



COPY  
FOR REFERENCE  
ONLY - DO NOT  
CIRCULATE

FOURTH COMMITTEE  
10th meeting  
held on  
Thursday, 3 November 1983  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 10th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 103: 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: 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)

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES: (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (continued)

- (a) 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)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 102: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (b) 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 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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.4/38/SR.10  
9 November 1983

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONTENTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 104: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

(a) 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)

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 105: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 106: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 103: 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: 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/38/23 (Part III))

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft decision on military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration which might be impeding the implementation of the Declaration (A/38/23 (Part III), chap. IV, para. 12), and to the draft resolution on activities of foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration (A/38/23 (Part III), chap. V, para. 12).

2. Mr. MATHIOUDAKIS (Greece), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Economic Community, said that the Ten wished to reiterate their concern at the proposal to vote on the draft decision, which dealt with a subject that was not in the list of items allocated to the Committee (A/C.4/38/1).

3. Mr. WARD (New Zealand) said that his country would abstain in the vote on the draft decision. It had objected on procedural grounds when a text on the subject had been submitted to the General Assembly in 1982 and those reservations remained. Moreover, his delegation could not accept the assertion that military activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories were necessarily detrimental to decolonization. The decision on the subject had no relevance to New Zealand's administration of Tokelau.

4. His delegation would, however, vote in favour of the draft resolution. New Zealand had always supported the broad principles of the resolutions adopted under the item and scrupulously observed those principles in its administration of Tokelau.

5. His delegation could not accept the general assertion in the draft resolution that foreign economic interests operating in Non-Self-Governing Territories were by their very nature detrimental to the interests of the people of those Territories. By disregarding the experience of many Non-Self-Governing or newly independent Territories, the draft resolution called for action which was not only unrealistic but would also be unhelpful to the objectives of its sponsors. Under reasonable controls and guidelines, foreign investment and trade could be a vital spur to development. His delegation regretted the generally condemnatory tone of the text and had reservations about the appropriateness of some of the paragraphs concerning Namibia and South Africa. It also regretted the tendency for unjustified assertions to be made about the behaviour and activities of administering Powers. Those criticisms had no application in the case of New Zealand's administration of

/...

(Mr. Ward, New Zealand)

Tokelau, as was clear from the report of the most recent visiting mission of the Special Committee of 24 to the Territory.

6. Mr. KURPERSHOEK (Netherlands) said that General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) had made a significant contribution to a process that had radically transformed the world. As a result, international co-operation had become a truly global affair. It was therefore regrettable that the issue of Namibia remained unresolved. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remained the only basis for an internationally acceptable solution. In that context, the Netherlands recognized the competence of the Council for Namibia to issue Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.

7. His delegation welcomed the newly independent State of Saint Christopher and Nevis, and looked forward to the accession to independence of Brunei at the end of 1983. It was satisfied that the Powers entrusted with administration of the remaining dependent Territories would continue to promote the well-being of their inhabitants and make every effort to foster the development of free political institutions, thus enabling them freely to determine their political status.

8. It was regrettable that, instead of using agenda item 103 as an opportunity to engage in serious discussion regarding the interests of the inhabitants of colonial Territories, some members of the Committee had indulged in sterile accusations and hackneyed polemics against other members. The inevitable polarization resulting from that approach severely damaged the spirit of consensus vital to the effective functioning of the Committee.

9. He was referring to the allegations that all activities of foreign companies in dependent Territories were per se harmful to the well-being of their inhabitants. In reality, many such Territories counted upon the influx of foreign capital to stimulate their economies and made every attempt to attract investors. The economic activity engendered by well-placed investment not only benefited those who provided the capital but could also induce increased prosperity for the inhabitants of the Territories concerned.

10. The draft resolution embodied many of the misconceptions which had been aired in the debate. His delegation could not agree that the activities of foreign economic and other interests necessarily constituted a major obstacle to political independence and racial equality; nor could it accept the inclusion in the draft resolution of unwarranted and selective criticism of Western countries, or the equation of the situation in South Africa with a colonial one. The Netherlands would therefore be unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution; however, its vote should not be interpreted as an indication that it opposed all elements of the draft resolution or the principles of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), to which it remained fully committed.

11. Mr. WERNDL (Federal Republic of Germany) said that in his delegation's view, the draft resolution on the activities of foreign economic and other interests lacked the balance necessary to win unanimous approval and its text did not seem

/...

(Mr. Werndl, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

to take into account all the aspects that would make for an in-depth approach to a solution. In particular, it failed to make the necessary distinction between those foreign economic and other interests which were detrimental, and those which contributed, to the development of the Territories concerned. Not all economic activity, investment and co-operation represented a threat to the independence of Territories under foreign administration. Fruitful economic exchange existed which was of major importance for the development of colonial countries and peoples.

12. There must be renewed efforts by all concerned with a view to reaching agreement on an undoubtedly difficult issue. His delegation hoped that it would be possible to solve the problem in the future and to find a meaningful common denominator.

13. His delegation would abstain on the draft resolution.

14. In regard to the draft decision (A/38/23 (Part III), chap. IV, para. 12), his delegation associated itself with the statement made by the representative of Greece on behalf of the European Economic Community.

15. Miss O'FARRELL (Ireland) said that her country condemned without reservation the exploitation of human and natural resources in Non-Self-Governing Territories without regard to the long-term interests of the inhabitants of those Territories. Economic activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories should have as their objective the enhancement of the long-term interests of the inhabitants of those Territories and not merely the exploitation of cheap labour and natural resources for profit.

16. The situation in Namibia provided the clearest example of such exploitation. Her delegation therefore supported the general thrust of those sections of the draft resolution which related to foreign economic interests in Namibia.

17. Her delegation could not, however, accept that foreign economic interests were in all cases detrimental to Non-Self-Governing Territories. An important factor in bringing those Territories to independence was, in fact, economic development. Economic interests should, however, be properly conducted and the administering Powers were under the obligation to ensure that those economic interests did not impede the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

18. In her delegation's view, the draft resolution did not constitute a fair and balanced approach to the issue and did not adequately address the complex range of issues which confronted the remaining small Territories, for which carefully promoted economic development was an important factor in achieving their independence.

19. Her delegation would therefore abstain on the draft resolution in the hope that a more balanced text would be submitted to the Committee at the thirty-ninth session.

/...

20. Mr. HAYASHI (Japan) said that his delegation believed that the activities of foreign economic and other interests must in no way deprive the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories of their rights to self-determination and independence, or prejudice the economic, social and cultural development of their peoples. Such activities must therefore be properly controlled so as to prevent such effects. His delegation fully shared the indignation expressed during the general debate regarding the harmful effects which sometimes resulted from those activities.

21. His delegation nevertheless found it difficult to subscribe to the assertion that all activities of foreign economic and other interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories were necessarily prejudicial to the interest of the colonial peoples or that they obstructed efforts to achieve self-determination and independence. Whether or not such activities were harmful depend upon the nature of the activity and upon the situation prevailing in the particular Territory. If properly guided, such activities could make valuable contributions to the socio-economic development of those Territories, for example through the transfer of technology and managerial skills and in the creation of job opportunities.

22. His delegation could not, therefore, agree with the general thrust of the draft resolution. It appreciated the efforts of the members of the Special Committee to arrive at a consensus and to avoid accusing any country by name; the draft resolution was nevertheless still unbalanced in its emphasis of the negative aspects of the activities of foreign economic and other interests.

23. His delegation could not, therefore, support the draft resolution and would abstain in the vote.

24. Japan had consistently upheld the view that the administration of Namibia by South Africa was illegal and that the United Nations should assume responsibility pending independence. Japan fully supported the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 and, pursuant to relevant United Nations resolutions, did not take measures or actions which acknowledged the administrative authority of South Africa in the Territory. It maintained no diplomatic relations with South Africa.

25. The Government of Japan prohibited direct investment in South Africa and Namibia by Japanese nationals or bodies corporate under its jurisdiction. Consequently, no Japanese national participated in the management of any enterprise in Namibia and no Japanese national or enterprise had a mining concession in Namibia. Japan did not extend co-operation such as grants, loans or technical assistance to the authorities in Namibia. In May 1975 his Government had taken measures to bring Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia to the attention of the general public by giving it due publicity. Japan had also made annual contributions to various funds and programmes such as the United Nations Fund for Namibia and the United Nations Institute for Namibia.

26. Mr. ULRICH (Denmark) said that Denmark condemned without hesitation the activities of those foreign economic and other interests which impeded decolonization, in Namibia and in other Non-Self-Governing Territories. In his delegation's view, however, the draft resolution on the item did not recognize that such activities could also be beneficial to the economic and social development of such Territories. The failure to distinguish between the various kinds of activities detracted from the fundamental aims of the draft resolution.

27. His delegation also had reservations of principle with regard to a number of specific paragraphs which failed to take into account provisions of the Charter concerning the division of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council.

28. For those reasons, Denmark would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

29. Mrs. NALINE (France) said that, as in the past, her delegation had serious reservations on the draft resolution. The activities of foreign economic and other interests could on occasion be harmful if a Territory's natural resources were exploited without regard to living and working conditions, the environment and the economic structure of the Territory. However, that situation was not general and, moreover, existed also in certain independent States. The real problem was to be found in the organization of markets and the imbalance between developing and industrialized countries. Her Government was well aware of the situation and one of the principal goals of its foreign policy was therefore the establishment of a new international economic order which would be more just and equitable to the disadvantaged.

30. At the previous session of the General Assembly her delegation had moved from a negative vote to abstention on the corresponding draft resolution because certain improvements had been incorporated in the text, particularly in regard to the elimination of selective condemnations. The draft resolution before the Committee had retained those improvements and her delegation would therefore abstain once again, notwithstanding its reservations.

31. Her delegation had procedural reservations regarding the draft decision on military activities and associated itself fully with the statement by the representative of Greece on behalf of the European Economic Community. Her delegation would refrain from commenting on the substance and, as in 1982, would vote against the draft decision.

32. Mr. BELLEFLEUR (Canada) said that his delegation regretted that once again it must vote against the draft resolution on foreign economic and other interests. Canada, as host to a number of transnational corporations, strongly opposed the principle of the extraterritoriality of its domestic laws. Canada strongly supported the principle that those national Governments, in whose territory transnational corporations had their headquarters should not interfere under the terms of their domestic law in the activities of such corporations. That principle had been completely endorsed by the Group of 77 during the discussion in the United Nations Commission on Transnational Corporations.

(Mr. Bellefleur, Canada)

33. His delegation had in the past asked the Special Committee to distinguish between legitimate economic activities in a developing country and those other activities which were designed to achieve colonial domination. The draft resolution did not make such distinctions and, moreover, contained so many erroneous insinuations regarding the commercial activities of certain Western States that his delegation felt obliged to vote against it. He invited attention to a document of the Commission on Transnational Corporations (E/C.10/1983/10), which had reported that the Canadian company Falconbridge Nickel Mines Ltd. had ceased operations in Namibia.

34. His delegation also felt obliged to vote against the draft decision on military activities. That question figured nowhere in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly; discussion of the draft decision in the Committee was therefore out of order. Indeed, the two recommendations in document A/38/23 (Part III) were so incompatible that they could not belong to the same item. His delegation opposed the manoeuvre whereby a draft decision not relevant to item 103 was introduced under cover of that item, contrary to the spirit and letter of rule 97 of the rules of procedure.

35. Mr. LINDAHL (Sweden) said that, taking into account the vulnerability of colonial Territories and their populations as compared to the strength of many foreign economic interests, Member States had a special responsibility to make every effort to protect the rights of the peoples in those Territories. Sweden associated itself with the condemnation of activities of foreign economic interests which impeded the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

36. The draft resolution was aimed principally at the serious situation prevailing in southern Africa. At the root of that unstable situation was South Africa's apartheid policy and its illegal occupation of Namibia. The Nordic countries had therefore adopted a joint programme against South Africa, including the prohibition or discouragement of new investments in South Africa and proposals in the Security Council which would result in binding resolutions against investments in, and trade with, South Africa. Sweden had enacted a law against new investments in South Africa and Namibia by firms under Swedish jurisdiction. Recently the Swedish Parliament had adopted a bill under which purchases of uranium from Namibia would be illegal so long as that Territory was not independent.

37. His delegation had noted with satisfaction that the draft resolution did not regard all foreign economic activities as necessarily negative but only those that impeded decolonization. Foreign economic investments could indeed in many cases be an important element in promoting industrial development and providing employment for the inhabitants of those Territories. On the other hand, certain paragraphs, which had caused his delegation considerable difficulties in the past, were still to be found in the draft text. The language in some cases touched upon his delegation's traditional reservations with regard to the division of competence among the principal organs of the United Nations.

/...



(Mr. Lindahl, Sweden)

38. His delegation would accordingly be obliged once again to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. That was all the more regrettable since Sweden fully shared the deep concern about conditions in southern Africa and supported the general considerations behind the draft resolution.

39. Mr. TANC (Turkey) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, in keeping with Turkey's strong support for international efforts against colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination as well as for the achievement of the independence of Namibia. His delegation nevertheless had reservations with regard to the naming of a specific region in the draft text.

40. For the same reasons, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft decision on military activities. It nevertheless believed that the text of the draft decision, particularly, paragraphs 2, 4, 12, 13 and 14, could have been drafted in a more balanced manner. His delegation also had strong reservations on the references to a particular group of States made in several paragraphs of the text.

41. Mr. ROWE (Australia) said that, in the Special Committee, Australia had voted in favour of the draft resolution on foreign economic activities, although it had had serious misgivings about many aspects of the draft. His delegation would maintain that position in the vote in the Fourth Committee.

42. His delegation was deeply concerned about the exploitative practices of many companies, both domestic and foreign, in Namibia both in relation to their work forces and to their extraction of the natural resources. It could not, however, wholeheartedly endorse certain aspects of the text relating to South Africa and Namibia.

43. The draft resolution, however, ranged beyond the situation in southern Africa to embrace all Non-Self-Governing Territories. There was something inherently contradictory between the wholesale condemnation of foreign economic involvement in Non-Self-Governing Territories implicit in the draft resolution and the calls made in various resolutions on non-self-governing territories for further economic development of those Territories. Foreign economic interests which impeded progress for self-determination were to be deplored. There was no reason, however, why constructive and balanced foreign economic investment should not contribute to the economic development of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories. Managed properly, the inflow of foreign investment was usually accompanied by the introduction of new technology, the acquisition of new skills and a general increase in managerial expertise. His delegation could not, therefore, accept the inference that all foreign investment impeded progress towards self-determination, or the generally condemnatory tone directed against the administering Powers of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories. He did not consider that the terms of the draft resolution related to the Australian administration of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands.

/...

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

44. His delegation considered that the draft decision on military activities had no place on the agenda of the Fourth Committee and it would accordingly abstain in the vote.

45. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom) said that, as in previous years, his delegation was unable to support the draft resolution, principally because of the clear implication in the text that all foreign economic interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories were by definition detrimental to the people of those territories. The draft resolution failed to distinguish properly between activities of foreign companies that might be harmful and the real economic benefits that responsible commercial activity could generate.

46. Moreover, his delegation could not accept that a resolution which extrapolated from conditions existing in one particular Territory, namely Namibia, was necessarily valid for all other dependent Territories with their differing social, economic and political circumstances. As an administering Power responsible for 10 of those Territories, the United Kingdom took pride in the fact that it had fully complied with its obligations. It was, however, frustrating to be exhorted on the one hand to accelerate economic development in the Territories for which it was responsible and, on the other, to be criticized for encouraging a private economic contribution to the fulfilment of that objective. It was also manifestly contradictory.

47. External trade and an inward flow of investment were crucial ingredients in the successful development which was the main requirement of the United Kingdom's dependent Territories. That had been made clear repeatedly in the context of visiting missions to those Territories. Inward investment brought with it managerial skills, access to new technology and finance, of which the United Kingdom was a major source, and accelerated industrialization. The United Kingdom had signed a number of bilateral investment agreements with developing countries designed to create the atmosphere of stability and mutual trust necessary for private investment. The important role of the private sector in development had been widely recognized by developed and developing countries alike and had been endorsed by numerous international organizations. It was therefore to be regretted that no such recognition was contained in the draft resolution.

48. For many delegations the main thrust of the draft resolution was to condemn economic and commercial contacts with South Africa. His delegation strongly condemned the system of apartheid but regarded apartheid as a gross violation of human rights and not as a residual colonial problem. Nor did it believe that the isolation of South Africa, as called for by paragraph 17 of the draft resolution, or the rupture of all economic relations, as proposed in paragraph 18, would enhance the prospects of peaceful change in Namibia. On the contrary, it could prejudice the outcome of negotiations on the Territory and create serious economic problems, not least for the African countries themselves. The maintenance of a dialogue with South Africa would be more productive than the use of threats or the imposition of sanctions.

/...

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

49. His delegation had made it clear on many occasions that it did not regard the presence of military facilities in dependent Territories as prejudicing the right to self-determination, which remained the cornerstone of the United Kingdom's decolonization policy. It was the people of the dependent Territories alone who would decide if and when their constitutional relationship with the United Kingdom should change. There was no question of the United Kingdom putting any obstacles in the way of their exercising that choice.

50. His delegation also had reservations regarding the draft decision on procedural grounds. As the representative of Greece had stated on behalf of the European Economic Community there was no justification for a vote on a text dealing with a subject that had not been allocated to the Fourth Committee. The issue had not been included in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly and had not even been formally introduced. The status of the draft decision was therefore doubtful and did not merit detailed comment. His delegation would vote against it.

51. Mr. MUKAYA (Malawi) said that owing to his country's experience of colonial domination and economic exploitation, it sincerely hoped that Namibia would become independent without further delay in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and it rejected any policy based on race, colour, religion or creed.

52. With regard to the question of Western Sahara, his delegation urged all concerned to resort to negotiation rather than violence with a view to securing a political settlement and halting the loss of life. That applied equally to all other colonial Territories. It also appealed to the world community to respect the political independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of member States.

53. However, his delegation felt obliged to abstain on the draft resolution (A/38/23 (Part III), chap. V, para. 12), because it could not endorse concepts and language which were not in line with the Charter and international law.

54. Mr. STEFANINI (Italy) expressed regret at once more being obliged to abstain on the draft resolution on foreign economic and other interests because, although his delegation fully supported some parts of the text, it did not share the underlying assumption that any foreign economic activity in Non-Self-Governing Territories impeded the implementation of the Declaration. On the contrary, foreign investment could play a useful role in fostering economic development.

55. Turning to the draft decision on military activities, he said his delegation fully endorsed the reservations expressed by the representative of Greece on behalf of the European Economic Community, and would vote against it.

56. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution in document A/38/23 (Part III), chapter V, paragraph 12.

/...

57. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

58. The draft resolution was adopted by 101 votes to 6, with 16 abstentions.

59. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft decision in document A/38/23 (Part III), chapter IV, paragraph 12.

60. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan,

/...

Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Lesotho, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden.

61. The draft decision was adopted by 97 votes to 10, with 15 abstentions.

62. The CHAIRMAN invited representatives wishing to do so to explain their votes.

63. Mr. SENGO (Mozambique) said that, owing to his country's commitment to peace and progress, it welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution. Regrettably, negative votes had again been cast by certain Western countries which, while proclaiming their stand against apartheid, in practice collaborated with the Pretoria régime. Some of those countries argued that strengthening their co-operation with South Africa would enable them to exert pressure on that régime to make democratic changes. However, Pretoria's acts of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring States were hardly democratic. The international community must denounce the complicity between those Western countries and the apartheid régime, which not only blocked the emancipation of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa but also constituted a threat to the front-line States.

64. Transnational corporations and their affiliates must provide the required information on their business and interests in Namibia.

65. No one could deny that military activities undertaken by colonial Powers in Territories under their domination deprived the peoples of those Territories of their right to self-determination and independence. Likewise, the activities of foreign economic and other interests resulted in the plundering of natural resources and provided huge profits from exploitation of the indigenous inhabitants. Since those activities were contrary to peace, progress and the inalienable rights of the people concerned, they were flagrant violations of the Declaration.

66. Instead of complying with the Charter and relevant United Nations decisions, the apartheid régime was more concerned with strengthening its colonial power over Namibia. In addition to its massive military build-up in that Territory, the régime had introduced compulsory military service for Namibians and was using mercenaries to oppress and massacre the Namibian people.

67. Massive investments by Western countries in Namibia and South Africa had encouraged the latter in its policies. According to document A/AC.109/744,

/...

(Mr. Sengo, Mozambique)

there were 90 transnational corporations with interests in Namibia, some 80 per cent of the total mining sector was controlled by three transnational corporations, international oil companies were involved in Namibia, and a substantial portion of the land was owned by South African individuals and corporations. Foreign investments in South Africa had trebled in the past few years and that country was being supplied with nuclear weapons. That enabled South Africa to threaten peace and security in the whole of southern Africa. South Africa was occupying part of Angola and had repeatedly attacked Mozambique in line with its strategy to destabilize the countries of the region.

68. In accordance with its full support for the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and the decision.

69. Mr. RAM (Fiji) said that his delegation had supported the draft decision because it agreed that military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration should not be detrimental to the people concerned. However, while it agreed with the main thrust of the decision, his Government did not consider that all military activities in all dependent Territories necessarily impeded the implementation of the Declaration. The inhabitants should be left to decide that question.

70. Mr. PEREZ (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it shared the basic ideas expressed, but it did not think that all economic activities necessarily hampered the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). That fact had been recognized in other United Nations resolutions where the administering Powers had been asked to increase investment in order to ensure the economic viability of the Territories under their administration.

71. Mr. ALMOSLECHNER (Austria) reaffirmed his country's support for the adoption of appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter to eliminate colonialism and apartheid in southern Africa and to implement the Declaration. It had, however, abstained from voting on the draft resolution because the text did not take sufficiently into account that all measures to be taken by Member States should genuinely serve the political, economic and social interests of the Territories concerned and should therefore leave room for activities clearly benefiting their economic and social development.

72. Mr. LA SARTE (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it fully supported the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination and to dispose of their natural resources and the obligation of the administering Power to promote the political, economic, social and cultural progress and to develop the human and natural resources of the Territories under its administration. However, it had reservations on paragraphs 9, 10, 11 and 18, which could not be fully reconciled with the sovereign right of States freely to conduct their international relations, and would have preferred a more balanced text.

/...

(Mr. La Sarte, Uruguay)

73. It had voted in favour of the draft decision because it supported the underlying ideas, although it doubted the pertinence of the text to the item under discussion.

74. Mr. MALINGA (Swaziland) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because of Swaziland's belief that it was high time that Namibia became independent and because of its firm opposition to apartheid. Owing to the geographical location of his country, however, his delegation would find difficulty in endorsing certain provisions, especially paragraph 14, since oil sanctions against South Africa would have a disastrous effect on Swaziland's economy.

75. Mr. NGUYEN THANH CHAU (Viet Nam) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft decision, although it wished to place on record that it would have preferred the use of the word "are" instead of "might be" in paragraph 1, since it firmly believed that such military activities were indeed impeding the implementation of the Declaration.

76. The CHAIRMAN said that he took it that the Committee agreed to request the Rapporteur to submit the report on item 103 directly to the General Assembly.

77. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (continued)

- (a) 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/38/23 (Part VI and Add.1), A/38/23 (Part VIII); A/AC.109/724 and Corr.1, 725, 726 and Corr.1, 727, 728 and Corr.1, 729-736, 737 and Corr.1, 738, 739, 740 and Corr.1, 741, 742, 746, 749 and Corr.1, 753 and 754)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/555)

AGENDA ITEM 102: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/38/125)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/477)
- (b) 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/38/23 (Part IV))

/...

AGENDA ITEM 104: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

- (a) 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/38/23 (Part IV)); A/AC.109/L.1472, L.1475 and Add.1, L.1487)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/111 and Add. 1-2, Add.3 and Corr.1, Add.4; A/AC.109/L.146)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/38/3 (Part II))

AGENDA ITEM 105: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/469)

AGENDA ITEM 106: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/549)

Question of Western Sahara: hearing of petitioners (A/C.4/38/6/Add.2, Add.3, Add.5 and Add.11)

78. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Ahmed (Mouvement révolutionnaire des hommes bleus (MOREHOB)), Mr. Rachid (Association des originaires du Sakiat El-Hamra et du Río de oro (AOSARIO)), Mrs. Brahim and Mrs. Mahmoud (Union des femmes marocaines), and Mr. Salem took places at the petitioners' table.

79. Mr. AHMED (Mouvement révolutionnaire des hommes bleus (MOREHOB)) said that MOREHOB had been the first native Western Saharan liberation organization established, during the colonial period. It had initiated the clandestine resistance to Spain and its activities had been a determining factor in winning the struggle against colonialism and in bringing the problem of Western Sahara to the awareness of the international community. The submission of the constitutional charter of MOREHOB to the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in 1972 had been the first step in the struggle, constantly waged alongside the Territory's motherland, Morocco.

80. In those years there had never been a group known as the Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el Hamra y Río de Oro (Frente POLISARIO), which had not surfaced until the end of 1974 when Algeria had created it from nothing. He challenged anyone to prove otherwise, with even so much as a reference in a contemporary newspaper to its existence.

81. For tactical reasons, MOREHOB had moved in 1973 to Algeria, with which it then had close relations. From there it had waged political, diplomatic and information campaigns and carried out certain armed actions. It wanted at the time to make the

/...



(Mr. Ahmed)

public aware of its stand: that Western Sahara should be restored to Morocco, its homeland. When Algeria, in a change of policy had launched its underground aggression against what was by then part of Morocco, it had outraged the 85 per cent of the population of Western Sahara which considered itself tied to Morocco. Algeria's political and military support had necessitated a struggle by Morocco to retain its inalienable rights in a region formerly plundered by colonialists.

82. MOREHOB was the authentic liberation organization in Western Sahara. The Frente POLISARIO had no representative status and was merely an extension of Algeria. MOREHOB denied its right to speak on behalf of the Saharan people.

83. Convinced that the United Nations had the capacity to act on behalf of justice and human rights, Western Sahara and Morocco demanded justice for the Western Saharan families who had been taken hostage in 1976 by Algerian army commandos and had been held since then in Algerian camps. Algeria had consistently refused to apply any international conventions to them or to allow the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to arrange for their repatriation, with their full consent. If the Committee showed impartial interest in the plight of those Saharan hostages, a misdeed would be rectified and the pretence of the so-called defenders of Saharan rights would be unmasked.

84. The United Nations should recognize that those whom Algeria asserted were refugees from the fighting in Western Sahara were actually subjects of neighbouring countries drawn to camps in the Tindouf area because of drought. Algeria itself had consistently refused to hold any objective census of the population there. MOREHOB represented the real population of Western Sahara and, if forced to do so, it would take up arms again to bring its own hostage families back from the Tindouf.

85. MOREHOB was firmly convinced that its cause was just. It ardently hoped that a United Nations-sponsored referendum, as proposed by His Majesty Hassan II of Morocco, would be held in the territory to allow the Saharan population to demonstrate once again their Moroccan status and allegiance.

86. Mr. RACHID (Association des originaires du Sakiat El-Hamra et du Río de Oro (AOSARIO)) said that AOSARIO was one of the groups fighting against colonial domination in Western Sahara; its aims were to ensure respect for international law and to make known the aspirations of the Saharan people. AOSARIO repudiated the Algerian mercenaries who purported to speak in the name of the Saharan people. They had no legitimacy whatsoever.

87. The Committee would recall that the 1975 Madrid Agreement establishing Morocco's rights in Western Sahara had been directly ratified in 1976 by an overwhelming 85-per-cent majority of the population through the Saharan Assembly, the Jema'a. Few expressions of popular will in recent times had had as much legitimacy; the United Nations had in other cases determined the status of Territories - that of West Irian and Bahrain, for instance - on the strength of far less representative segments of the population.

/...

(Mr. Rachid)

88. Algeria, however, had chosen to contest the legality of the expression by the Saharan people of their wish to be united with Morocco, their homeland. In 1981, anxious to have the international community reconfirm the validity of the original ratification of its authority through the Jema'a, Morocco had agreed at the 1981 session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to a United Nations-supervised referendum in Western Sahara. The Algerian response, by contrast, had been to launch troops against Moroccan territory.

89. OAU had consistently refused to recognize any Western Saharan liberation movement born in the days of Spanish domination, and Morocco had historically been the Saharan people's sole supporter. Under pressure from Algeria, OAU had adopted a resolution at the 1983 session of its Assembly of Heads of State and Government urging Morocco to negotiate with the Algerian-sponsored mercenaries in Western Sahara. The so-called Frente POLISARIO was not a liberation movement in any sense, and it would be considered an outrage by the Saharan people, who were living contentedly as part of Morocco, if their homeland were to have any dealings with those subversive adventurers.

90. In 1981, a group of left-wing government officials and journalists from the Netherlands had visited Western Sahara and reported their findings in newspapers in the Netherlands: although originally inclined to favour the claims of the Frente POLISARIO, they had, by their own account, come away convinced that the group was an extension of the Algerian Government, that it actually controlled no territory in Western Sahara and that the charges of genocide it had levelled against Morocco were unfounded. The government officials had stated that, had they been able to, they would have withdrawn the motion they had submitted to the Netherlands Parliament in 1979 calling for self-determination by the Saharan people.

91. The same group had been given a tour of the camps at Tindouf by Algeria, where they found the refugees to be mainly Algerian, Mauritanian and Chadian Saharans, and where they were struck by the aura of official secrecy and suspicion that prevailed. Algeria itself had consistently refused, for obvious reasons, to allow a census there. Later in 1981, Amnesty International had ascertained through two founding members of the so-called Frente POLISARIO who had sought asylum in the Netherlands that conditions in the Tindouf camps were deplorable; and the Netherlands press reports of their revelations had confirmed that 90 per cent of the members of the Frente POLISARIO came from outside Western Sahara. A great cause of concern was the fact that in those same camps were captive Saharan families whose safety could be guaranteed only by the application of international conventions.

92. When they heard Algeria, hiding behind the cloak of the Western Saharan issue but actually defending its own interests, invoke sacrosanct principles, some members of the international community could easily be deceived. It was Morocco, however, which even during the Spanish colonial period had consistently spoken out for Western Saharan rights. Peace must be brought to the region by the holding of the referendum in Western Sahara proposed by King Hassan of Morocco.

/...

93. Mrs. BRAHIM (Union des femmes marocaines (Section des provinces sahraouies)) said that the Saharan women she represented had kept pace with the men of Western Sahara at all stages of the struggle to safeguard the unity and territorial integrity of Morocco. Their cohesion has been exemplified by the immortal Green March.

94. She wished to denounce the acts of disorder wreaked by the band of mercenaries sent by Algeria to further its expansionist designs, plunder Western Sahara and subjugate its people. She was constrained to describe the tragedy of certain women who, though few in number, were being besieged at Tindouf, which the Algerians were using as a base for all kinds of political and military crimes. The United Nations must do everything possible to stop Algeria from sending bands of mercenaries known as the Frente POLISARIO to Western Sahara and murdering Saharan people. She proclaimed the steadfast adherence of Saharan women to Moroccan unity and national values and their readiness to support any resolution proving to the world the Moroccan identity of all the sons of Western Sahara. The Saharan women strongly rejected any measure that would regard the mercenaries as anything other than henchmen being used to further the expansionist designs of Algeria over Moroccan territory.

95. King Hassan II had proclaimed to OAU that Morocco would agree to hold a referendum in Moroccan (Western) Sahara. The Saharan women were fully prepared to contribute to the holding of that referendum if it was approached by the United Nations and OAU in an impartial manner and was not influenced by the false arguments spread by Algeria in its propaganda campaign. They appealed for an end to the tension prevailing in the area and declared that peace and security would not be achieved unless Algeria ceased its attacks and allowed Morocco to live in peace and security.

96. Mrs. MAHMOUD (Union des femmes marocaines (Section des provinces sahraouies)) said that the Saharan women had decided through free and democratic elections to reaffirm their loyalty to King Hassan II of Morocco, as their predecessors had done. Some neighbouring countries were trying to deny that loyalty and to establish bands of mercenaries to form a "liberation movement", the so-called Frente POLISARIO. The organization she represented categorically rejected any representativity of the Frente POLISARIO, which had been set up in 1976 by Algeria for reasons known to everyone.

97. Some countries were arming bands of mercenaries to attack the Saharan territory. Her organization rejected the acts of vandalism carried out by the Algerian army in 1975 and 1976 and regretted the presence in the United Nations of heads of bands of mercenaries who did not represent the population of the Saharan provinces. It was prepared to support a referendum under the supervision of an international organization to demonstrate to the world the Moroccan nature of the Saharan people and their loyalty to King Hassan II.

98. Mr. SALEM, speaking on behalf of the association of fathers and guardians of persons held at Tindouf, said that he wished to expose the situation of a small number of Saharans which was giving rise to much bitterness.

/...

(Mr. Salem)

99. Morocco had been subjected to an odious colonization which had fragmented its territory; after a protracted struggle, it had been liberated and united by stages, and the last stage had been the recovery from Spain of its desert - part of the Sahara - through a unique event, the Green March, in which King Hassan II had recovered Moroccan Sahara in accordance with international law and in response to the sentiments of all Moroccans, especially the sons of the former Spanish Sahara. During the transitional period following decolonization, because of frontier disputes between Morocco and Algeria, entire Saharan families had been deported; despite the small numbers involved, it was the duty of his association to defend them, just as it was the responsibility of the Fourth Committee, in the defence of human rights.

100. The world must realize that the people held at Tindouf by the Algerian army were not all from the Saharan region; therefore their future was not related to the future of Western, or Moroccan, Sahara. His association condemned the highhanded manner in which the Algerians were treating those families from Sakiat El-Hamra and Río de Oro and preventing them from returning to their native land. He challenged the Algerians to lift the state of siege and give the detainees safe conduct to return to their own countries; the whole world would see whether any of them wished to remain under Algerian control.

101. He wished to express the view of the Saharan people about the group of traitors who were being used by Algeria in an attempt to realize its ambitions of total control of the Maghreb, especially vital areas such as Moroccan Sahara; that group in no way represented the people of Sahara and had been formed illegally. All dealings with that group were an affront to the dignity of the Saharan people and their entire cultural and human heritage. The Saharan people had always respected their homeland and maintained allegiance to their King.

102. The Saharan people's position of principle could not be changed by any trickery or affected by any resolutions which ignored them or their fundamental position regarding the unity of Morocco, which went far back in history. The mercenaries known as the Frente POLISARIO represented nothing; they had no legitimacy and any resolution of the United Nations or OAU giving them representative status was null and void and could not be applied in the Saharan territory.

103. His association asked that an international body such as the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees should be allowed to visit the Saharans detained at Tindouf in order to establish their identity and their origins; his association was willing to facilitate identification of the Saharans among the prisoners.

104. His association wholeheartedly supported the decision of King Hassan II to organize a referendum and called upon the competent authorities to facilitate its implementation so that, when the results became known, the world would see how devoted the Saharan people were to their Moroccan identity; the referendum should be organized in accordance with international law. It would be in the Frente POLISARIO's interest to join in the preparations for the referendum instead of

/...

(Mr. Salem)

continuing to carry out mercenary activities. His association would like the Committee to visit the regained territory of Moroccan Sahara to see how devoted the people were to their Moroccan heritage and what they had achieved in their daily lives.

105. Mr. Ahmed, Mr. Rachid, Mrs. Brahim, Mrs. Mahmoud and Mr. Salem withdrew.

General debate

106. Mr. CASSANDRA (Sao Tome and Principe) stressed that the question of Western Sahara should be dealt with in the context of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The legitimate aspirations of the Saharan people could be attained only through the holding of a referendum under the supervision of OAU and the United Nations. Peace could return to that region only as a result of direct negotiations between the parties to the conflict, namely Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO.

107. His delegation regretted that the resolution adopted by consensus at the nineteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU had been rejected by Morocco at a recent meeting of the Implementation Committee on Western Sahara, whose work had been postponed sine die because of Morocco's continued intransigence. If that country was ready to be bound by the result of a referendum on self-determination which included all the population of the Territory and those living abroad as political exiles or refugees, it should co-operate with OAU for direct negotiations with the Frente POLISARIO on a cease-fire.

108. It had recently become evident that, whenever international pressure for a negotiated settlement of the conflict became intense, Morocco resorted to a world-wide diversionary campaign of misrepresentation of facts, at the same time blocking all the mediation efforts of the international community. The Moroccan Government had long been playing with words and with the destiny of the Saharan people with the clear aim of spreading confusion. His delegation appealed once more to that Government to co-operate with OAU in the search for a solution. Morocco was becoming increasingly isolated and its delaying tactics would certainly fail.

109. Firm support by the international community for the implementation of the OAU resolution would be a step towards peace in the region, and would eventually compel Morocco to negotiate and desist from the illegal annexation of the Territory.

110. Mr. FIGUEIREDO (Angola) said that despite numerous United Nations resolutions and appeals and the efforts of OAU to create conditions for a referendum, the people of Western Sahara had still not been allowed to exercise their right to self-determination. An increasing number of States, including Angola, had officially recognized the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic. Despite the support given by the overwhelming majority of the international community to the struggle of the Saharan people for the right to make their own choice, the occupying Power had refused to co-operate.

(Mr. Figueiredo, Angola)

111. The Saharan people, led by the Frente POLISARIO, had waged a brave struggle for independence on many fronts, diplomatic, political and military. In liberated territory, the Frente POLISARIO ran schools, hospitals, farms and small enterprises. In many world capitals, it represented the political aspirations of the Saharan people. Frente POLISARIO militants had succeeded in pushing the occupying forces, backed by a far superior military arsenal, into a few fortified strongholds.

112. The international community must fulfil its obligations under the Charter by pressing for negotiations that would lead to the exercise of self-determination by the Saharan people. It should support the efforts of the current Chairman of OAU, who, under the mandate given to him by that organization, had thrown his full authority behind attempts to organize negotiations between Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO.

113. The Frente POLISARIO had agreed to the OAU Chairman's formula for direct bilateral negotiations with Morocco and, after Morocco's refusal to enter into such negotiations, it had agreed to negotiations through the Chairman of the OAU Implementation Committee; Morocco, however, had rejected the proposal. Pressure must be brought to bear on Morocco to accept the OAU Chairman's advice, particularly in view of the diplomatic and political flexibility consistently displayed by the Frente POLISARIO. The African States in particular must not forget the fraternal spirit displayed by the Frente in support of the interests of OAU as a whole. The Fourth Committee should press Morocco to prove that it sincerely desired a solution by accepting the OAU formula for negotiations. Otherwise, the consequences of Morocco's intransigence and colonialist strategies would be devastating.

114. Mr. PULZ (Czechoslovakia), referring to item 104, said that the potential as well as the actual participation of the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations in decolonization was important in the context of the speedy and consistent implementation of the Declaration. Those agencies and institutions were a significant factor in current international relations. Because they included the overwhelming majority of States, enjoyed high international authority and controlled considerable material and organizational means for implementing their decisions, the most important United Nations decisions on decolonization were addressed to them as well. It was important, therefore, that they should respond to the appeals in those resolutions and decisions and should implement them in their activities.

115. The consideration of the role of those agencies and institutions in efforts to eliminate colonialism had become an important part of the Fourth Committee's work of evaluating the status of implementation of the Declaration. Bulgaria's initiative whereby the question had become a separate agenda item was well-founded and useful. Previous resolutions of the General Assembly, including resolution 37/32, and of the Economic and Social Council and the Special Committee on decolonization, had helped to invigorate the role of those organizations in the decolonization process.

/...

(Mr. Pulz, Czechoslovakia)

116. The granting of assistance to national liberation movements was a particularly important form of participation by those organizations in decolonization.

Activities which helped to create conditions for development based on indigenous resources following the achievement of independence were also significant. During the deliberations of the Special Committee's Sub-Committee on Petitions, Information and Assistance, representatives of national liberation movements of southern Africa had stressed the importance of the training of qualified national cadres. Another significant element in those organizations' activities was their participation in mobilizing world public opinion in support of decolonization, as well as material assistance for newly-independent States and the front-line States subjected to acts of aggression by the Pretoria régime.

117. The Secretary-General's report (A/38/111 and Add.1-3) described the activities of UNDP, UNESCO, WHO, FAO, UNICEF and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in support of decolonization. The report of the President of the Economic and Social Council on consultations held with the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee (E/1983/102) provided further information.

118. Further development of the activities of the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations in support of decolonization would depend on closer contact and co-operation with OAU and with the national liberation movements. In that connection, he welcomed the contribution of the OAU secretariat to the implementation of United Nations resolutions. He also welcomed the admission of Namibia, as represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, to membership in the International Atomic Energy Agency and the International Telecommunication Union.

119. The specialized agencies and the institutions were required to do more, however, than merely participate in efforts to eliminate traditional colonial remnants. The primary issue was to resist the growing endeavours of neo-colonialism aimed at subordinating young economies to the interests of foreign capital, particularly transnational corporations, and at incorporating the economies of the colonial Territories and newly established States in a system of international economic relations where the overt forms of colonial administration were replaced by economic mechanisms. The authority and resources of the specialized agencies should not be used for providing support for such endeavours, which might undermine the very foundations for independent development of the national economy after the attainment of independence.

120. His delegation was particularly concerned at the continuing support by some specialized agencies for the South African apartheid régime. South Africa was still a member of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). In the case of IMF, relations with South Africa had resulted in intensive support for the Pretoria régime, in the form of loans of \$446 million in 1976 and of \$1.1 billion in 1982. The latter had been granted despite the categorical appeal in General Assembly resolution 37/2 and despite the protests of international public opinion. It had been pushed through by representatives of the United States and other Western States regardless of the fact that South Africa did not meet the economic criteria stipulated by IMF for a loan.

/...

(Mr. Pulz, Czechoslovakia)

121. It had been revealed that IMF had taken the price of gold at the time of the decision to be \$315 an ounce, a price advantageous to the applicant, although at the time the price of gold on world markets had already averaged \$430 an ounce. IMF had also departed from its practice of requiring an absolute reduction in the applicant's budgetary deficit as well as a reduction relative to gross domestic product. It had been obvious at the time, and confirmed by further developments, that South Africa needed the credit to finance its racist oppression, its occupation of Namibia and its aggression against independent African States. The sum lent was approximately equal to the cost of South Africa's occupation of Namibia. The granting of the loan was evidence of the politicization of IMF under the influence of the United States, as further demonstrated by the refusal of credits to Viet Nam, Nicaragua and Grenada on other occasions.

122. The case of Grenada was a clear demonstration of the aims of the United States. After the failure of attempts to hold back progressive developments in Grenada through political and economic pressure, including the use of the IMF voting mechanism, the United States had launched a military attack and occupied the island. That flagrant violation of the Charter and international law, and the murder of many of the defenders of Grenadian independence, had taken place only a few years after the people of Grenada had implemented their right to self-determination.

123. His delegation had joined in the Special Committee's condemnation of the IMF loan to South Africa and in its appeal for the discontinuation of all co-operation with the South African régime until the right to self-determination of the people of Namibia had been realized and the inhuman system of apartheid eliminated.

124. The resolution adopted by the Special Committee (A/38/23 (Part IV), chap. VI) provided a good basis for further strengthening the participation of the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations in the decolonization effort. His delegation supported it fully and believed that its implementation would contribute significantly to the fulfilment of the aims in regard to decolonization set forth in the Charter and the Declaration.

125. Mr. MRANI ZENTAR (Morocco), speaking in the exercise of the right of reply, took strong exception to the remarks of the representative of Sao Tome and Principe. His allegations showed that he knew very little of what had taken place at the eighteenth ordinary session of the OAU Assembly or in the OAU Implementation Committee. At the eighteenth session, King Hassan II of Morocco had proposed a peaceful settlement through unification. The subsequent proposals of the Implementation Committee had been accepted immediately by Morocco, but agreement from the other side was still awaited. That representative would also seem to have forgotten King Hassan's solemn declaration, made recently in the United Nations, that if a referendum was found to be necessary it could take place at once and Morocco would undertake to abide by the outcome. The charge that Morocco was using delaying tactics was clearly unfounded.

/...



(Mr. Mrani Zentar, Morocco)

126. Regarding that representative's questioning of the authenticity of the representatives of the Saharan people, he said that Western Sahara was open to all who wished to find out for themselves the real aspirations of its inhabitants. Morocco was proud to have given those who had been in the forefront of the fight for liberation an opportunity to appear before the Fourth Committee.

127. Mr. CASSANDRA (Sao Tome and Principe) said that no positive steps had been taken since the eighteenth ordinary session of the OAU Assembly, and that although Morocco claimed that it was ready to abide by the outcome of a referendum nothing had been done in that direction. The OAU should set 31 December 1983 as a time limit. His delegation hoped that before then Morocco would resume negotiations with the Frente POLISARIO in order to work out a solution.

128. Mr. MOUSSA (Jordan) said he wished to place it on record that, if his delegation had been present during the vote on the decision concerning military activities, it would have voted in favour.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.