

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION

*Official Records **



FOURTH COMMITTEE
10th meeting
held on
Thursday, 11 October 1979
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 10th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOYA (Benin)

CONTENTS

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

AGENDA ITEM 92: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA AND NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

* 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-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/34/SR.10
20 October 1979
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a further request for a hearing concerning East Timor.
2. Mr. CARRASCALAO (Indonesia) said that the people of East Timor had already exercised their right of self-determination, and the Territory of East Timor was now part of Indonesia. Any hearing concerning the Territory would therefore constitute interference in the internal affairs of Indonesia.
3. The CHAIRMAN said that the statement of the representative of Indonesia would be reflected in the summary record of the meeting. He suggested that, in accordance with the customary practice, the communication should be circulated as a Committee document (A/C.4/34/3/Add.4) and that it should be considered at a later meeting.
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: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/34/23 (Part III))

5. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, at the preceding meeting, a number of delegations had asked to exercise their right of reply.
6. Mr. GRAHAM (United States of America) said that he wished to address several points raised by the Soviet delegation at the preceding meeting. First, regarding Southern Rhodesia, while his delegation would not comment in detail on the political situation in that country, it categorically rejected the assertion that current peace efforts, in which the United States had played a part, were only smoke-screens for installing puppet governments.
7. The Soviet delegation had also stated that foreign companies, including United States companies, continued to dominate the economy of Southern Rhodesia. The United States had fully supported economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia at the time when they had been adopted, and it continued to support them. His delegation challenged the Soviet representative to produce evidence that companies in Southern Rhodesia had remitted a single dollar of profit back to the United States or were being directed from the United States.
8. Second, it strained logic to claim, as the Soviet delegation had done, that the operations of transnational corporations could produce beneficial results in

/...

(Mr. Graham, United States)

independent countries but not in Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Committee and other agencies in the United Nations system ought to be concerned, not with blanket condemnation of those companies, but with working for controls and safeguards to prevent abuses.

9. In talking about the need for safeguards to protect the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories from foreign interests, the Soviet Union itself should not be exempted. According to the FAO Yearbook of Fishery Statistics, in 1977 the Soviet Union had taken over a million metric tons of fish off the coast of Namibia, mostly within the 200-mile limit. If Namibia were independent, it could be assumed that it would have an "exclusive economic zone" of economic benefit to Namibia. Such, however, was not the case; the Soviet Union had made no landings in Namibia and had paid no fees. While the Soviet Union indicated its dedication to principles of conservation, it was a fact that it had depleted the fisheries off the Namibian coast to the detriment of the people of Namibia.

10. Soviet fishing off the coast of Namibia could in fact be beneficial to the people of the Territory; the Soviet Union could pay fees, obtain licences, train Namibians. That was an example of how adequate safeguards could turn an apparently negative economic activity into one beneficial to the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

11. The Soviet representative had challenged the United States delegation to cite a single transnational corporation operating in the interests of the peoples of southern Africa. The formal statement of the United States would address that question in more detail; in the meantime, he would simply say that whether foreign interests were operating in the interests or against the interests of the peoples of southern Africa was an open question even among the black people directly concerned. If that was the case, it would be premature and presumptuous for the Committee to make a one-sided judgement.

12. He wished to stress that the statistics which he had quoted before the Committee on 8 October and which had been denied by the Soviet delegation were taken from the IMF Direction of Trade Yearbook for 1979.

13. With regard to Micronesia, the Charter of the United Nations was quite clear on the question which forum was appropriate for the discussion of that Territory; it was the Trusteeship Council, which in May and June 1979 had discussed the situation in the Territory, including its economic conditions. On the question of a proposed superport in Palau, the United States representative in the Trusteeship Council had made a statement (T/PV.1488) in response to a question from the Soviet delegation.

14. He welcomed the statement by the Soviet delegation that the policy of the Soviet Government was one of honest friendship with the struggling peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was therefore all the more important that Governments should try to seek common ground in assessing and if necessary calling for increased safeguards regarding foreign economic interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories, rather than engage in sterile ideological argumentation.

/...

(Mr. Graham, United States)

15. With respect to the statement made by another delegation, he pointed out that the question of Puerto Rico was not on the agenda of the Committee. However, the United States reaffirmed that it fully respected the right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination.

16. Mr. ERAN (Israel) said he wished to remind the Committee that an investigation into the alleged sale of helicopters to South Africa by Israel had shown that press reports of such sales were entirely without foundation.

17. Mr. HAYDAR (Syrian Arab Republic) said that he wished to reply, in his capacity as Rapporteur of the Committee of 24, to the remarks made by the Canadian delegation at the preceding meeting. One such remark had been that all Canada could do to discourage investments in South Africa was to withdraw its Trade Commissioners. He pointed out that the Swedish, Iranian and Nigerian Governments had taken much sterner action, and their example might well be followed by Canada.

18. The representative of Canada had complained that, in its decision on the subject, (A/34/23 (Part III), para. 13), the Special Committee of 24 had made a sweeping condemnation of certain Western countries and other States, without naming them. However, the wording of paragraphs 6 and 7 of the decision was clear enough in that respect.

19. The Canadian delegation had felt that the report of the Special Committee could have been better. The Special Committee would welcome any constructive and objective criticism which would enable it to improve its report.

20. Lastly, whatever the representative of Canada might say, economic collaboration, in the case of South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia, implied political support.

21. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, urged the United States representative, who was disputing facts cited in official United Nations documents, to read the report on the activities of transnational corporations in southern Africa (E/C.10/51) more carefully. He (Mr. Kharlamov) considered that report objective, and indeed too lenient towards transnational corporations in view of what was actually happening.

22. Whether transnational corporations were reprehensible was a purely theoretical question; the fact was that they existed. That was an objective phenomenon resulting from the evolution of the capitalist system. The point at issue was how the transnational corporations conducted their activities. The USSR had never contested, or even condemned, their presence; it had simply mentioned their shameless acts of plunder in Non-Self-Governing Territories. The representative of Venezuela had also said that the activities of transnational corporations in sovereign States of Latin America contributed very little to the economies of the host countries; thus, even sovereignty and independence were no protection against dangerous exploitation by transnational corporations.

/...

(Mr. Kharlamov, USSR)

23. With regard to Non-Self-Governing and colonial Territories, he would like to ask the United States representative whether he could give one example of a colonial Territory which, after becoming independent, had expressed any desire to allow transnational corporations to continue their activities in its territory.

24. As for the Soviet Union's fishing activities, neither the assertions made nor the figures given by the United States delegation regarding the amount of fish taken by the USSR off the Namibian coast were convincing. The USSR had not even taken the quota to which it was entitled under an international fisheries agreement to which it was a signatory.

25. Micronesia was a Territory which had not yet achieved sovereignty. In that regard, the United Nations Charter was explicit: the administering Power must pursue a policy designed to lead the Non-Self-Governing Territory towards self-determination and independence. The Committee of 24 had therefore considered that the question of Micronesia was within its competence. Furthermore, according to the American author of a book on Micronesia, independence could hardly be more than a dream for the Territory, because it was not a viable option; the best it could hope for was association with the United States. In other words, Micronesia would change from a colonial Territory to a dependent one.

26. Mr. RAHMTALLA (Sudan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Israel, in attempting to deceive the members of the Committee by saying that the statement made on the previous day by the Sudanese delegation was not relevant to the item under discussion had once more shown the bad faith of the Zionist entity. In his statement of the previous day, he (Mr. Rahamtalla) had stated a fact of which the Sudanese people had been informed in July 1978 by one of the two authentic leaders of the Zimbabwe Patriotic Front, Mr. Mugabe, who had said that guns manufactured in Israel had been in the hands of the white racist leaders of southern Africa, thus contributing to the massacre of African freedom fighters in the region.

27. Such collaboration between the racist régimes of Tel Aviv, Salisbury and Pretoria was certainly relevant to the item under discussion. In any event, it was not for the representative of the Zionist entity to make a judgement on that point.

28. Mr. BADI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that he wished to reply to the accusations made by the representative of France in the Committee. The representative of France seemed to have forgotten that European colonialism, including French colonialism, had created countless border problems, and he was trying to use those problems in a vain attempt to sow discord among brethren.

29. Mr. AL JOBOURI (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, noted that the Zionist entity denied facts that were known by the international community, such as the sending of pilots to Southern Rhodesia and the delivery of helicopters to South Africa. Israel similarly denied its persecution of the Palestinians, who were evicted from their territories, persecuted and imprisoned.

/...

30. Mr. BROCHENIN (France), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, in view of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya's foreign experience, it was not in a position to make false accusations against France.

31. Mr. SETLOBOKO (Lesotho) said that the activities of foreign monopolies in the Non-Self-Governing Territories of Namibia and Zimbabwe were directly responsible for the denial of the right to self-determination and independence to the peoples of those Territories. The intransigence of the Pretoria Government regarding the United Nations proposals for a peaceful settlement of the Namibia dispute and the heightened exploitation of the resources of that Territory by capitalist corporations were proof of the collusion between the apartheid régime and foreign economic interests in Namibia. It was difficult to believe that transnational corporations had established an illegal presence in Namibia for the purpose of making profits without the support and encouragement of their countries of origin.

32. Whenever profit prevailed over principle, the result was brutal exploitation of peoples under alien domination. There was no denying the relationship between the enslavement and exploitation of the blacks and the wealth of the whites in southern Africa; it was the only part of the world where capitalism, colonialism and apartheid had conspired to create a situation in which people of a certain colour were denied the freedom and dignity to which they were entitled.

33. Southern Rhodesia represented an even more glaring example of international irresponsibility. The mandatory sanctions imposed by the United Nations against Southern Rhodesia had been systematically violated by foreign economic interests using South Africa as a pipeline for financial and other forms of aid to the Smith régime. In those circumstances, the people of Zimbabwe could not be blamed for taking up arms against a colonial régime which had managed to remain in power despite all the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions condemning it. Even now, when the liberation war in Zimbabwe had become irreversible, there were still some interests which hoped to subvert the legitimate aspirations of the people of that country. The real enemies of the peoples of southern Africa were those who took advantage of their temporary enslavement in order to make large profits at their expense and who provided arms to their oppressors.

34. His delegation believed that a resolution which directly addressed itself to that problem could be adopted by the Committee during the current session of the General Assembly, if the States that had always voted against resolutions on the issue in order to protect their own interests would only show a spirit of co-operation and compromise.

35. Mr. FURGUSON (Guyana) said that his delegation had read with a sense of frustration the report of the Special Committee (A/34/23 (Part III)), which clearly showed the role played by certain Western economic interests in keeping the illegal minority régimes in power in southern Africa. There was no doubt that systems of race dominance and oppression were integrally related to systems of economic exploitation. That was why his delegation firmly believed that the economic isolation of the minority régimes in southern Africa was fundamental to their dismantling.

(Mr. Furguson, Guyana)

36. Unfortunately, despite the efforts of most countries to that end, a few major Western Powers, which in international forums hypocritically condemned the system of apartheid and racial domination, persisted in their economic collaboration with the racist régimes. Although economic collaboration or foreign investment might in some cases have positive effects, it could not be justified in the case of southern Africa, because it only served to buttress the white minority régimes in their brutal exploitation of the indigenous peoples, thus contributing to the denial of the exercise by those peoples of their inalienable rights to self-determination and to the enjoyment of their own natural resources.

37. Guyana's position on co-operation with the racist régimes in southern Africa was clear. It had always supported the General Assembly resolutions on the application of the sanctions against South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, and would continue to support the strengthening and extension of those sanctions. Guyana urged all members of the international community to condemn South Africa's decision to annex the port of Walvis Bay and the territory surrounding it in order to perpetuate its hold on Namibia's resources. Guyana also reaffirmed its unconditional support for the oppressed peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia in their heroic struggle, under the leadership of the Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe and SWAPO, to put an end to the exploitation they had suffered for so many years. Guyana once more condemned the apartheid system in South Africa, which was a flagrant affront to the conscience of mankind, and the contemptible policy of the régimes in southern Africa, thus endorsing the position taken by the Non-Aligned Movement at its recent meeting in Havana.

38. In conclusion, she said that her delegation joined other delegations in appealing to the Western Powers that were still co-operating with the racist régimes in power to end that co-operation immediately. Only the economic isolation of those régimes could hasten the victory of the freedom fighters in southern Africa and enable the peoples of Namibia and Southern Rhodesia to exercise their rights at last.

39. Mr. SANGSOMSAK (Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that despite substantial progress in decolonization, many obstacles were still blocking the international community's efforts to realize one of the main purposes of the Charter, which was to liberate all peoples and territories under colonial domination. Very few countries had taken legislative and administrative measures to impose sanctions on those responsible for activities which hindered the application of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Some Western capitalist countries and their racist allies had been responsible for the shocking economic exploitation of colonial territories before they achieved independence. They trampled underfoot not only the right of colonial peoples to self-determination and independence, but also their right to full control over their natural resources.

40. The exploitative activities of the imperialist monopolies were largely concentrated in southern Africa, as indicated in the report of the Special Committee, not only because it had abundant natural resources, but above all because the capitalist societies enjoyed the complicity of the racist régime of

/...

(Mr. Sangsomsak, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

South Africa and the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia. Exploitation of African labour in the manufacturing and mining sectors, in Southern Rhodesia enabled them to reap high profits, while most Africans lived below the poverty line. What was even more serious was that the illegal régime, acting in collusion with the settlers in the Territory, were now proposing to invest some 827 million Rhodesian dollars in the agricultural sector. The monopolizing of agriculture by the illegal régime and foreign interests would inevitably deprive the people of Zimbabwe of their only means of subsistence, and encourage them to intensify their struggle to free themselves from colonial exploitation and oppression.

41. The situation in Namibia was even more tragic. The racist régime of South Africa, with the complicity of foreign investors, was monopolizing all the economic sectors, particularly the mining sector. In the matter of financing, Africans could not obtain the loans granted by the financial institutions operating in Namibia because their incomes were too low to guarantee their credit reliability, and they were therefore excluded from the commercial sector. The agricultural sector was also in the hands of the white minority. Thus, the Africans strictly represented a pool of cheap labour and had absolutely no share in the profits of foreign companies, which were repatriated in the form of dividends to shareholders residing in South Africa and in the capitalist countries.

42. All those activities clearly showed that the racist régime in South Africa, the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and foreign economic interests had no intention of discontinuing their exploitation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Furthermore, the capitalist countries that depended on South Africa and Namibia for their supply of raw materials had for years resorted to all sorts of delaying tactics and were supporting the racist régimes in order to promote their own economic interests.

43. Her delegation considered that the situation in Southern Rhodesia and in Namibia had lasted far too long, and if it was to be ended, there must be a halt to all the activities of foreign interests, economic and other, in those territories; all the sanctions imposed against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia must be strictly applied, and the sanctions against South Africa must be strengthened in order to prevent nuclear co-operation between South Africa and certain Western countries, which was a real threat to international peace and security both in the region and in the world. Her delegation was ready to support all efforts to attain those objectives, so that the oppressed and exploited peoples could win their freedom and independence.

44. Mr. DAWADI (Nepal) said that there was no denying that, as many other delegations had pointed out, many foreign monopolies were unfairly exploiting the natural and human resources of the colonial territories in southern Africa, and thus obstructing the legitimate aspirations of the colonial peoples to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

(Mr. Dawadi, Nepal)

45. In Zimbabwe those foreign interests were helping the illegal minority régime to maintain itself in power. In exchange, that régime allowed them to make huge profits, to the detriment of the indigenous population, which served as a pool of cheap labour. In Namibia the apartheid régime of South Africa, in co-operation with foreign companies, was exploiting the country's rich mineral resources, which actually belonged to the people, and was using all kinds of manoeuvres to maintain its racist domination over Namibia. His delegation rejected the argument that the activities of foreign economic interests benefited the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia. Everything indicated that the opposite was true: the repatriation of almost all the profits, the wide disparity between the wages of Blacks and Whites, and all the forms of discrimination to which the Africans were subject showed that those economic activities were preventing the peoples of those Territories from exercising their rights.

46. Nepal had consistently condemned the racist minority régimes of Zimbabwe and South Africa which, in order to strengthen their position, encouraged foreign monopolies to exploit resources which only the peoples of Zimbabwe and South Africa had the right to use for their own benefit. His delegation wished to pay a tribute to the tireless efforts of the Special Committee to put a stop to all the activities of the foreign economic interests and other parties which hampered the process of decolonization in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. In view of the refusal of the racist régimes in southern Africa to implement the innumerable resolutions adopted by the United Nations and to put an end to their co-operation with foreign monopolies, the international community had no alternative but to strengthen the economic sanctions against the illegal Salisbury régime and the apartheid régime in South Africa. It should also intensify the international campaign against apartheid and racial discrimination and allow the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence without delay.

47. Mr. ADUNDO (Kenya) said that Kenya and the whole African continent would never rest until the aims of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which contained the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, had been fully achieved. Kenya unreservedly supported the efforts of the peoples still under colonial domination to shake off the social, political and economic chains that prevented the exercise of their right to self-determination and freedom, and their accession to independence and sovereignty.

48. Unfortunately those efforts were being thwarted by the activities of foreign interests - above all in Namibia and Zimbabwe - which exploited the territories, as indicated in great detail in the report of the Committee of 24 (A/34/22 (Part III)). Therefore, before the indigenous people could exercise their inalienable right to self-determination, and to ensure full implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), it was essential to break the very close links between the transnational corporations and the colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa.

/...

(Mr. Adundo, Kenya)

49. The Kenyan delegation welcomed the conversations on the Zimbabwe Constitution taking place in London under the auspices of the administering Power.

50. In the case of South Africa, pressure must be intensified to hasten the elimination of apartheid, by cutting off foreign investments and refusing to supply the South African régime with the technology it needed. South Africa must be forced to recognize the United Nations as the legal authority in Namibia and withdraw from the Territory.

51. Unlike those who thought that some of the activities carried on by foreign monopolies were more reprehensible than others, the Kenyan delegation felt that all activities that helped to strengthen the position of the colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa should be condemned, whether it was the transfer of military and industrial technology, mining and industrial ventures, financial activities and loans or the unjust exploitation of cheap labour, since all were an obstacle to the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) and impeded the decolonization process. There could be no selective condemnation.

52. Kenya was strongly opposed to the wanton exploitation of the human and natural resources of the colonial territories, resources which should be used by the population in their own best interests. It resolutely supported the heroic peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia, Western Sahara and other Territories in their liberation struggle, with a view to helping to end the collusion between foreign economic interests and colonialism, racism and apartheid.

53. Mrs. WADIBIA (Nigeria) recalled that in its resolution (A/34/23, (Part III), para. 13) the Special Committee of 24 had reaffirmed, among other things, that the natural resources of Zimbabwe and Namibia were the heritage of the peoples of those Territories and that the exploitation of those resources by foreign economic interests in association with the illegal minority régimes was a direct violation of the rights of the inhabitants, as well as of the principles of the Charter and of all relevant resolutions of the United Nations. It had also reaffirmed the inalienable right of the peoples of dependent Territories to self-determination and independence as well as their right to dispose of the natural resources of their territories.

54. Apartheid was the bitter fruit of slavery, imperialism, and colonialism. It was a threat to peace and a hindrance to international co-operation. Foreign interests supported it because it enabled them to make large profits by exploiting to the full the cheap labour it supplied, as well as the natural resources of the region. The transnational corporations, whose number was constantly growing, were strengthening their grip on the Namibian economy and their ties with the system of apartheid.

55. The Nigerian delegation once again wished to stress that any collaboration with the apartheid régime encouraged it to persist in its criminal, racist, repressive and aggressive policies and seriously aggravated the situation in Namibia and the rest of southern Africa. Foreign economic interests and, through them, their respective Governments, were therefore directly responsible for the

/...

Mrs. Wadibia (Nigeria)

continuation of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and for the escalation of the criminal acts of the apartheid régime because their attitude had convinced Pretoria that it could act without fear of retribution.

56. Some delegations maintained that some of the activities of foreign interests in South Africa were beneficial to the indigenous peoples. However, it was a known fact that they brought them only exploitation and oppression. In Namibia, for example, (the world's fourth-largest exporter of minerals) black workers were being paid wages below the poverty line and had no trade union rights.

57. As a member of the OAU and of the non-aligned countries, Nigeria called on the Western and other countries to break their economic, military and cultural ties with the illegal régime of South Africa. It also called on all Member States to take effective steps to discontinue foreign investments in and financial loans to South Africa. It was no longer enough to adopt resolutions; it was necessary now to show the political will needed to implement them.

58. Mr. FIGUEIREDO (Angola) said that his delegation had presented various facts and figures in previous years on the activities of Western Governments and their transnational corporations in southern Africa. Despite repeated condemnation by the international community and the imposition of various sanctions, they continued to bolster the racist minority régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury and enabled them to survive.

59. Thus, as the Special Committee of 24 recalled in its report (A/34/23, (Part III), annex II, para. 1), in order to protect their investments, foreign interests supported South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and participated in and benefited from the practice of apartheid, which ensured a supply of cheap labour. In exchange, they exploited the Territory's vast resources at great profit to themselves. Foreign interests in South Africa, Rhodesia and Namibia had set up various levels of collaboration, ranging from direct involvement at the government level to collaboration between Western corporations and the illegal régimes, collaboration between the foreign subsidiaries of transnational corporations and the illegal régimes as well as semi-public and private corporations of southern Africa, Namibia, and Southern Rhodesia, and lastly, the direct support of one illegal racist minority régime for the other.

60. A number of campaigns to express solidarity with the peoples of southern Africa had been launched by private groups in order to effect a change in the economic activities of their respective Governments. Unfortunately, as long as the Governments and corporations in question were unwilling to abide by the provisions of the various General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, such actions would do little good. Similarly, some European Governments had shown the best intentions in that connexion, but the steps they had taken to prevent their corporations from investing in South Africa did not go far enough. There were a great many foreign corporations operating in South Africa; there had been 1,632 in 1974 and their number was rising steadily.

/...

(Mr. Figueiredo, Angola)

61. Moreover, owing to the massive assistance it received from Western financial institutions (more than \$8 billion in loans), South Africa was in a position to increase its military budget considerably and thus to strengthen its military and nuclear capability. It should be noted in that connexion that the Western countries providing the racist Pretoria régime with nuclear assistance were directly responsible for the deterioration of the situation in southern Africa, the resulting threat to peace in the region and the attacks on the security and sovereignty of neighbouring States.

62. Effective and lasting peace would not come to southern Africa until the national liberation movements had installed genuine majority rule for the people of Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa, and western interests had ceased to collaborate with the racist régimes.

63. The delegation of Angola therefore renewed its call for total sanctions against South Africa. Only then would the racist minority régime of Pretoria be forced to abide by the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

64. Mr. ABEYRATNE (Sri Lanka) welcomed the Special Committee's report (A/34/23, (Part III)) and the revealing information it contained on the activities of various foreign interests, commercial and otherwise, which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)). That Declaration was one of the most frequently quoted documents of the United Nations. Nevertheless, particularly in the case of Southern Rhodesia and Namibia, its provisions were often violated with impunity. Essentially, there were two closely related aspects of those violations: the political and the economic.

65. With regard to the economic aspect, with which the agenda item was basically concerned, he referred, in particular, firstly to the unchecked exploitation of the natural or physical resources of Namibia and Zimbabwe for the profit of concerns, interests and groups outside those Territories and, secondly, to the exploitation of the peoples of those two Territories, which was reflected in grossly unfair wage scales, poor working conditions and the exploitation of labour. The exploitation of the natural resources and the labour of those two Territories could not be justified under any pretext; the peoples of any country should be able to dispose freely of their natural resources. The individuals who had come to power as a result of the "internal settlement" in Rhodesia could not, however, be considered the true representatives of the Rhodesian people. His delegation sincerely hoped that the Commonwealth initiatives towards a just settlement would bear fruit and that the right of the people of Zimbabwe to control the natural resources of their country would be restored to them. In Namibia, Decree No. 1 for the protection of the natural resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia was being totally ignored.

66. On the political plane, such economic exploitation was a means of perpetuating the colonial status of Namibia and Zimbabwe, thereby creating a kind of buffer for the protection of South Africa. It also made it possible to strengthen and bolster racist domination and apartheid in southern Africa.

/...

(Mr. Abeyratne, Sri Lanka)

67. Other related issues, such as the growing nuclear co-operation between various countries and South Africa, should also be taken into consideration. That was one aspect of a strategy being applied by certain groups in order to perpetuate the domination of the region by South Africa and thereby ensure the continued economic exploitation of Zimbabwe and Namibia. It was clear that the South African system could not continue for long without the backing of foreign interests and groups, as well as that of certain countries which, for the sake of economic gain, were ensuring that the régime in South Africa would not be overthrown. That involved a violation of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council, and such an attitude must be condemned as contrary to the provisions of Article 25 of the Charter.

68. His delegation reaffirmed the inalienable right of the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe to self-determination and independence, including the rights to exploit, develop and freely dispose of their resources. Sri Lanka was convinced also that the foreign economic, financial and other interests that were exploiting and depleting the natural resources of Zimbabwe and Namibia in association with the illegal racist minority régimes and South Africa were violating the right of the peoples of those Territories and contributing to the perpetuation of racist colonial domination in those Territories. Lastly, Sri Lanka condemned the policies of any Government which supported or collaborated with those foreign economic groups. In that connexion, his delegation noted with considerable satisfaction the measures being taken by the Swedish Government to discourage investments which would help to perpetuate racist colonial domination in the region.

69. Mr. DUNFEY (United States of America) recalled the reasons for which the United States Government had voted against the draft resolution on foreign economic and other interests the preceding year. He hoped that the two provisions which had occasioned that negative vote would not be contained in the draft resolution that would be put before the Committee at the current session.

70. The United States Government had believed that the draft resolution did not sufficiently distinguish between the situation in southern Africa and the situation existing in other Non-Self-Governing Territories. More important, his Government did not accept the proposition that the activities of economic interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories were, by their very nature, detrimental to the interests of the peoples of those Territories, while they could have positive effects in independent countries. True, the current pattern of foreign economic investment in Non-Self-Governing Territories sometimes left much to be desired, but an effort must be made to remedy those shortcomings, rather than condemning the activities of such economic interests en bloc. They could, and frequently were, beneficial, and each investment must be judged on its own merits. Only those investments which were in fact detrimental to the interests of the peoples concerned should be changed or ended.

/...

(Mr. Dunfey, United States)

71. He recalled that the situation concerning Namibia was governed by United Nations Security Council resolutions and International Court of Justice rulings which obliged Member States to ensure that, in their economic and political relations with South Africa, they did not convey legal recognition to its administration of Namibia. In the case of Zimbabwe, the relevant Security Council resolutions provided for mandatory economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The United States Government supported those resolutions and rulings, and there was no United States trade with Zimbabwe other than humanitarian trade permitted under Security Council resolutions.

72. The United States Government, to which apartheid was unacceptable, had in recent years taken a number of actions to underscore its concern about the situation in South Africa. Following the death of Steve Biko and the October 1977 crackdown, the United States had supported the adoption of a mandatory arms embargo in the Security Council. In addition, the United States had unilaterally imposed a ban on all exports of whatever nature to the South African military and police. On 4 October 1979, speaking before ambassadors and ministers of the States members of the Organization of African Unity in New York, the United States Secretary of State had reaffirmed that, unless a system of government evolved in which all South Africans could participate, United States relations with South Africa would inevitably deteriorate.

73. Because of the common obligation to contribute to the end of the apartheid system in South Africa, firms doing business in that country had special responsibilities. There were approximately 350 United States firms in South Africa, accounting for approximately 2 per cent of total fixed investment in that country and about one sixth of all foreign investment in South Africa. Some Governments, notably the countries of the European Economic Community and Canada, had developed their own official code of conduct for firms operating in South Africa. For its part, the United States Government had issued guidelines relating to labour practice in South Africa to United States firms. Additionally, in early 1977, the Reverend Leon Sullivan, prompted by concern stemming from a visit to South Africa, had succeeded in getting 12 United States companies to sign a set of six principles pledging to improve working conditions for black workers employed in their South African plants. In 1978, the Reverend Sullivan had expanded those principles. One hundred United States companies, employing 90 per cent of all the blacks employed by United States firms, had adopted those principles. Those principles were: non-segregation; equal and fair employment practices for all employees, including the right of black workers to form or belong to unions; equal pay; initiation and development of training programmes that would prepare blacks and other non-whites for supervisory, administrative, clerical and technical jobs; increasing the number of blacks and other non-whites in management and supervisory positions; and improving the quality of employees' lives outside of the work environment. In addition, firms which had signed those principles were required to report to the Reverend Sullivan twice a year on their progress in implementing the principles.

(Mr. Dunfey, United States)

74. Although his Government was convinced that only the people and Government of South Africa, through a combination of internal and external pressures, could, by peaceful changes, eliminate the apartheid system, it believed that codes of conduct such as the Sullivan principles could improve the lot of the black majority. He wished to note that the South African Government had recently taken steps to eliminate some aspects of discrimination in the economic area but that those measures had been hedged with restrictions which diluted their impact.

75. While stressing that codes of conduct did not address the root of South Africa's problem, he believed that every effort should be made to move business leaders towards the dismantling of the apartheid system.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.