonial peoples.

116. Mr. SAMIL (Afghanistan) said he had joined the consensus on the draft resolution just adopted but had reservations regarding paragraph 10, as he considered that military bases represented an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

117. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of item 18.

118. The General Assembly would begin its consideration of the question of Namibia the following day and consequently the Committee would resume its work when that question had been examined by the General Assembly. The President of the General Assembly had requested that members of the Fourth Committee should be made aware of his appeal that they should do everything possible to be available on time when its various reports were considered in plenary meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.