United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION
Official Records*



FOURTH COMMITTEE
6th meeting
held on
Monday, 8 October 1979
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 6th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOYA (Benin)

CONTENTS

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

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 (continued)

Distr. GENERAL A/C.4/34/SR.6 18 October 1979 ENGLISH ORIGINAL: FRENCH

^{*} This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent within one week of the date of publication to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3558.

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (A/C.4/34/3/Add.1-3)

- 1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received three requests for hearings on the question of East Timor (A/C.4/34/3/Add.1-3), and also a letter from the Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations (A/C.4/34/5/Add.1).
- 2. Mr. JUWANA (Indonesia) said that he was strongly opposed to granting the requests made by Mr. Carlos Alfonso Henriques, Mr. José Ramos-Horta and Ms. Elizabeth Traube for hearings before the Committee on the question of East Timor; no purpose could be served by such hearings.
- 3. The CHAIRMAN requested that the opinion expressed by the Indonesian delegation should be clearly reflected in the summary record of the meeting and suggested that the Committee should grant the three requests for hearings made respectively by Mr. Carlos Alfonso Henriques, Secretary of the Movimento Nacional para a Libertação e Independencia de Timor Dili (A/C.4/34/3/Add.1), Ms. Elizabeth Traube, assistant professor of anthropology at Wesleyan University (A/C.4/34/3/Add.2), and Mr. José Ramos-Horta, member of the central committee of FRETILIN (A/C.4/34/3/Add.3).

4. It was so decided.

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 (continued) /A/34/23 (Part III)/

- 5. Mr. YUMJAV (Mongolia) said that, although the decolonization process had entered its final phase, millions of people throughout the world were still suffering under the yoke of colonialism and racism.
- 6. Southern Africa was the most dangerous area because it was in that region that the Western Powers were attempting to safeguard their positions and protect their economic, political and strategic interests at all costs by resorting to various manoeuvres designed to perpetuate the colonialist and racist system.
- 7. As the non-aligned countries had rightly pointed out in the Final Declaration which they had adopted at the recent Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at Havana, the racist régimes could not survive for long if the imperialist Powers did not give them every kind of assistance and support. The imperialist countries were pursuing a policy aimed at suppressing the national liberation movements and creating a common base from which to safeguard and extend their economic, political and strategic interests in the colonial Territories,

(Mr. Yumjav, Mongolia)

thereby seriously impeding the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. In defiance of the decisions of the United Nations General Assembly, the Western Powers were encouraging their monopolies to plunder the resources of the colonial Territories; there was clear proof of that in the report of the Special Committee of $24 \ /A/34/23$ (Part III). Those monopolies, in collusion with the racist régimes of southern Africa, continued to control the economy of Namibia and Southern Rhodesia, exploiting their vast natural resources and cheap labour.

- 8. South Africa, which played a decisive role in all sectors of the Namibian economy, was encouraging large private companies to set up business under its control in agriculture, the mining industry and fisheries, as well as in the business and financial sectors. South Africans controlled about 40 per cent of the share capital of the mining companies and almost all of the capital in the fisheries sector. According to information supplied by the Commission on Transnational Corporations in its most recent report, during the period 1972-1978 the number of foreign companies operating in South Africa had increased by 260 to 1,883. Similarly, there had been a considerable increase over the same period in the value of loans granted to South Africa, mostly by banks in the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France and Switzerland; the current total was \$5.5 billion.
- 9. In Namibia, the economic circles of South Africa and other foreign countries continued to pillage the natural resources of the Territory, and the considerable profits which they derived from their operations, representing almost half of Namibia's gross domestic product, were repatriated instead of being reinvested locally.
- 10. In Southern Rhodesia, foreign economic and other interests continued to control the Territory's economy, in defiance of the sanctions imposed by the United Nations Security Council. As a result of the shameless exploitation of the African population by the illegal régime and by foreign economic circles, the standard of living of the indigenous population had continued to decline to such a point that the majority of Africans in Southern Rhodesia were living below the poverty line.
- ll. For some time Western economic circles active in Southern Rhodesia had been concerned about the nature of any political settlement of the Southern Rhodesian problem. International recognition of the puppet régime of Bishop Muzorewa was very much in their interest; they were therefore doing everything in their power to achieve that end and to ensure that the sanctions imposed by the Security Council against the racist régime of Southern Rhodesia were lifted.
- 12. In the report it had submitted to the Fourth Committee for consideration, the Special Committee of 24 had also stated that foreign economic and other interests, primarily the monopolies of the principal NATO members, were continuing to play a leading role in the economies of the small Pacific and Caribbean Territories, thereby impeding their decolonization. The colonial Powers were using the small Territories for military and strategic purposes and, in some cases, were even trying to annex them.

(Mr. Yumjav, Mongolia)

- 13. The United Nations should take further measures as a matter of urgency to stop those abuses. The General Assembly should once again categorically condemn the evil activities of foreign economic and other interests which were exploiting the natural and human resources of the colonial Territories and should insist that the Western Powers should implement the relevant United Nations resolutions to the letter. In that connexion, his delegation associated itself with the African and non-aligned countries which were calling for the extension of sanctions to South Africa. It therefore attached great importance to the international conference which was to be held in 1980 under the joint auspices of OAU and the United Nations to mobilize world public opinion and ensure effective implementation of economic and other sanctions against South Africa. That meeting had received the support of the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held recently at Havana.
- 14. Mr. ZAGAJAC (Yugoslavia) observed that the item before the Committee had recently been on the agenda of the Special Committee of 24 and had also been considered in other international forums, especially at meetings and conferences of the non-aligned countries. The international community seemed at last to have understood the great urgency of condemning the activities of those foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The root of the problem lay in the propensity of certain Western countries to reap huge profits without effort. Those countries naturally had an interest in the perpetuation of systems based on exploitation and therefore became the faithful allies of the racist régimes. When it was borne in mind that Namibia ranked fourth in the world as an exporter of minerals, producing 16 per cent of the world's diamonds, 3 per cent of its uranium, and 1 per cent of its cadmium, lead, zinc and copper, and that approximately the same percentages applied to its share of world reserves of those minerals, it was easy to understand the great interest of the transnational corporations of certain developed Western countries in maintaining the status quo in that Territory. That was also the cause of the delay in finding a political solution in Namibia.
- 15. The adoption in Southern Rhodesia of the racist law known as the Emergency Powers Regulations (1969), which prohibited giving away economic secrets in other words, the publication of any kind of information on production, external trade and participation of foreign capital illustrated the role played by such capital in southern Africa. By such concealment, the racist authorities were able to present a distorted picture of economic and business conditions in order to attract as much foreign capital as possible. Once established, foreign interests were tied to the existing régime and helped to keep it in power. According to the information published in the report of the Special Committee of 24, the efforts of the racist authorities to attract foreign capital were often successful. In 1978

(Mr. Zagajac, Yugoslavia)

Southern Rhodesia had managed to obtain two foreign loans in the amount of \$165 million. The Western countries did not realize that by granting loans to racist régimes they were actually cutting off the branch on which they were sitting, for it was quite certain that their present co-operation with those régimes would make it impossible to build bridges for co-operation with the future independent States. What was more, those future independent States might rightly question the failure of those countries to put an end to the exploitation of their natural resources in compliance with the decisions of the General Assembly and might demand the payment of compensation for economic exploitation during the period of occupation by the racist régimes.

- 16. His country had repeatedly set forth its position regarding the activities of foreign economic and other interests in Territories under colonial rule, a position based on the decisions of ministerial meetings and summit conferences of non-aligned countries. He referred, in that connexion, to the documents adopted by the ministerial meetings held at Maputo and Colombo and by the Conference of Heads of State or Government held at Havana from 3 to 8 September 1979. Yugoslavia's position was also based on the decisions of the General Assembly, especially the resolution adopted on 3 May 1978 at the Ninth Special Session on the question of Namibia. That resolution strongly condemned South Africa for its continued exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia in complete disregard of the legitimate interests of the Namibian people.
- 17. In accordance with the principles of the non-aligned movement and the decisions of United Nations bodies on the question of decolonization, his country endorsed the demand put forward by the Special Committee of 24 at its meeting at Belgrade on 27 April 1979 to those States whose transnational corporations continued to operate in Namibia. On that occasion the Special Committee had urged those countries to comply with all the pertinent resolutions of the United Nations by immediately withdrawing all investments from Namibia and generally putting an end to their co-operation with the South African administration. His delegation believed that the General Assembly at its current session should condemn the continuing support that the racist régimes in southern Africa were receiving from foreign economic, financial and other interests. The Assembly should also condemn the violation of the political, economic and social rights of the inhabitants of Territories under colonial rule. Lastly, the Assembly should condemn South Africa, which was contravening the decisions of the United Nations by engaging more than ever, together with Southern Rhodesia, in the exploitation and plundering of natural resources that did not belong to it. The General Assembly should once more call upon all States to adopt legislative, administrative and other measures aimed at putting an end to activities detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants of those Territories. It should once again call upon all countries to safeguard the permanent sovereignty of colonial Territories over their natural resources. It should also urge the administering Powers to abolish all discriminatory and unjust wage systems in the Territories under their administration. His country would

(Mr. Zagajac, Yugoslavia)

continue to exert its efforts for the implementation of United Nations decisions and to lend full support to the liberation movements and the front-line States in their struggle against the racist régimes, with the aim of preventing further exploitation of the human and natural resources of Territories which were still under colonial administration.

- 18. Mr. PENAZKA (Czechoslovakia) observed that one of the principal causes of the persistence of colonialism and racism lay in the activities of foreign economic and other interests which exploited the indigenous population in the colonial Territories, plundered their natural resources and extracted huge profits. Those activities constituted one of the major obstacles to the effective implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; they violated the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and contravened the relevant United Nations resolutions.
- 19. In their concern to protect their economic, political and strategic interests, imperialist circles were desperately seeking to retard the decolonization process and to keep the world's colonialist and racist systems, principally those of southern Africa, in power for as long as possible.
- 20. The activities of the imperialist monopolies were of direct help in propping up the minority régime of Southern Rhodesia, and in perpetuating South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and the fascist apartheid régime in South Africa itself. That country formed the principal bastion for the activities of Western monopolies harmful to the interests of the peoples of southern Africa. The Commission on Transnational Corporations, in its report of March 1979, had stated that the number of companies operating in South Africa was continuing to increase and currently stood at 1,883. In 1977, the total volume of foreign investments in the economy of racist South Africa had reached some 21 billion rand. The interests of the Western monopolies in that country were mainly concentrated in the mining and processing industries. The value of loans granted to South Africa by the Western countries was growing, having reached a total of almost \$5.5 billion over the past seven years.
- 21. The situation in Namibia was virtually identical; the Western monopolies were allied with the Pretoria régime against the interests of the African population. It was mainly that country's mineral resources (uranium, diamonds, zinc, copper, cadmium, etc.) which attracted the foreign monopolies. As the Special Committee of $2\frac{1}{4}$ had stated in its report, those monopolies were repatriating the profits they extracted from Namibia instead of reinvesting them there. As a result, the indigenous population remained in a state of dire poverty.
- 22. Despite the sanctions imposed by the Security Council, foreign companies and capital continued to play a decisive role in the Southern Rhodesian economy. While flagrantly violating those sanctions, the Western monopolies were engaging in an increasingly active campaign for lifting of the mandatory sanctions against the

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

minority régime. It was obvious that it was the considerable natural resources of the Territories of southern Africa, together with the opportunity to pillage and exploit them at will, which motivated the support given by certain Western countries and monopolies to the illegal régimes in that area in order to impede the freedom and accession to independence of the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa.

- 23. The continued collaboration of the Western monopolies with the <u>apartheid</u> régime in the nuclear and military fields posed a particularly serious threat to the peoples of southern Africa and to the security of the region. The Western Powers were thereby helping to bolster the fascist régime of South Africa and the illegal minority régime in Southern Rhodesia by giving them the means to repress the national liberation movements and to perpetrate acts of aggression against sovereign African States.
- 24. The activities of the Western countries' economic, financial and military circles also had detrimental effects on a number of small colonial Territories because they prevented the peoples of those Territories from exercising the inalienable right to self-determination and independence enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.
- 25. In all the decisions and resolutions it had adopted on the subject, the United Nations had categorically condemned the activities of foreign countries in the colonial Territories as an impediment to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and had called upon all the States concerned to take urgent measures to put an end to them. Nevertheless, in defiance of United Nations decisions, the colonial Powers and certain other Western countries continued to pillage and exploit the natural and human resources of the Non-Self-Governing Territories.
- 26. His delegation believed that the United Nations should take further action and demand that the imperialist circles should stop that pillage. It was equally imperative that all Member States should immediately halt all economic, financial, military or other assistance to the colonialist and racist régimes and should strictly implement the mandatory sanctions. In addition, the Security Council should again be called upon to widen the scope of the sanctions to include South Africa and to take urgent measures to prevent that country from acquiring nuclear weapons. By adopting such measures, the United Nations would fulfil, in part, its responsibilities in respect of decolonization and give effective and practical assistance to the peoples struggling for freedom and independence. His country, for its part, was ready to support any proposal which would help achieve that objective.
- 27. Mr. DZOGBEKLO (Togo) said that foreign interests were encouraging and helping to reinforce the policy of apartheid in South Africa. Their investments had given a considerable boost to the South African trade sector since 1960, as indicated by South Africa's GNP, which had risen from \$162 million in 1960 to \$439 million in 1970 and \$1 billion in 1977 an increase of approximately 250 per cent between 1970 and 1977. The consolidation of foreign investments was intended to guarantee

(Mr. Dzogbeklo, Togo)

Western countries a supply of strategic minerals: diamonds, uranium and gold from Namibia: chromium and other precious metals from Southern Rhodesia. South Africa had infiltrated the agricultural, industrial, trade and financial sectors of the Namibian economy. That infiltration helped to maintain the political and social status quo based primarily on racial discrimination, was naturally detrimental to the indigenous population and was in defiance of United Nations resolutions. The huge profits reaped by South Africa every year proved that the country's real income was increasing considerably without any commensurate improvement in the living standards of the black population.

- 28. His delegation condemned the exploitation of Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and South Africa by racist minorities supported by the selfish interests of some Western countries. It endorsed the conclusions of the report of the Special Committee and urged the international community to take the necessary action to combat activities hampering the process of decolonization.
- 29. Mr. LE ANH KIET (Viet Nam) said that although the item before the Committee had been under consideration for years and many resolutions relating to it had been adopted by overwhelming majority votes, the situation in the colonial countries and Territories, particularly in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and South Africa, had been going from bad to worse. The report of the Special Committee (A/3! /23 (Part III)) pointed out that the economy of Southern Rhodesia was sill dominated by foreign economic and other interests, which acted in co-operation with and were supported by the illegal régime, and that South Africa and other foreign interests had for years controlled the commercial sectors of the Namibian economy.
- His delegation believed that three main factors accounted for that situation: first, Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and other Territories under colonial domination had potential economic resources, were consumer markets and were a source of cheap labour. The imperialist and colonialist Powers were clinging to those areas in order to continue exploiting their natural resources, buying raw materials at low prices and then selling manufactured goods at very high prices. why the transnational corporations and foreign companies had been increasing their investments in those areas. Secondly, South Africa was an important strategic area, which the imperialist and neo-colonialist States could use as a spring-board in opposing not only the indigenous peoples, but also the peoples of other countries. Finally, there was the collusion between the imperialists and the racist and apartheid régimes: the imperialists wanted to keep the latter in power in order to continue their exploitation of natural resources and manpower, while the racist régimes were relying on the imperialists in maintaining their ruling position and opposing the popular struggle for true national independence. In addition to those basic reasons, there was the collusion between the imperialists and the international reactionaries, who, while paying lip-service to the right to self-determination and the observance of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations and categorically declaring their opposition to apartheid, were plotting to prevent those countries from becoming independent.

(Mr. Le Anh Kiet, Viet Nam)

- 31. It was clear that in Namibia and in Southern Rhodesia the activities of the imperialist monopolies had impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.
- 32. The situation in the Territories of the Pacific, the Indian Ocean and the Caribbean had shown no improvement. Those Territories were still being used by the administering Powers as military bases, for strategic military purposes or as testing sites for sophisticated weapons. Attempts were also being made to divide them, as in the case of Micronesia.
- 33. In view of that situation, his delegation felt that the General Assembly should adopt at the current session resolutions expressing the strong support of the international community for the peoples in countries and Territories under colonial domination and vigorously condemning the activities of the economic, military and other interests of the imperialist and colonialist countries, which were impeding the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). His delegation agreed with those delegations which had spoken of the need to denounce by name and demand sanctions against the accomplices of the racist régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia.
- 34. The stand of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam with regard to that question was well known. His delegation reaffirmed the full and resolute support of the people and Government of Viet Nam for the patriotic struggle of the people of Zimbabwe under the leadership of the Patriotic Front, the just struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO and the struggle for self-determination and national independence of the people of South Africa under the leadership of ANC against the racist régimes of southern Africa. His delegation would support any draft resolution which correctly reflected the situation concerning the activities of all foreign economic and other interests in southern Africa and in other Territories under colonial domination.
- 35. Mr. MUSHKETIK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that 20 years had elapsed since the General Assembly had adopted, at the initiative of the USSR, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Ten years later, the USSR had launched the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration. Although very important results had since been achieved, the process of emancipation for those peoples was still far from completion. Several countries in southern Africa and small Territories in the Pacific and the Caribbean were still under the colonial yoke. The international community was particularly disquieted by the situation in southern Africa, where the racist régimes were hampering the peaceful development and social progress of the peoples of the region. As several delegations had noted, those régimes would long since have been overthrown had they not been receiving economic, political and military assistance from the Western Powers, particularly the members of NATO, and from their imperialist monopolies.
- 36. The documents before the Committee gave a complete picture of the involvement of those monopolies in the exploitation of the countries of southern Africa. In the 1970s foreign investments had accounted for over 50 per cent of total

(Mr. Mushketik, Ukrainian SSR)

investments in Namibia; the number of concessions granted to Western countries was steadily rising, almost tripling during the 1970s. In Namibia, some 100 monopolies, 35 of South African origin, controlled the economy. Consolidated Mines of South West Africa, Ltd. had a virtual monopoly on rough diamonds. The United States, the United Kingdom and South Africa controlled 90 per cent of all investment in the mining industry of Namibia. Almost 80 per cent of the profits were exported.

- 37. The situation was similar in Zimbabwe, although the investments there were carefully kept secret. Nevertheless, almost 90 per cent of the capital invested in the mining industry was known to come from the United Kingdom, the United States and South Africa. Union Carbide and the Anglo-American Corporation were periodically engaged in operations that could be described as brigandage.
- 38. It was not surprising that the Western countries should regularly try to have the sanctions adopted by the United Nations in 1966 lifted. Sanctions were interfering with the activities of their monopolies. Such activities continued to prosper, however, especially in the mining and trade sectors, where there were some 500 American companies, 600 British companies and 100 other companies from Western countries. In all, there were approximately 2,000 foreign companies in South Africa, including some industrial giants such as Mobil, Shell, British Petroleum, General Motors, Chrysler Corporation and Volkswagen. The General Electric Company represented several investors and the Rothschild Group was particularly active under the name of Rio Tinto Zinc.
- 39. It was quite clear that the activities of transnational corporations in Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa were based on shameless exploitation of the Africans. They were paid less than white workers, and generally speaking not even the minimum wage. The wages paid by Shell and BP to black workers were only one-fifth of those paid to whites. In Rhodesia, the wages paid by Union Carbide to black workers were only one-sixth of those received by white workers.
- 40. The military support given by the Western Powers to the racist régimes was cause for serious anxiety. There was hardly any weapon that was not produced in South Africa, with the assistance, the capital, and the technology of the Western countries. Its suppliers included American, British and other companies, for example, Lockheed in the case of aircraft. The production of rockets and air-to-air missiles had been made possible by the assistance of such foreign monopolies as BMW, Bosch and Siemens. As reported in document A/AC.109/L.1318, South Africa also benefited from the technical assistance of Israel in the construction of spacecraft. Lastly, it could be said that every bullet fired at the resistance fighters of SWAPO or the Front-Line States bore the name of a major Western corporation. Collaboration between the transnationals and South Africa in nuclear weapons was also extremely disquieting.
- 41. As was well known, South Africa had refused to sign the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Western countries bore a heavy responsibility in that respect, in so far as they were helping the racist régimes to equip themselves with nuclear arsenals that threatened the world and, more immediately, the African continent. The companies involved in that kind of activity were listed in the report he had mentioned.

(Mr. Mushketik, Ukrainian SSR)

- The fifth session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations and the second regular session of the Economic and Social Council had categorically condemned such co-operation between the transnationals and South Africa, and had demanded that those companies should respect the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. On 8 August 1979, at its 1154th meeting, the Committee of 24 had adopted a resolution condemning the exploitation of the natural and human resources of the countries of southern Africa at the expense of the indigenous population, stressing that the activities of the transnational corporations were one of the main obstacles to their attainment of independence. That resolution was still being ignored. In the meantime, voices were being raised to defend the activities of the foreign monopolies, on the pretext that they helped to improve the social and economic situation of the indigenous peoples. The purpose of such statements was clear: it was to cut the ground from under the feet of the anti-colonialist movements of the peoples fighting for their independence in southern Africa and elsewhere. It was clear that the activities of the foreign monopolies were an obstacle to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The Ukrainian delegation was convinced that the examination of the activities of transnational corporations should continue to be a matter of high priority.
- 43. The time had come to apply sanctions against South Africa, under Chapter VII of the Charter, and the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia must be maintained. Everything possible must be done to bring the activities of the transnational corporations to an end. Each year, millions of people joined the fight against racism. The position of the Ukrainian SSR was clear: it stood resolutely on the side of the forces striving for the social progress and independence of peoples under the colonial yoke.
- 44. Mr. GRAHAM (United States of America), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, noted that the representatives of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukraine and Viet Nam had all in their statements represented transnational corporations and foreign interests as rapacious plunderers, amoral and unscrupulous, moved solely by a desire to keep whole peoples in slavery. It was questionable, however, whether they were as harmful as they were made out to be, since many countries - including the United States - allowed foreign corporations and interests to operate in their territories. The answer was that it was in the national interest to allow them to carry out their activities, but subject to control. That point of view, moreover, was not that of the Western countries only. In an article in the April 1979 edition of World Paper, Mr. Silviu Bruncan, journalist and former ambassador of an East European country to the United Nations, noted that by the middle of the 1970s more than 200 American companies had entered into industrial co-operation agreements with organizations in the East European countries, and that three out of four of those corporations were The growing ties between transnational corporations and the East multinational. European countries were, in his view, the outcome of a historical situation which meant that, although the Revolution had started in the under-developed countries, capitalism, the system of the Western countries, continued to hold a dominant position in the economic and technical field. In the circumstances, the East European countries had grasped the necessity of putting development first and building socialism afterwards.

(Mr. Graham, United States)

- 45. Those comments were not intended to open an ideological debate but simply to serve as a reminder that each case must be judged separately, on its own merits. The activities of foreign economic interests could make a positive contribution, particularly in regard to transfer of technology, balance of payments, development and training. They could also have harmful consequences, particularly in Non-Self-Governing Territories, if they were not controlled. However, the international community had means to remedy that state of affairs. For example, it could take action within the framework of the negotiations on the preparation of a code of conduct for transnational corporations. The Fourth Committee could also adopt more effective and more appropriate methods.
- 46. The representatives of Czechoslovakia and the Ukraine had dwelt at length on the question of principles, particularly in regard to trade with South Africa. In that connexion, he noted that the International Monetary Fund's Direction of Trade Yearbook, 1979, indicated that the value of South African exports to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland, predominantly minerals and base metals, had risen to \$12 million in 1978. South African imports from Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Soviet Union, mainly chemical products, machines and textiles, had also totalled \$12 million in 1978. That was not a large figure when compared with total South African trade. In that connexion, however, the United States delegation shared the view of the Syrian representative, who had said in the Committee on 4 October that it was the principle that counted and not the precise amount.
- 47. Mr. ERAN (Israel), exercising his right of reply to the charges made about military ties between his country and South Africa by the Ukrainian representative, drew the Committee's attention to the note verbale of 14 September 1979, distributed as document S/AC.20/17, in which the Government of Israel stated that it had called on industry to take measures to terminate licences granted in the past for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition, and that it would not approve any application for the renewal or extension of such licences.
- 48. Mr. PENAZKA (Czechoslovakia), exercising his right of reply, said that the representative of the United States was making the same baseless accusations against his country as in the previous year. He recalled that the People's Republic of Czechoslovakia, at the very start of the 1960s, had broken off all relations with South Africa and maintained no commercial, economic, diplomatic or other ties with that country. That was a fact known to all and he wondered whether, in making such a statement, the United States representative was not trying to distract attention from those countries and interests which were pursuing, in South Africa and other territories, a policy preventing those countries from fighting for freedom and independence.
- 49. The United States representative had said very little about the consequences of his own country's policy in southern Africa. The facts, however, as they emerged from the work of the Committee of 24, the Special Committee against Apartheid, and many other United Nations bodies, all went to prove that those consequences were dire for the local population, as the whole international community was well aware.

- 50. Mr. MUSHKETIK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), exercising his right of reply, said that all the facts relating to collaboration between Israel and South Africa in the military sphere were to be found in document A/109/L.1318.
- 51. Mr. GRAHAM (United States of America), exercising his right of reply, said that his intervention had not been intended to provoke a discussion on the accuracy of a particular figure. Having been criticized at the previous session for using figures taken from the South Africa Digest, on the present occasion he had quoted figures appearing in an International Monetary Fund document, which everyone could trust.
- 52. He quite understood the arguments against activities by foreign economic interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories. He recognized that some of those interests could be harmful, but he had wished to refute possible exaggerations in the remarks of some representatives. The Committee must examine those foreign interests as objectively as possible, in the light of the information provided by the Committee of 24 and other United Nations bodies, as well as that emanating from outside sources. The United States delegation hoped that the draft resolution would encourage constructive action to remedy the harmful consequences that foreign interests might have, and that representatives would be able to refrain from generalizations which might lead to an impasse.
- 53. Mr. SCHROTER (German Democratic Republic) reserved the right to exercise his right of reply at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.