

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records*



FOURTH COMMITTEE

7th meeting

held on

Tuesday, 13 October 1981

at 10.30 a.m.

New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 7th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. JAMAL (Qatar)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 94: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDANCE 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 (continued)

UN LIBRARY

OCT 30 1981

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.4/36/SR.7

30 October 1981

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

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

AGENDA ITEM 94: 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 (continued) (A/36/23 (Part III); A/AC.109/652 and Corr.1, 655, 656, 658)

1. Mr. KALINA (Czechoslovakia) said that a major obstacle to the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and to the elimination of colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid was posed by the persisting and even expanding activities of foreign economic and other interests in colonial countries in defiance of international condemnation. The major culprits were the United States and certain other NATO countries which still had not taken legislative, administrative or other measures to terminate or limit the activities of foreign interests which continued to deny dependent peoples the use of the resources they required for their future independence.
2. The transnational corporations had a direct interest in preventing decolonization. That was why the Western monopolies had supported the racist régime in Rhodesia to the very end and why they now supported the Government of South Africa and refused to grant the right of self-determination to the peoples of southern Africa. Indeed, the apartheid régime and its illegal occupation of Namibia survived thanks only to the political, economic and military support of the Western countries, whose investments in South Africa already totalled \$30 billion. The major investors were NATO members - the United Kingdom, the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany - and their motives were largely political. Their aim was to strengthen the armed forces and repressive apparatus of the apartheid régime in order to defend the white minority Government, the illegal occupation of Namibia and the mounting acts of aggression against the African front-line States. Western aid to South Africa in the nuclear field was fraught with particular danger because it created the preconditions for the production of nuclear weapons. Those same Western Powers, together with France and Canada, were also extracting huge profits by depleting the natural resources of Namibia through their supranational corporations. The Western monopolies played an identical role in the small Territories in other parts of the world.
3. Attempts to justify the activities of those corporations as being beneficial to the Territories in which they operated were merely a ploy to divert attention from the fact that not only did they plunder those Territories for profit but they did so through the exploitation

/...

(Mr. Kalina, Czechoslovakia)

of the cheap labour of the indigenous populations, which were deprived of all social and political rights. The dependent peoples received no more education than they absolutely required and were paid just enough to ensure the reproduction of the labour force. Claims that transnational corporations were interested in improving the working conditions of the indigenous populations through so-called codes of conduct were pure demagoguery because such codes were not binding and were designed to gear the activity of those corporations to their own survival.

4. Extremely harmful was the continuing military activity in dependent Territories, which prevented their peoples from realizing their inalienable right to self-determination and independence and threatened international peace and security. South Africa's stubborn refusal to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia was of particular concern. It used its powerful military machine in Namibia against SWAPO as well as against the front-line States with a view to destabilizing them and thereby terminating their support for the struggle of the Namibian people. South Africa's actions in Namibia were possible only because of Western military co-operation in violation of United Nations decisions.

5. The existence of military bases in other dependent Territories was also one of the major obstacles to the implementation of the Declaration.

6. In the light of the above considerations, his delegation held that it was essential to condemn again, and in the harshest terms, the plundering of the colonial countries by foreign economic, financial, military and other interests as a gross violation of the Charter and as an obstacle to the full implementation of the Declaration. It was also essential to condemn categorically those specific countries which continued to maintain political, economic, military and other co-operation with the Pretoria régime. His delegation also whole-heartedly supported the legitimate demands of the majority of the States Members of the United Nations that the Security Council should immediately adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

7. His delegation further supported the proposal submitted by the representative of the German Democratic Republic requesting that a systematic register should be kept of the profits of transnational corporations in dependent Territories.

8. Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt) said that, notwithstanding the progress which had been made on the issue of decolonization, a number of problems remained. Twenty Territories still remained under colonial domination but the issue which required immediate attention was that

/...

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

of Namibia. There had been an unprecedented mobilization of the efforts of Member States to implement the plan for the independence of Namibia, which continued, however, to be thwarted by foreign economic interests. In violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, the repressive racist administration, in collusion with foreign economic interests, including transnational corporations, continued to plunder the natural resources and exploit the people of Namibia. Moreover, continuing acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States had caused extensive loss of life and destruction.

9. Certain countries which had not implemented the relevant decisions of the United Nations had claimed that the activities of such interests, representing mainly private enterprise, had benefited colonial peoples. Such claims were totally unfounded. Any administering Power which deprived the people of their rights to their own natural resources was in clear violation of the Charter. Such activities deserved the condemnation of the international community. It was therefore vital to impose effective sanctions on South Africa in implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Urgent action must also be taken to implement General Assembly resolution 35/118 and other relevant resolutions. The activities of foreign economic interests had undoubtedly hampered the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the ending of the system of apartheid in South Africa.

10. The South African régime must be strongly condemned for its continued plunder of the resources of Namibia. Those countries which had ignored United Nations resolutions on the issue and supported South Africa should equally be condemned, and pressure should be brought to bear on them. In particular, the continuing co-operation of the Western Powers and Israel which had enabled South Africa to develop a nuclear capability must be strongly condemned.

11. Steps must also be taken to implement paragraph 13 of the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in the annex to General Assembly resolution 35/118. In particular, a campaign should be launched with a view to arousing public awareness of the events which were taking place in Namibia and the activities of foreign economic interests. In conclusion he reaffirmed that all peoples had the right to self-determination and independence. His Government would furnish material and moral support to that end.

12. Mr. HUTCHENS (Australia) said that his delegation, as an active member of the Council for Namibia, was committed to the early

/...

(Mr. Hutchens, Australia)

achievement of genuine independence by that Territory. The recently concluded meeting of Commonwealth Heads of Government, held in Melbourne, had registered grave disappointment that the pre-implementation meeting in Geneva in January 1981 had been aborted by the refusal of the South African Government to agree to a date for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The meeting had reaffirmed the determination of its participants to ensure that the people of Namibia were allowed without further delay to exercise their right to self-determination and independence and had urged the Western Contact Group, as a matter of urgency, to intensify efforts to secure the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) without modification or dilution as early as possible in 1982.

13. There were many well-documented examples of the exploitation of Namibian labour by South African companies and such activities must stand condemned. His delegation was not, however, convinced of the appropriateness of proceeding from that to a generalized condemnation of all foreign economic and other interests. Political and economic oppression clearly existed in Namibia. But his delegation believed that the interests of the oppressed people of southern Africa would be better served by a more judicious examination of the causes of their oppression. The resort to blanket condemnation did not seem helpful.

14. It was in the context of other Non-Self-Governing Territories, in particular, in the Pacific and the Caribbean, that his delegation took issue with those who had asserted that all activities of foreign economic and other interests were detrimental to the people of those Territories and constituted a barrier to an act of self-determination by them. If the validity of such an assertion were accepted, it would be tantamount to arguing that no foreign investment or development assistance should be provided to dependent Territories anywhere. The balanced and responsible introduction of suitable foreign economic investment and resources had frequently been an essential part of the process of economic development in dependent Territories. Managed properly, the inflow of foreign investment was usually accompanied by the introduction of new technology, the acquisition of new skills and a general increase in managerial expertise. Those elements were vital to the establishment of viable and diversified social and economic structures. What was needed was a sensitivity on the part of administering Powers and foreign investors to the aspirations and real needs of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories. Economic over-dependence on the administering Power must be guarded against, although that was sometimes difficult to avoid, particularly in small Territories with scanty resources. Efforts should also be made to prevent irresponsible foreign investment for the sole purpose of making quick profits.

/...

(Mr. Hutchens, Australia)

15. His delegation considered that any draft resolution prepared under the item must recognize the difference between the situation in southern Africa and that in other dependent Territories. Those foreign economic and other interests which impeded the fulfilment of the aims of the Declaration must clearly be condemned; it would, however, be capricious to condemn all foreign economic interests outright without due regard to their real impact. His delegation could not associate itself with any text which selectively condemned certain countries, and had been disappointed that those principles had not always been followed in previous years.

16. Mr. BEREZHKOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the remarkable successes scored in recent years by decolonization efforts would have been even more significant had imperialism not attempted to regain its lost positions, particularly in Africa, by stifling the national aspirations of the peoples and regaining mastery over their natural wealth. The imperialists had claimed entire regions of the world as their sphere of vital interest, covered them with a network of military bases, backed racist and dictatorial régimes and created conflict producing situations. The international community had repeatedly stressed that the activities of foreign economic and other interests were a major obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

17. The major offenders were the members of NATO and their transnational corporations, which continued to defy the United Nations by pursuing their close co-operation with the racist Pretoria régime. By 1980 investments in South Africa had totalled some \$35 billion and more than 2,500 foreign companies, based mainly in the United Kingdom, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and some other Western countries, were operating there.

18. In Namibia, South African and Western transnational corporations had long held a virtual monopoly in the key sector of the country's economy, the mining industry, which accounted for nearly two thirds of the value of the country's total exports and nearly half of its State revenue. However, that industry brought no benefits to the indigenous Africans, whose income was one twelfth that of the white population because they were used as a cheap labour supply. The transnational corporations repatriated most of their profits and exported minerals, thereby reinforcing the colonial nature of an economy geared to the export of raw materials.

19. Especially dangerous was South Africa's virtually unlimited access to Namibian uranium which, owing to the country's military and nuclear co-operation with the major Western Powers and Israel, enabled South Africa to increase its military and nuclear capability, thereby threatening world peace and security. The Western Powers also used Namibia as a base for attacks on neighbouring sovereign African States, primarily Angola.

(Mr. Berezhkov, Byelorussian SSR)

20. It was the Western Powers, greed for super-profits in Namibia and their military and political interest in southern Africa which motivated their policy of frustrating the United Nations plan for a political settlement in Namibia by vetoing Security Council resolutions to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. His delegation supported the General Assembly's urgent appeal to the Security Council to impose such sanctions and held that States Members of the United Nations must also be asked to take measures to terminate political, economic, financial and other support for the Pretoria régime and strictly observe the relevant United Nations resolutions.

21. The imperialist circles of the Western Powers also played a dominant role in the small colonial Territories, where they continued to deny the local population their right to their natural resources and prevented implementation of the Declaration. Through the administering Powers, they also had set up bases in the Caribbean and in the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian oceans in order to preserve their military presence there, crush the national liberation struggles, interfere in the internal affairs of independent States and carry out acts of aggression. Those bases constituted a real threat to peace and security, and the military activity of the colonial Powers in the small Territories was a major obstacle to their independence. The imperialist Powers, in defiance of the United Nations, also tried to absorb the Territories under their administration, particularly in Micronesia.

22. In its decisions, the Committee must strongly condemn the activities of foreign economic and other interests in southern Africa and in all other colonial Territories as impeding implementation of the Declaration. Member States must be asked to adopt measures to terminate all co-operation with the South African racist régime, including those called for in paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 35/28.

23. His delegation therefore supported the proposal by the representative of the German Democratic Republic that the Centre on Transnational Corporations should keep a register of the profits which transnational corporations earned from the exploitation of colonial and dependent Territories.

24. The Western States must be urged to observe the arms embargo against South Africa, and the Security Council must again be urged to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

25. His delegation supported all measures designed to ensure the speedy and full implementation of the Declaration and other United Nations decisions on decolonization.

/...

26. Mr. RWETSIBA (Uganda) said that foreign capital had played a predominant role in South Africa's economy for over a century. His delegation viewed with grave concern the role played by transnational corporations, which had contributed to the continued existence of apartheid by building and strengthening the military-industrial complex of the white minority régime. Foreign bank lending to South Africa between 1972 and 1978 had totalled \$5.5 billion. Transnational corporations had transferred military technology to South Africa, notwithstanding the mandatory arms embargo imposed by Security Council resolution 418 (1977). Although an oil boycott of South Africa had been imposed, the racist régime had continued to acquire oil through the machinations of transnational oil corporations, which had also enabled South Africa to acquire expertise in sectors such as chemicals, nuclear energy and mineral exploitation. In collaboration with the racist régime, transnational corporations continued to deplete the mineral resources of Namibia, as was clear from document A/AC.109/656.

27. Even more grave was the role of the transnational corporations in building up the armed power of the apartheid State at a time when that power was being increasingly employed to mount attacks against the independent African States of southern and central Africa. The most ominous manifestation of collaboration between transnational corporations and South Africa was the development of a nuclear capability. It had been reported that a contract had recently been concluded with a European firm to manufacture fuel rods for South African nuclear power plants. Apart from strengthening South Africa's hold on Namibia, such a development was a threat to international peace and security. The recent invasion of Angola was a vivid example of the breach of peace rising therefrom. It had become imperative to impose sanctions against the racist régime under Chapter VII of the Charter.

28. The illegal South African presence in Namibia and the extension to the Territory of South Africa's abhorrent policy of apartheid had not only hindered progress towards independence but had also ensured the continued denial to Africans of any meaningful share in the wealth which was being generated. The Africans in Namibia continued to be regarded as no more than a reservoir of cheap labour with no claims to the benefits of the economic system. Thus, per capita income of the non-white population in 1977 had averaged only \$225 per year compared to an average of more than \$5,000 for whites. Moreover, in keeping with South Africa's policy of exploitation, there had been no requirement that any profits be reinvested for development purposes; instead, the bulk of the profits were regularly repatriated to foreign shareholders.

29. It was clear from the situation prevailing in many dependent Territories that, with rare exceptions, the activities of foreign interests led to a prolongation of the colonial status. People's

(Mr. Rwetsiba, Uganda)

minds had been conditioned to identify progress and economic security with the transitory benefits of investment stimulated by advantageous tax laws and cheap labour. That situation must be rectified as soon as possible.

30. He appealed to those countries which, through their united efforts had been victorious over fascism and nazism, to join the peace-loving countries in the fight against colonialism, racism, racial discrimination and apartheid.

31. Ms. LUCAS (New Zealand) said that her delegation supported efforts to control the activities of those foreign economic interests which continued to exploit colonial and dependent Territories and to impede their development. Administering Powers should ensure that the interests of colonial peoples were not subordinated to such activities. Her delegation nevertheless had reservations about the direction which the debate on the item had taken in recent years. It was one thing to condemn the activities of foreign economic interests which impeded the implementation of the Declaration; it was altogether another to suggest that all such activities were detrimental. Such an argument was clearly insupportable in the context of the experience of many new developing countries. Foreign investment could be of critical importance to development; properly controlled, it could inject much-needed capital into developing countries and contribute substantially to the transfer of technology and managerial skills. The activities of foreign economic interests in colonial and dependent Territories should be judged by sensible and practical criteria and not simply dismissed out of hand for doctrinaire reasons.

32. During previous sessions of the General Assembly, the corresponding resolution on the item had expressed deep concern at the way foreign interests deprived the indigenous populations of colonial Territories, including those of the Pacific Ocean region, of their rights over the wealth of their countries, and at the continued loss of ownership of land by the inhabitants of those Territories as a result of the failure of the administering Powers to take effective steps to safeguard such ownership. Such sweeping claims did not stand up to examination. New Zealand, the administering Power for Tokelau, guaranteed the Tokelauans full and sole possession of their land and the benefits of their 200-mile economic zone. Tokelau received assistance from New Zealand of about \$1,000 for every inhabitant. Furthermore, there were no foreign companies operating in the Territory. In such circumstances, her delegation found it hard to understand why anyone would want to imply that New Zealand had deprived the people of the Territory of their land or been otherwise negligent of their interests.

33. There had been other elements in the resolution adopted at previous sessions which had presented difficulties to her delegation and to others. She hoped that, during the current session, the language of the draft resolution would be so modified that it would be so modified that it would be possible to adopt it by consensus.

/...

34. Mr. MUKELEBAI (Zambia) said that some had argued over the years that foreign economic interests in southern Africa were a means of bringing about the desired political change in the area. Western transnational corporations, however, with the blessing of their respective Governments, were operating in Namibia in collaboration with the racist Pretoria régime without any regard for the welfare of the indigenous people and practising the same racial discrimination as existed in the South African-controlled institutions. They had plundered Namibian natural resources, making huge profits at the expense of the black majority who lived and worked under near-slave conditions. The people of Namibia and South Africa were thereby deprived of their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence.

35. In order to perpetuate the status quo, South Africa had even resorted to attacking independent African States in order to destabilize countries which opposed its illegal occupation of Namibia. It had support from certain Western countries whose transnational corporations were operating in Namibia. Those same Powers, which spoke out so boldly in favour of human rights elsewhere, conspired to deny those rights in Namibia by delaying its accession to independence and by supporting South Africa's tactics to block an internal settlement in Namibia.

36. His delegation called upon the Committee to expose and condemn the foreign economic interests which were perpetuating racism, repression, exploitation, colonialism and neo-colonialism in Namibia and South Africa, and called for South Africa's unconditional withdrawal from Namibia and an end to its policy of apartheid. It reiterated Zambia's firm support for the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and urged the Western contact group to secure South Africa's co-operation in implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It also held that the peoples of all Non-Self-Governing Territories, regardless of size, population or economic standing, were entitled to self-determination and that the administering Powers had a duty to encourage the exercise of that right and to take effective measures to ensure the economic viability of those Territories.

37. Mr. GALLARDO (Mexico) said that his country attached great importance to the principle of self-determination and considered that its denial was the cause of many contemporary political problems. During the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly his delegation had reiterated its decision to refrain from selling crude petroleum or its derivatives to South Africa.

38. Mexico had in the past spoken out in various forums against the racist régime and its occupation of Namibia. The information before the Committee made it clear that the illegal action of South Africa,

/...

(Mr. Gallardo, Mexico)

in association with those countries which maintained close economic relations with that régime, had enabled it to continue to exploit Namibia's natural resources. His delegation had recently pointed out in the Security Council that, although efforts had been made to isolate South Africa, its economic and political links with a number of countries had been strengthened and that, while the legal authority of the United Nations over Namibia had been established and the framework of negotiations for its independence created, its territory continued to be occupied and United Nations resolutions thwarted.

39. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that his Government fully supported the process of self-determination and independence in Namibia so that its people might develop their human and material resources free of any economic and political interference. South Africa was currently occupying Namibia against the wishes of all the members of the international community, including the United States. There existed in that troubled land great disparities in educational, social and economic opportunities and much remained to be done so that the people could hold free and fair elections to establish a system of government responsive to their aspirations.

40. The members of the Western contact group had stated at their meeting in September 1981 that their collective goal was independence for Namibia in 1982 on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and, to that end, representatives of the "Western Five" would soon be consulting with all parties to the negotiations to discuss possible constitutional principles to guide an independent Namibian State and to devise a time-table for resolving remaining issues. It had always been the policy of the United States, which had been involved in the negotiations since 1977, to seek a workable solution and avoid inflammatory rhetoric which contributed nothing to the ultimate goal.

41. The Committee, in discussing the question of foreign economic interests in dependent Territories, had a similar responsibility and should ask itself whether resolutions calling for radical action, especially on Namibia, would in any way advance the interests of the dependent peoples whose welfare was at stake. The frequent claim that the withdrawal of extra-Namibian interests from that Territory would make the goal of independence more attainable should also be judged in that light. The United States could not accept the major thesis of the draft resolution before the Committee that economic activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories were, by their very nature, detrimental to the interests of either Namibians or the peoples of other Territories. Many representatives present realized that, despite inequities and irregular patterns of investment, foreign participation in their own countries' economies had benefitted their people greatly. It seemed inconsistent, therefore, to declare that those same activities were somehow automatically harmful to the peoples of a dependent Territory.

(Mr. Sherman, USA)

42. The United States, fully adhering to the Security Council resolutions and the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice on Namibia, maintained a consistent policy towards investment in Namibia: officially, it discouraged investment in Namibia; it did not guarantee investments in Namibia based on rights acquired through the South African Government since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI); and it did not provide financial assistance of support trade and investment in Namibia. Those official policies ensured that his Government's economic and political relations with South Africa in no way served to recognize its administration of Namibia as either legal or legitimate. In spite of their rhetoric, very few of those same delegations which regularly denounced similar activities by other States could state categorically that their nations or corporations had no economic or commercial dealings with South Africa.

43. The United States could not accept the view that the solution to South Africa's racial problems could be found only by South Africa's increasing isolation from the international community. Quite the contrary, his Government was committed to working to assist evolutionary change in South Africa through an economic and commercial involvement which was motivated by a commitment to constructive change. Through voluntary programmes such as the Sullivan Principles, for instance, United States corporations in South Africa were pledged to eliminate discrimination in the workplace, develop programmes to prepare black South Africans for professional and technical jobs, and improve the quality of their housing, transport, schooling and health facilities.

44. Even such undertakings, however, could not in the end guarantee fundamental changes in South Africa, which must come about from forces within that society. The United States would continue to support those in South Africa, whether government officials or private citizens, whether black or white, who recognized that only real revision of an unacceptable system would serve the ultimate interests of all the people of South Africa.

45. He wished to clarify, in response to a mistaken assertion that the United States was violating the Security Council arms embargo, that the United States had unilaterally embargoed the shipment of arms to South Africa in 1961, 16 years before the United Nations embargo had been established, and that since 1977, the United States had scrupulously abided by the Security Council embargo. Further, with regard to the question of United States military bases in Micronesia, he wished to point out that the United States had not used Micronesia as a base for military operations although it had, in accordance with article 5 of the Trust Agreement, assigned one naval officer to the Trust Territory headquarters and set up the contract missile-testing facility of Kwajalein. He was not aware that the people of Micronesia had ever objected to the presence of either.

49. Mr. OULD SIDI AHMED VALL (Mauritania) said that the Committee's consideration of the item before it showed its faith in the right of people to control their own natural resources and, consequently, their own destinies among free nations. It was the duty of all those administering dependent Territories to recognize that right. Mauritania opposed all actions that served to hamper the future of those Territories, but at the same time paid tribute to all efforts to help develop their economic infrastructures.

50. It stood together with all other States against apartheid and called for a halt to the South African occupation of Namibia. Certain other States, however, were using delaying tactics, especially the veto in the Security Council, to prevent a solution. Further, the illegal co-operation between South Africa and Israel was allowing South Africa to develop its nuclear capability, thus posing a threat to security and stability throughout Africa. Mauritania condemned all such assistance to the régime and appealed to those with influence on South Africa to induce it to end its occupation of Namibia.

51. His country, then, supported the right of all States to self-determination, independence and the control of their own wealth; it emphatically condemned investment in South Africa and the provision to it of weapons and nuclear technology; it called upon States whose transnational corporations were operating in southern Africa to stop their detrimental activities; it underscored the need to implement the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter and called for the full implementation of relevant General Assembly resolutions.

52. Mr. SOLTYSIEWICZ (Poland) said that his country's solidarity with colonial peoples fighting for their freedom had been one of the cornerstones of its foreign policy. It had supported all actions to that end by the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, the non-aligned States and progressive bodies. The historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had accelerated the pace of decolonization and contributed to radical changes in the world map, yet colonialism persisted, notably in southern Africa, and foreign economic and other interests were still exploiting colonial peoples and denying them their political, economic and social rights. Economic motives had led to the rise of colonialism, and its vestiges also rested on economic interests. That was why so many transnational corporations were now operating in South Africa exploiting Namibia's natural resources and supplying arms, including nuclear technology, to the Pretoria régime, in defiance of the Security Council arms embargo.

53. In other parts of the world, the presence of military installations in some of the small Territories was a matter of particular concern since it represented a serious obstacle to the full implementation of the Declaration.

(Mr. Soltysiewicz, Poland)

54. Given the disquieting international situation, it was more important than ever to implement all relevant United Nations resolutions and to apply the sanctions envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter. That could only happen when those currently giving economic support to colonial systems finally understood that decolonization was a historical process from which there was no escape.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.