

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION

*Official Records\**



FOURTH COMMITTEE  
5th meeting  
held on  
Wednesday, 20 October 1982  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 5th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ROA-KOURI (Cuba)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 98: 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)

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

\* 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.4/37/SR.5  
27 October 1982  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 98: 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 (A/37/23 (Part III) and (Part III)/Add.1, A/37/333, 405; A/AC.109/690, 701, 702, 703; A/37/23 (Part II) and (Part II)/Add.1, A/AC.109/696, 698, 704) (continued)

1. Mr. PULZ (Czechoslovakia) said that the activities of transnational corporations were one of the main obstacles to the elimination of colonialism, racism and apartheid. Despite numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations, the role of foreign economic and financial interests had not in any way diminished; those interests were continuing to dominate the economies of colonial countries and Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was the Western monopolies and the co-operation of certain States in the political, economic and military fields that were making it possible to maintain apartheid and the illegal occupation of Namibia.
2. A mission of the Special Committee of 24 had found that in 1981 there were 3,035 foreign monopolies in 22 States which provided capital to the South African régime, or an increase of 1,152 companies compared with 1978. According to the data provided by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions 80 per cent of foreign investment in South Africa was made by companies from five States: the United Kingdom, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, Switzerland and France. One hundred and fifty-one Australian companies also provided capital to the apartheid régime.
3. Namibia was still the most important area of operation for companies from Western countries. The Namibian territory provided them with raw materials such as lead, zinc, tin and copper under conditions which enabled those companies to make enormous profits. Foreign companies were also involved in petroleum prospecting and South Africa's unwillingness to leave Namibia was perhaps attributable to the hope that the Territory would become a major producer of petroleum.
4. As document A/AC.109/702 indicated, South Africa had attracted foreign investment in Namibia by various means and had accorded many benefits to transnational corporations. Czechoslovakia was therefore convinced that it was essential to continue to isolate the apartheid régime in international life, to implement the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and to apply effective sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.
5. As could be seen from the series of documents prepared by the Special Committee of 24, that type of situation did not exist only in southern Africa but also in small Territories in various parts of the world. Since the main objective of the Western monopolies was to make the greatest possible profit from their operations and that was made possible by colonialism, the monopolies were for

(Mr. Pulz, Czechoslovakia)

obvious reasons trying to perpetuate colonialism. In that respect, Czechoslovakia expressed gratitude to the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations for its report on the preparation of a register indicating the profits which transnational corporations derived from their activities in colonial Territories (A/37/405). It believed that that report drawn up in implementation of General Assembly resolution 36/51 made a useful contribution to the discussions on the adverse consequences of the activities of transnational corporations in the colonial Territories and particularly in southern Africa.

6. As to military activities and the measures that the colonial Powers were taking in the Territories they administered, Czechoslovakia's position was based on the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and particularly General Assembly resolution 35/118. In accordance with that basic document, Czechoslovakia believed that the military activities of the colonial Powers in the Territories under their domination were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. As was stressed in the documents of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Namibia had been transformed by South Africa into a vast shooting range for testing new types of weapons and a bridgehead for attacks against neighbouring States. It was also evident that the Pretoria régime could not carry out its activities in Namibia without the direct support of the principal member countries of NATO, and those activities were contrary to the decisions of the United Nations.

7. Since the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 385 (1976), the armed forces of South Africa had increased more than five times and in 1981 they were estimated at 100,000 men. If one added the so-called "civilian" forces, the number was 180,000. Namibia's level of militarization was one of the highest in the world; there was one soldier for every 12 inhabitants. Moreover, through licencing agreements with certain Western countries and Israel, South Africa was now the tenth producer of arms in the world. In violation of Security Council resolution 418 (1977) concerning an embargo on the delivery of arms and related matériel, a number of Western countries were continuing to supply equipment to the South African army. According to specialists, South Africa would soon be able to produce nuclear weapons. It was clear that if South Africa became a nuclear Power, it would become even more aggressive and would represent an even more dangerous threat to the African countries and the entire world. The arms race and war psychosis maintained by the military and industrial circles of imperialism were leading to the establishment and maintenance of military bases in the small Territories which was disastrous for those Territories and endangered the peace of the regions concerned and of the world.

8. In conclusion, he wished to stress that the presence of military bases and installations in Guam, Micronesia, Bermuda, Puerto Rico and the Turks and Caicos Islands and other small Territories was one of the main obstacles to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

9. Mr. ZAGAJAC (Yugoslavia) said that because of the significance of the item under consideration and its possible consequences for the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples the General Assembly, at its current session, must pay due attention to the issue and try to progress towards a solution.

10. There was no doubt that the existing foreign economic and financial interests were impeding the decolonization of some Non-Self-Governing Territories such as Namibia, and that the profits and benefits derived as a result of the colonial status of those territories were at the core of the problem. The military and strategic interests in Namibia and some other Non-Self-Governing Territories had also prevented those Territories from achieving independence. If there was a foreign military presence in a territory, the will and national aspirations of the people could not be freely expressed.

11. Despite numerous international legal instruments, General Assembly resolutions and an opinion of the International Court of Justice, all of which constituted an integral part of international law, 88 major transnational corporations and hundreds of smaller ones were operating in Namibia without the permission of the Council for Namibia. According to the data of the Council for Namibia, most of those companies belonged to Western countries. The General Assembly, in a number of resolutions, had identified the countries which were the main economic partners of South Africa and whose corporations were engaged in illegal activities in Namibia. Those activities involved all major sectors of the Namibian economy and their scope was clear from the data of the Council for Namibia and the Centre against Apartheid. The exploitation of the mineral resources of the Territory had assumed such proportions that the reserves were being gravely endangered.

12. The foreign financial presence in Namibia was a reason for increased concern of the international community. According to documents of the Council for Namibia, the transfer of capital to South Africa and Namibia had military implications and helped the South African régime to maintain its illegal occupation of the Territory. Those transfers were subsidizing the South African military capacity and strengthening its machinery for oppression not only in Namibia but also in South Africa. Without the billions of dollars that were invested in South Africa and Namibia and the enormous profits of the transnational corporations, the illegal occupier would soon lose interest in administering that international Territory. If all financial assistance and investment capital were denied to the occupying régime, the liberation of Namibia and the implementation of the United Nations Plan for Namibia would be accelerated.

13. The situation in other Non-Self-Governing Territories was not much different from that of Namibia. Since they very often lacked natural resources, it was above all strategic interests which were impeding their independence. The presence of foreign military bases which was never in the interests of the local population and even represented potential danger in the event of war was being justified under the pretext of being a source of income and an effort by the administering Power to improve the economy of the Non-Self-Governing Territory.

(Mr. Zagajac, Yugoslavia)

14. However, as events had shown, the foreign military presence in those Territories could directly threaten the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring independent States. It had been thus that, by its enonomic exploitation, the racist régime in South Africa had turned the occupied Territory of Namibia into a spring-board for its acts of agression against neighbouring peaceful countries.

15. Faithful to its policy of non-alignment with regard to decolonization questions and to its opposition to any form of foreign domination, Yugoslavia had undertaken to respect strictly the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and other United Nations organs calling for the cessation of economic and other foreign activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories which impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The international community should, at the current session, take a further step to prevent the illegal exploitation of the natural resources of the peoples still under the colonial yoke.

16. Yugoslavia, like the majority of Member States, considered that it was essential to reaffirm once again the right of all peoples still under the colonial yoke and foreign domination to exploit their natural resources themselves. Yugoslavia considered also that that economic co-operation with the occupying colonial régime in Southern Africa was inadmissible and that it constituted a violation of numerous decisions adopted by the United Nations. His delegation was in favour of resolute action by the United Nations to arrive at the rapid decolonization of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories, on the basis of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), and was ready to participate in any endeavour to that end.

17. Mr. KORAMA (Sierra Leone) said that it was indeed pertinent but none the less regrettable that the Fourth Committee should be discussing the activites of foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; pertinent because the continued existence of colonialism, apartheid, and racism impeded the social, cultural and economic development of the colonial peoples and because the natural resources of those peoples should be exploited for their benefit; regrettable because, 22 years after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), colonies and colonial situations continued to exist in the world; pertinent and regrettable because it had already been possible, in the past to see the state of unpreparedness, both in terms of education and in terms of economic, social and cultural development, in which colonial peoples had found themselves when they had finally obtained independence, even though their resources had been exploited. Such a policy, if policy it was, should not be allowed to continue.

18. The General Assembly had adopted many resolutions aimed at implementing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence, setting Namibia free, ending the exploitation of its resources and putting an end to the policies of apartheid, whose very essence was the exploitation of cheap labour for superprofits. Unfortunately, instead of heeding the calls of the General Assembly, certain Governments and their multinational corporations, in tandem with the racist régime

/...

(Mr. Korama, Sierra Leone)

in South Africa, were impeding the implementation of those resolutions. Those multinationals continued their mass investment in South Africa and Namibia, with the aim of maximizing profits. As a consequence, the Pretoria régime, which was illegally occupying Namibia, was even more entrenched, more intransigent and more determined than ever to deny the people of Namibia their inalienable right to freedom and independence. Instead of ceasing trade relations with South Africa, certain multinational corporations had increased their investments to the tune of billions of dollars, both in South Africa and in Namibia.

19. Unlike some, Sierre Leone did not believe that the benefits of increased investment, expanded trade and transfer of technology would somehow percolate through to the African workers currently being exploited. So far, the situation of those workers had not improved, and they had been obliged, at great sacrifice, to go on strike in order to achieve a minimum wage. It was thus evident that the activities of the multinationals, far from promoting the freedom and independence of Namibia or the elimination of apartheid in South Africa, presented an impediment to such goals.

20. His delegation took the present opportunity to reaffirm its support for General Assembly resolution 36/51, requesting the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations to prepare from available sources a register indicating the profits which transnational corporations derived from their activities in colonial Territories.

21. His delegation also reiterated its call for an end to be put to the activities of transnational corporations and for economic measures to be taken against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Sierre Leone, for its part, would do all in its power to expose the activities of such corporations and to contribute to the eradication of apartheid in South Africa and to the independence of Namibia.

22. Mr. ADDABASHI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that success in putting an end to the activities of foreign interests in colonial Territories would accelerate the process of decolonization and the peoples of those territories would be able rapidly to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. However, that was not an easy task, as the innumerable resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the question testified. The main obstacles to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples were the foreign interests and military bases of the Western countries; those countries aimed only at making superprofits and obtaining military and strategic advantages.

23. It was the assistance provided to South Africa by transnational corporations and banks which enabled the racist régime of South Africa to continue to occupy Namibia and pillage its resources, in defiance of United Nations resolutions and Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia. In that regard, the Special Committee of 24 described clearly in document A/AC.109/702 the procedures being used by South

(Mr. Addabashi, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

Africa to attract foreign investments to Namibia, by authorizing corporations with headquarters abroad to deduct their capital expenses from their gross regular profits, to mine minerals unrestrictedly and to export them for processing abroad, which harmed the economy of the Territory, which was thus deprived of jobs which might have created a local industry for the processing of raw minerals. Moreover, foreign corporations were not obliged to reinvest any percentage of the profits in the Territory for development purposes, and the greater part of the profits on foreign investments was regularly repatriated abroad to be paid to shareholders.

24. In defiance of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations, the Western States, in particular, the United States, were encouraging their corporations to invest in Namibia and South Africa. The number of transnational corporations which had invested in South Africa had increased from 1,888 in 1978 to 3,035 in 1981. That increase was most spectacular in the case of corporations with headquarters in the States members of the contact group specially established to settle the question of Namibia. It thus seemed that the main objective pursued by the Western countries was not Namibia's accession to independence but the unrestrained exploitation of its mineral and human resources. The difference between the wages paid to white workers and to black workers was considerable, since, according to reliable reports, the average monthly wage of a black working in the mines had been 170 rands in 1980, as against 1,057 rands for a white. Not content with pillaging the natural resources of the Territory, the transnational corporations were also exploiting the black workers, who did not benefit from any training programme and were dismissed as soon as they made the slightest claim regarding their working conditions. Among other examples of the exploitation of the resources of Namibia should be mentioned the sale by South Africa of Namibian uranium to Western countries and oil prospecting. For all those reasons, the Western countries, and most particularly the Zionist entity, supported the apartheid régime, which they regarded as the guarantee of their interests in southern Africa. In that regard, emphasis should be placed on the points which the Zionist entity and the racist régime in South Africa had in common: the racist Zionist entity refused the Palestinian people its right to found a State and occupied Arab territories, including Lebanon; the racist régime in South Africa refused the Namibian people access to independence and occupied a part of Angola territory. That similarity was borne out by the spectacular strengthening of trade relations between the Zionist entity and South Africa; the volume of the trade had increased from \$3 million in the 1960s to more than \$80 million in 1981. The support of the Western countries for those two racist régimes had enabled them to attain self-sufficiency with regard to certain military materials.

25. The support given by the United States and its allies to the apartheid régime, however, was not limited to the investments of transnational corporations and to armaments; it was also apparent in the Security Council itself, an organ whose action the Western Powers had succeeded in frustrating by abusing their right of veto. That influence was also felt in the International Monetary Fund which was contemplating the grant of a loan of \$1.1 billion to South Africa, an amount equivalent to two thirds of that country's increase in military expenditures for 1981 and 1982.

(Mr. Addabashi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

26. Several of the colonial territories were suffering from recession and stagnation because of the stranglehold of the transnational corporations on their economic life and because the countries in which those corporations had their head offices were not concerned with their development. Moreover, those territories served as military bases and were the centres for a wide range of military activities of the Western countries, which impeded the exercise of their right to self-determination and independence.

27. In conclusion, his delegation paid a tribute to the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations for the work it had done in preparing its report (A/37/405) and hoped that it would be able to complete its work thanks to the information transmitted by the countries concerned.

28. It was important that the Security Council should impose mandatory global sanctions on South Africa so as to compel it to comply with United Nations resolutions and end the exploitation and usurpation of Namibian resources. His delegation reiterated its unconditional support for the Namibian people and SWAPO, its sole legitimate representative, and for all other colonial peoples in their struggle for self-determination and independence.

29. Mr. ABUBAKAR (Nigeria) said that three United Nations bodies, namely, the Special Committee against Apartheid, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on decolonization had recently called on the International Monetary Fund to reject racist South Africa's application for a credit of \$1.7 billion.

30. He drew the attention of the international community to the need to isolate the South African apartheid régime at the present juncture when it was facing serious economic difficulties. By approving its application for that credit, the Fund would be giving it another lease of life, whereas the sanctions adopted, especially since the Soweto massacre, and its enormous expenditure on the defence budget, which had exceeded \$2 billion, had seriously weakened the South African economy. His Government therefore deplored the fact that South Africa continued to enjoy membership in the World Bank and International Monetary Fund in spite of several United Nations resolutions.

31. His delegation was convinced that granting the loan in question to South Africa would be tantamount to prolonging the sufferings of the innocent victims of apartheid, to financing the continuing military attacks launched by South Africa against the front-line States and to perpetuating world tension. The International Monetary Fund, which was a specialized agency of the United Nations, should not work at cross purposes with the international community by approving the South African application but should channel its enormous resources towards helping needy developing countries particularly to balance their annual budgets. He appealed to all delegations and international organizations and bodies to prevail upon the Fund to reject South Africa's application so that apartheid might finally be eradicated.

32. Mr. KHAMMAVONG (Lao People's Democratic Republic) noted that, under the United Nations Charter and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the administering Powers had obligations towards the peoples of the non-self-governing territories and that those Powers had, on the contrary, impeded the economic growth and social progress of those territories by exploiting and plundering their natural resources and wealth. As the General Assembly reaffirmed each year in its resolutions, the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the colonial territories constituted one of the main obstacles to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence and to the final elimination of colonialism, racism and apartheid. The case of Namibia was the best example: South Africa, scorning the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly, continued to occupy the territory, to monopolize its wealth, to deny its people its fundamental rights and was doing nothing to relieve the poverty of the black population.

33. In contravention of the relevant resolutions adopted, the transnational corporations, motivated by greed, were opposing the process of decolonization and development by their activities in the colonial territories. That was very obvious in Namibia where they reaped substantial profits from the mining of various ores. Furthermore, the presence of oil explained South Africa's obstinacy in maintaining its occupation of the territory.

34. The military activities of the administering Powers in the non-self-governing territories, especially the maintenance of military bases, constituted a major obstacle to the political and economic independence of those territories and therefore to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In some territories, particularly Micronesia, Guam, Bermuda, the Turks and Caicos Islands, the United States Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, military activities were being intensified, which constituted an obstacle to the self-determination of peoples and to the independence of those territories and was also a threat to international peace and security.

35. The colonialist imperialists were perpetuating their domination of many peoples, both in order to expropriate their natural resources and exploit their labour and uphold their strategic interests. The United Nations must therefore constantly endeavour to ensure the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

36. His delegation continued to support unreservedly the colonial peoples struggling for self-determination and independence and believed that the States Members of the Organization should put a stop to all economic and financial assistance to South Africa and compel it to comply with the relevant United Nations decisions and resolutions. It was also important that the Security Council should impose sanctions against the South African régime in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

37. Mr. POPAL (Afghanistan) said that the alarming and worsening economic situation in Namibia and other non-self-governing territories caused by the activities of transnational corporations and foreign monopolies was a matter of deep concern. The main objectives of the colonial Powers were to plunder the

(Mr. Popal, Afghanistan)

natural and human resources of those territories and maintain them in a condition of permanent dependency and exploitation. That policy had already resulted in a tragic situation and also entailed serious consequences for the future development of the peoples of those territories.

38. The foreign monopolies and transnational corporations had concentrated their activities in the main economic sectors. In Namibia, for example, they had focused on mining and mineral resources purely for their own gain and to the detriment of the Namibian population. All those situations had hindered the efforts of the Namibians to achieve economic growth and promote social development, self-determination and independence.

39. The General Assembly, on several occasions, had pointed out that the activities of the transnational corporations in colonial territories constituted an obstacle to the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and had called for their immediate termination. All peoples must have access to their own natural resources.

40. The military bases and installations of the colonial Powers in Bermuda, Guam, Diego Garcia, Micronesia and the Malvinas were not only against the interests of the indigenous populations but also incompatible with international peace and security. The imperialist Powers were keeping those bases or building new ones in order to use them for strategic purposes and to crush the national liberation movements of the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

41. The annexation policy of the United States Government towards the Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico was contrary to the wishes of the peoples of those territories and a violation of the principles of the Charter.

42. The racist South African régime, which clearly enjoyed the co-operation of some NATO countries, had been intensifying its military activities and manoeuvres to suppress SWAPO, invade Angolan territory and destabilize the front-line States. Since that policy was a real danger to international peace and security, it was incumbent on the international community to take urgent measures to foil the diabolical manoeuvres of the South African régime and to condemn the illegal collaboration of certain Western countries with Pretoria. His delegation strongly condemned those countries and urged full compliance with the military and economic sanctions imposed against the racist régime by the international community.

43. The presence of foreign economic and military interests in Namibia and the other territories under colonial domination constituted an obstacle to the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Afghanistan called for the immediate termination of their activities in those territories.

44. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that, despite numerous resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and other international bodies, foreign economic, and other interests continued to exploit the human and natural resources of the Non-Self-Governing territories and were thus obstructing decolonization and

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

contributing to the perpetuation of the immoral system of apartheid and racial discrimination. Resolutions of the General Assembly calling upon the colonial Powers to break their economic, commercial and financial relations with South Africa and to take measures to prevent their nationals and bodies corporate under their jurisdiction from acting in a manner detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants of those territories had had little effect.

45. Indeed, there had been increased collaboration between, on the one hand, colonial countries professing their commitment to justice and, on the other, the racist minority régime of South Africa, which had perpetrated the worst crimes against humanity. The outcome had been to entrench further the régime's illegal domination over the territory of Namibia and to strengthen its hateful system of apartheid.

46. He recalled that in 1947 foreign interests had not proved an impediment to independence in the South Asian sub-continent and that such interests had been safeguarded through treaties and agreements between the foreign companies concerned and the new Government, because of the contribution such companies had made to the development of trade and the economy. The same principle could be applied in the remaining colonial territories and such foreign economic interests should not serve as a reason for not granting independence to them.

47. The most dangerous form of collaboration between certain industrialized countries and the South African racist régime was to be found in the nuclear field. Such collaboration must cease immediately if the Pretoria régime was to be prevented from using nuclear weapons to intimidate peoples struggling for their freedom from the yoke of colonialism and racism. It was also essential that all States should comply strictly with the arms embargo on South Africa imposed by the Security Council.

48. His delegation was also deeply concerned at the exploitation of the natural and human resources of certain colonial Territories in the Caribbean and the Pacific and deplored in particular the absence of restrictions on the sale of land to foreigners.

49. Pakistan would continue to extend its moral and material support to the liberation movements in Namibia and South Africa. It was time to move beyond the stage of condemnation and to take effective measures against the forces that continued to collaborate with the South African régime. It was also imperative that the publicity campaign should be intensified so that the peoples of those countries should be made more aware of the role being played by transnational corporations in propping up the colonial and racist régime in South Africa at the cost of the inalienable rights of the indigenous peoples.

50. His delegation pledged its full support for any steps that the international community might decide to take to put an end to economic exploitation, racial discrimination and apartheid on the continent of Africa and indeed throughout the world. His delegation commended the Special Committee of 24 for its work during 1982 and supported the resolution which it had adopted on the activities of foreign

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

economic and other interests; it was his firm hope that the Fourth Committee would give its unanimous approval to the measures recommended by the Special Committee.

51. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam) said that the Committee had had the item under consideration for the past 15 years but that, in the context of a very serious international situation marked by an unrestrained armaments race and explosive international crises provoked by imperialism and the forces of international reaction, the item had currently become of crucial importance, bearing in mind that the industrialized countries had ignored the baneful impact of the capitalist world's economic crisis on the developing countries, particularly those which were still under colonial domination.

52. The United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations, in its report (A/37/405), had demonstrated the negative attitude of transnational corporations which in the main had declined to co-operate in the preparation of a registry indicating the profits derived by such corporations from their activities in colonial territories; such an attitude confirmed that transnational corporations did not contribute to development but rather acted contrary to the basic interests of those Territories by deliberately destroying their natural and human resources.

53. According to a study prepared by the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/AC.131/L.250), the African workers employed by such corporations received wages that were only about five or six per cent of the wages paid to white workers. The average per capita income came to approximately R 3,000 per year for the white population and to R 125 for blacks, a ratio of 24 to 1.

54. His delegation considered that foreign interests were not only a major impediment to political independence and racial equality but indeed were the fundamental obstacle to the granting of independence to countries and peoples still under colonial domination because foreign economic interests in colonial Territories were currently very closely linked with the strategic, political and military interests of the imperialist and hegemonistic Powers. Such was particularly the case in southern Africa, endowed as it was with substantial natural resources of great economic and strategic value. That was the basis of the collusion of certain countries with the racist Pretoria régime, and their aim was not only to prolong the colonialist oppression of the South African racists but at the same time to establish a forward military base as part of their global strategy for world domination.

55. Nor were the Asian hegemonists standing aside. Indeed, according to an article in The New York Times of 19 September 1982, China had sold semi-enriched uranium and, as the country lacked hard currency, it might be tempted to increase its exports, particularly of nuclear fuel and technology.

56. It was therefore essential that the international community should take effective measures as a matter of urgency to put an end to all collaboration with South Africa in the political, diplomatic, economic, commercial, military and nuclear fields.

(Mr. Le Kim Chung, Viet Nam)

57. His delegation wished to congratulate the Special Committee of 24 for the exemplary work it had accomplished; his delegation shared the concern expressed by the Special Committee in its decision concerning the situation prevailing in Namibia and other colonial Territories, particularly the Territories of the Caribbean and the Pacific. His delegation considered that it was essential to step up the mobilization of world public opinion against on the one hand the role played by foreign economic, financial and other interests in the exploitation of the natural and human resources, which hindered the independence of colonial Territories and the elimination of racism, particularly in southern Africa and, on the other hand, in support of the imposition of economic and other sanctions against the Pretoria régime.

58. Mr. ALAWI ABDUL HADI (Democratic Yemen) noted that, although more than 20 years had elapsed since the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, a number of Territories continued to be deprived of their right to self-determination and independence and had been victims of wars of genocide and extermination. In that connection mention had to be made of the odious crimes perpetrated by Israeli troops against the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon in violation of the Charter and of human rights.

59. In southern Africa the racist Pretoria régime continued to occupy Namibia in defiance of numerous United Nations resolutions. In many regions of the world, tension was rising because certain colonialist countries refused to grant the peoples under their domination their right to independence.

60. The problem of decolonization should not be considered from an abstract point of view; it was not sufficient merely to adopt resolutions deploring the behaviour of certain countries. There was a need to take account of reality and to study in depth the policies of the régimes which continued to usurp the resources of the colonial peoples and to deprive them of their legitimate rights. Colonialism, racism and zionism were identical in their approach to the exploitation, oppression and denial of the fundamental rights of mankind. The collaboration between Tel Aviv and Pretoria must be exposed particularly as it applied in the nuclear field, which posed a serious threat to international peace and security.

61. The fact that foreign interests continued to dominate the economy of Namibia and the other colonial Territories was a serious obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and blocked efforts by the international community to eliminate all forms of colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination.

62. Democratic Yemen had long struggled to achieve its independence and it firmly supported the national liberation struggles in Palestine, Namibia and the other colonial Territories. It considered it imperative to aid the people of those Territories to become independent politically, economically, socially and in other spheres, and to assist in enabling them to exercise their fundamental rights, as confirmed in the Charter and in United Nations resolutions.

63. Mr. BOUGUERRA (Algeria) said that the Committee's consideration of the question of the activities of foreign interests in the colonial Territories had always elicited the interest of the international community.

64. Even though, since the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples more than 20 years earlier, the advance of peoples towards freedom had to become irreversible, it still had to be recognized that colonial situations, even though on the wane, remained a reality in many regions of the world. Foreign interests in the colonial Territories were unquestionably continuing to impede the liberation of people and to stand in the way of their aspirations to independence.

65. The attempt to perpetuate colonial and racial domination through the activities of those interests was evidenced primarily in southern Africa, and more specifically in Namibia. Not content with reinforcing its apartheid policy in South Africa itself, the Pretoria régime continued to occupy Namibia illegally, in violation of all the relevant resolutions adopted by the international community, and it was intensifying its acts of aggression against neighbouring States.

66. South Africa was being encouraged in its defiant stand by the manifold assistance it was receiving from various Western countries and some specialized agencies. For it was thanks to their aid that it had been able to extend its deplorable system of apartheid to Namibia, and with their collaboration it had engaged in further pillage of the natural and human resources of the Territory.

67. The social and economic infrastructure set up by foreign interests in Namibia, far from satisfying the legitimate aspirations of the population, was devised solely to allow those interests to reap maximum profits. That situation, a matter of concern for the economic future of the Namibian people, must be opposed by every means available. The international community must do its utmost to ensure the strict application of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, and it must give increased assistance to the just struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO. It should, further, impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions on the racist South African régime in order to force it to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia, its despicable policy of apartheid and its repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring African States. Lastly, the United Nations must firmly oppose the assistance furnished to the Pretoria régime by certain Western countries and specialized agencies. In that connection, the request for a \$1.1 billion loan which South Africa had made to the International Monetary Fund was yet another cause for concern. To grant such a loan would be an insult to colonial peoples and to mankind as a whole.

68. The activities of foreign interests were impeding the right of peoples to self-determination and independence in other regions of the world as well, especially in islands in the Pacific and Indian oceans. Regardless of the natural resources they were exploiting in the colonial Territories - uranium in Namibia, phosphates or marine resources in the case of Western Sahara, for instance - foreign interests had never given a thought to the interests of the people of those

(Mr. Bouguerra, Algeria)

Territories. Their presence there, in addition to being a violation of the permanent sovereignty of colonial peoples over their national wealth, constituted a major impediment to the attainment of their legitimate aspirations to freedom and independence.

69. Mr. CHIN Yung-tsien (China), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, rejected the slanderous and mendacious attacks made by the delegation of Viet Nam against his country. He recalled that China had always supported the liberation struggle of the people of South Africa and Namibia and had refused to establish relations with the racist Pretoria régime.

70. Mr. HADDAOUI (Morocco), speaking in exercise of the right of reply and referring to the attacks upon his country made by the Algerian delegation, said that, since he did not wish to repeat himself, he would refer Algeria to the explanations he had given at a previous Committee meeting when another delegation had mentioned the question of the exploitation of phosphates in Western Sahara. Algeria was better informed than anyone on the situation in the region and knew perfectly well that the territory was not under colonial domination. The Organization of African Unity (OAU) had, in any case, recognized the rights of Morocco over Western Sahara.

71. Mr. LE KIN CHUNG (Viet Nam), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, categorically rejected the gratuitous accusations made by the Chinese delegation against his country. The information he himself had provided had been published in the press; he had invented nothing.

72. Mr. BOUGUERRA (Algeria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, recalled that OAU had recognized that Western Sahara was still a colonial problem and that the Territory continued to be under foreign domination. It was a well known fact that Morocco had signed agreements with other countries on the exploitation of the resources of Western Sahara, in particular the Madrid Agreement of November 1975 on the exploitation of phosphates.

73. Mr. HADDAOUI (Morocco), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, pointed out that the Madrid Agreement mentioned by the Algerian delegation had no bearing on the question before the Committee.

#### REQUEST FOR A HEARING

74. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a communication regarding a request for a hearing related to item 97. In accordance with the usual practice, he suggested that it should be distributed as a document of the Committee and taken up at a later meeting.

75. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.