



NOV 7 1984

FOURTH COMMITTEE  
8th meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 23 October 1984  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 8th MEETING**

**Chairman: Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea)**

**CONTENTS**

**AGENDA ITEM 104: 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)**

\*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.

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 104: 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/39/23 (Part III), A/39/133, 478, 560; A/C.4/39/7 and Add.1; A/AC.109/766, 778, 779, 781, 782, 786 and 787)

Hearing of petitioners

1. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs. Reverón (Oficina de Información Internacional para la Independencia de Puerto Rico) took a seat at the petitioners' table.
2. Mrs. REVERON (Oficina de Información Internacional para la Independencia de Puerto Rico) said that the elimination of colonialism from the world was and should be the primary concern of all. The United Nations had clearly established the priority which that great task had for international peace and security. Although there was cause for satisfaction at the rapid dismantling of colonialism throughout the world, it should be noted that the new free nations were faced with reconstructing their pillaged countries. Because of the existing international economic system, their economies could be dominated by the former imperial metropolises. At the same time, economic interests were hand in glove with military interests, since the latter guaranteed the former. The most unfortunate countries in that regard were those to which no economic importance was attributed, but which were considered strategically essential owing to their geographical location.
3. The small Pacific islands offered the best example. Not all the money in the world could pay or compensate for the harm caused to the inhabitants of Bikini Atoll, where the administering Power had performed such barbaric acts as the testing and detonation of nuclear weapons. United States military interests and activities in the Pacific were the main obstacle to the development by the peoples of the Pacific of economies and political systems which corresponded to their interests. Guam was a typical example of a people mutilated by foreign interests and activities. And although at times efforts were made to present Non-Self-Governing Territories as beneficiaries from a military and economic viewpoint, as in the case of Puerto Rico, militarization was the fate of all those peoples which were of strategic interest to the imperialist Powers.
4. The insensitivity of the Western countries to the oppression of the Namibian people was cause for alarm and indignation. Apartheid continued to exist today owing to the co-operation which the South African racist régime received from its Western friends. The Western Powers had ignored United Nations appeals to end collaboration with that country. Despite the international community's demands, in recent years the South African régime had been strengthened through its

/...

(Mrs. Reverón)

co-operation with the International Monetary Fund and the so-called "quiet diplomacy" of the United States. In Western Sahara a people continued to struggle for independence. Despite the determination of the Saharan people the colonizing Power refused to negotiate peace. United States moral and economic support for the Government of Morocco allowed the latter to wage a colonial war in the face of the demands of the Saharan people that they should be able to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

5. A number of cases of colonialism persisted on the American continent. The people of Argentina continued to claim the Malvinas Islands. During the hostilities between the United Kingdom and Argentina, United States collaboration had made it possible for the United Kingdom to continue its occupation of the Islands. The economic activities and military installations of the United States, French and British colonial Powers in the Caribbean meant that the area was currently one of those most affected by colonialism in the world. In Bermuda, the Turks and Caicos Islands and Puerto Rico, to mention just a few examples, there were military installations operated by the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada. Owing to their geographical location, those Territories were frequently used by the United States military to launch attacks on neighbouring countries. All United States interventions in the area - the invasion of Nicaragua in the 1930s and its current sequel, the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961, the occupation of the Dominican Republic in 1965 and the invasion of Grenada in 1983 - had been carried out with the support of the United States military installations in Caribbean colonial Territories, mainly its naval base in Puerto Rico.

6. The Caribbean economies were also subjected to constant intervention by foreign economic Powers, which had succeeded in making the Caribbean countries dependent on their economies to facilitate their control over the region. The military installations scattered throughout the Caribbean region were an obstacle to the exercise of the right to self-determination. As long as the situation was allowed to persist, the objective of eliminating colonialism could not be attained. No people, however small, should be allowed to remain under colonial domination. Neither should efforts to disguise colonialism as "compacts of free association" be countenanced. It was the international community's duty and moral responsibility to ensure respect for the inalienable rights of all peoples under colonialism to self-determination and independence. Puerto Ricans expected no less of the international community.

7. Mrs. Reverón withdrew.

8. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. González-González took a place at the petitioners' table.

9. Mr. GONZALEZ-GONZALEZ, speaking as a private citizen and journalist, said that he took the phrase "in all other Territories under colonial domination" in agenda item 104 to refer to the three groups of colonial Territories referred to in paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), and the phrase "economic and other" to refer to questions of an economic, military, cultural, educational, psychological or moral nature - in short, to all means that the imperialists

/...

(Mr. González-González)

employed to ensure that peoples under their domination remained so, thus frustrating the implementation of the Declaration. In view of the importance of the unity of peoples in the struggle to attain sovereignty and independence, the imperialists took great care to keep their colonies isolated from their brothers and neighbours. Such psychological pressure was, if not the greatest obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration, at least one of the greatest obstacles, greater still than the obstacle posed by the economic exploitation of colonial Territories.

10. Few events were worthy of greater admiration in the decolonization of Africa than the fact that the free nations of the continent had always joined together in full support of the African Territories which had still not been liberated. The peoples of South Africa, Namibia and of the former Spanish Sahara bore testimony to that. That example should be emulated by all the free peoples of America in support of liberty for the colonial countries in the Caribbean region, where some countries were not yet free.

11. Much had been said about the use and abuse of colonial Territories as military bases for imperialism and about how such bases constituted one of the major obstacles to the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). The studies prepared by the Special Committee and the Fourth Committee proved conclusively that foreign bases did not exist for the defence of the inhabitants of the Territories, but only for the defence of the interests of imperialism at the expense of the colonized people. In addition, such bases created among the oppressed people a false sense of security as well as dependence on the colonizing Power, and fostered the emergence of a ruling class, which was then used by the oppressors as a bulwark against the implementation of the Declaration. Such phenomena were all too well known in the Territories of Guam and Namibia, as well as in Micronesia and the Caribbean colonies.

12. However, what constituted the major obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration were the threats which, at certain moments, a certain imperialist country made against Members of the United Nations to ensure that many of them did not express support for the application of resolution 1514 (XV) to a colonial Territory over which the imperialist country in question considered that it had exclusive jurisdiction. Pressure applied by the United States Government against certain countries in order to thwart the application of resolution 1514 (XV) was a clear example of how blackmail was used in an attempt to humble free, sovereign and independent nations.

13. Mr. González-González withdrew.

14. Mr. KAKOURIS (Cyprus) said that much remained to be done in the area of decolonization before the objectives set forth almost 40 years earlier in the United Nations Charter were achieved. For example, there were still the policies followed by the apartheid régime of South Africa in Namibia. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Cyprus had repeatedly condemned the South African racist régime and its blatant contempt for the resolutions and decisions

/...



(Mr. Kakouris, Cyprus)

adopted by the United Nations. In a statement in the general debate at the current session of the General Assembly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cyprus had condemned the persistence of the illegal colonial occupation and exploitation of Namibia by South Africa and its refusal to implement the plan embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978); he had reaffirmed the full support of Cyprus for the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia, and for their heroic struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, their authentic and legitimate representative (A/39/PV.8, pp. 81-82).

15. He drew attention to the unwavering commitment of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, of which Cyprus was a member, to support the right to self-determination of the people of Namibia, as reflected in the Final Communiqué of the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly (A/49/560). In the Communiqué, the Movement had reiterated its condemnation of the sabotaging of the Namibian independence talks by the racist South African régime, which insisted on linking the independence of Namibia with extraneous issues and continued its flagrant defiance of United Nations resolutions and decisions.

16. Regrettably, although it had been 10 years since the enactment of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, those resources continued to be relentlessly exploited by South Africa and other foreign economic interests, with total contempt for the repeated verdicts of the international community expressed through the United Nations and other international forums. The working paper prepared by the Secretariat regarding Namibia (A/AC.109/782) clearly showed the degree of exploitation of the Territory's natural and human resources. The racist régime of South Africa released carefully selected statistical information to give the impression that Namibia was an unviable Territory which relied for its survival on South Africa's economic support. The report prepared by the Special Committee showed, on the contrary, that the profits reaped by South Africa and foreign transnational corporations were not those offered by an unviable Territory; the fact was that over 60 per cent of Namibia's gross domestic product was appropriated as company profits before taxes. South Africa's extension of apartheid to Namibia guaranteed an abundance of cheap labour and high profits, and that had lured many to seek wealth at the expense of the Namibian people. Such exploitation covered the widest gamut of the economic life of Namibia: South Africa and foreign corporations continuously kept a stranglehold on the Territory's fishing, mining and petroleum industries.

17. His delegation called upon the South African régime to end its unco-operative attitude towards the Special Committee. Cyprus reaffirmed its unwavering commitment to exert every effort to remove the last vestiges of colonial rule and allow colonial countries and peoples to exercise their right to self-determination.

18. Mr. CESAR (Czechoslovakia) said that the military activities of the colonial Powers and their allies in various colonial Territories had an adverse effect on the international situation in general and on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in particular.

/...

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

Despite the provisions of the United Nations Charter, the Declaration, the Plan of Action for its implementation, and various General Assembly resolutions and decisions, the colonial Powers not only maintained their military arsenals in the colonial Territories, but had taken steps to expand them. There was no doubt that military pressure was being exerted on national liberation movements, that acts of direct aggression were being perpetrated from colonial Territories against neighbouring States and that, in general, the Non-Self-Governing Territories constituted an element in the strategic plans of the colonial Powers and their allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

19. Instead of fulfilling their obligations under the United Nations Charter and the Declaration, in particular the obligation to contribute to the development of the colonial peoples to enable them to exercise their right to self-determination, the colonial Powers were deliberately stifling the identity of the colonial peoples in order to impede their independence, imposing militarization with a view to suppressing and physically eliminating freedom fighters in Namibia, Puerto Rico and other Territories, and changing the demographic composition of the colonies by establishing bases and military installations. Moreover, in some Territories the colonial Powers had occupied vast areas for military purposes: for example, in Puerto Rico and the island of Vieques, 14 per cent of the territory served the needs of the United States Army; in Micronesia, 62 per cent of the territory had been allocated by the United States for nuclear-weapon tests.

20. Only by a great stretch of the imagination could one believe that the militarization of the colonies contributed to their economic, social, political or cultural development. On the contrary, the bases and military activities of the colonial Powers in those Territories served only the strategic, hegemonistic goals of imperialism. That was what explained their determined struggle to perpetuate colonial rule. There were many examples of the use of military bases by the colonial Powers for direct or indirect aggression: Viet Nam, Grenada and Angola had been the targets of attacks launched from Guam, Vieques and Namibia respectively. The commitment by the forces of imperialism to suppress national liberation movements and impose neo-colonialist models of development on newly independent States enabled the South African military-industrial complex and Western monopolies supporting it to reap fabulous profits. As stated in document A/AC.131/119, the South African war machine had the support not only of Western transnational corporations, but also of several Western States, lead by the United States and Israel. South Africa was thus able to acquire and manufacture conventional weapons and develop its nuclear-weapon capability, in violation of the arms embargo imposed by the Security Council in its resolution 418 (1977). That situation not only impeded the process of decolonization, but also endangered international peace and security.

21. The continuing presence of military bases and installations and the increase in military activity of the colonial Powers constituted a serious obstacle to the exercise by colonial peoples of their right to self-determination and independence and a threat to international peace and security, and hence were contrary to the provisions and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Bearing such

/...

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

facts in mind, his delegation therefore reaffirmed its support for the adoption of measures to promote elimination of the military bases and presence of the colonial Powers in Non-Self-Governing Territories.

22. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam) said that the members of the Special Committee had during the year prepared very important documents which, although they did not always fully reflect realities, exposed the nature of neo-colonialism, confirmed the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination and national independence and revealed the dangerous actions threatening peace and security in the world.

23. The political, economic and military situation in colonial Territories remained deplorable and unacceptable. The administering Powers clung to those territories in their continuing attempts to exploit their natural resources, to sell them goods and weapons and expand military installations there. Investment by transnational corporations was increasing and the administering Powers often used the Territories as springboards to threaten and oppose neighbouring countries and peoples. At the same time, there was close collusion between imperialism, colonialism, racism and apartheid aimed at perpetuating their exploitation, military bases and oppression of the indigenous peoples. They were seeking every means to put into practice a new type of dangerous collective colonialism by using military and economic activities against other peoples. The struggle to end the activities of foreign interests and to eradicate the vestiges of colonialism remained difficult and complex. In that connection, it was appropriate to recall the recommendation of the Special Committee in chapter V of document A/39/23 (Part III) and the contents of paragraph 14, subparagraph 3, of chapter VI of the same document. Viet Nam was firmly convinced that the final victory would belong to those who continued their struggle against colonialism, imperialism and racism, with determination and energy and by all means at their disposal, including military means.

24. The military activities of the administering Powers in the Non-Self-Governing Territories were a source of tension and a threat to international peace and security. As a littoral State of the Pacific Ocean, and a victim of various types of aggression, Viet Nam had good reason to be worried by the activities of the administering Power in Guam and in the Pacific Islands. Those islands were not only bridgeheads to East Asia but also military bases and installations for aggression, as was shown in paragraph 2 of the working paper on Guam prepared by the Secretariat (A/AC.109/766). While such activities were going on, no one in Asia could feel safe. Instead of granting independence to the peoples of the colonial Territories, the administering Powers resorted to the policy of annexing or dismembering those Territories through political, military and economic activities. That policy was particularly dangerous if account was taken of the expansion and consolidation of military bases in the area and the growing collusion and military co-operation with hegemonism.

25. As to Namibia, the largest strategic fortress of colonialism in southern Africa, the economic and military activities of some countries in the area constituted an obstacle to its independence. The racist régime, with the military

/...

(Mr. Le Kim Chung, Viet Nam)

and political support of certain Western States, continued to intensify its economic and military activities against the Namibian people and its sole legitimate representative, SWAPO. The growing demand for uranium had increased the Territory's attraction for certain Powers. Rössing Uranium, a consortium of Western and South African firms, had created the necessary conditions for South Africa to develop its nuclear capacity, a fact which had been denounced by the Organization of African Unity and the Non-Aligned Movement. It was only with the support and assistance of Western States, such as the United States, the United Kingdom and Israel, that Pretoria was able to continue its policy of occupation, oppression and repression in southern Africa.

26. The administering Powers continued to use the colonial Territories for their wicked designs, instead of adopting immediate measures to ensure their independence. It sufficed to recall that Guam had been used by United States B-52 bombers as a base for inflicting suffering and destruction on the peoples of Indo-China. A Territory in the Caribbean, Puerto Rico, had also been used as a weapons testing ground and a staging area for intervention against neighbouring countries and aggression against Grenada. The position of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam was clear: it would continue to support all colonial peoples fighting for their independence and national liberation.

27. Mr. QASIM (Oman) said that the activities of foreign economic and other interests were impeding the granting of independence to certain colonial countries and peoples and promoting apartheid. South Africa exploited Namibia's valuable resources, denying the right of the Namibian people to self-determination so as to continue to plunder its natural wealth. Working paper A/AC.109/782 prepared by the Secretariat threw light on the activities of foreign interests and the impact they were having on Namibia. Despite the many resolutions of the General Assembly, the situation had not changed, owing to South Africa's intransigence. The policy of apartheid was contrary to basic humanity, and South Africa should assume full responsibility for the breakdown of the Lusaka and Cape Verde negotiations and for perpetuating exploitation of the resources of Namibia and its people. Furthermore, South Africa's policy and its efforts to produce nuclear weapons required that the international community should spare no effort to put an end to that serious threat to international peace and security. The international community should help to put an end to those exploitative activities so that Namibia might exercise its right to self-determination.

28. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom) said he was speaking as representative of the administering Power responsible for 10 of the Non-Self-Governing Territories that appeared on the agenda of the Committee, said that when the delegation of the Soviet Union had spoken recently of 11 Territories under United Kingdom administration, it had not taken account of the fact that Brunei Darussalam had already achieved independence some 10 months earlier. Despite the large number of Territories for which his Government was responsible, the debate had so far concentrated almost exclusively on the situation in southern Africa. It was not right to extrapolate from the unique situation existing in that area and apply the findings to the Territories under United Kingdom administration.

/...

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

29. There was no denying that developed countries could greatly contribute to the advancement of developing countries. As one of the primary sources of private capital for the developing world, the United Kingdom took particular interest in the contribution the private sector could make to the development process and had taken a number of measures to promote private investments overseas. Moreover, in the Territories it administered, the United Kingdom was responsible only for external affairs and defence; the local, democratically-elected Governments were responsible for economic policy. Therefore, criticism directed at the economic situation in one of those Territories amounted to criticism of the local Government as much as of the administering Power. The new State of Brunei Darussalam was a good example of a case in which foreign economic interests had not impeded independence or development. The lack of labour and natural resources in many Territories prevented them from following the economic model of other developing countries and obliged them to resort to capital-intensive industries for which foreign investments were essential. That disproved the frequent assertion that foreign economic interests were only there to exploit natural resources for their own ends. Many of the States represented in the Committee, including the United Kingdom, played host to foreign economic interests. It was important that those interests be required to act in conformity with local laws, but they did help to speed up the industrialization process and to provide funds for development, technical skills and managerial expertise.

30. The United Kingdom's two largest dependent Territories, Bermuda and the Cayman Islands, fittingly illustrated the benefits produced there by the activities of foreign economic interests. In Bermuda, tourism generated \$300 million a year or more than 50 per cent of foreign exchange earnings. Its liberal fiscal policy had attracted international companies, whose numbers stood at over 5,800 at the end of 1983, and whose expenditure in fiscal year 1982/83 amounted to \$165 million or 30 per cent of Bermuda's foreign exchange earnings. That was reflected in the fact that per capita income in Bermuda was some \$11,000 per annum which was in itself a remarkable achievement. The gross national product was expected to be more than \$1 billion in the period 1984-1985. The standard of living was high and social welfare services, particularly in the field of education and health, were second to none. In the Cayman Islands the situation was equally favourable. The tourist sector had contributed \$20 million to the economy and the banking sector had generated \$30 million in direct expenditure. The construction industry had contributed \$40 million and had employed, almost exclusively, persons native to the islands. The insurance sector had contributed \$52 million to the Territory's finances.

31. There was clearly no evidence of poverty, unemployment or exploitation in any of those Territories. On the contrary, a sound economic infrastructure, beneficial to the local population, existed. Resolutions of the Fourth Committee frequently called on administering Powers to strengthen the economies of dependent Territories. It was extremely frustrating to be criticized for encouraging private sector contribution towards that end. Naturally, the United Kingdom would give all necessary help to enable those Territories to move towards independence, provided always that that was the freely expressed will of the local population.

32. The United Kingdom strongly condemned the degrading system of apartheid, which was a gross violation of human rights. His Government fully complied with the

/...



(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

embargo against the sale of arms and related material to South Africa and pursued a policy of refraining from any military collaboration with that country. It nevertheless considered it necessary and desirable to maintain economic links with South Africa, since such links could contribute to the process of peaceful reform. While sharing the aim of many others who wished to see change in South Africa, the United Kingdom did not support further sanctions which, in its view, would damage the prospects for peaceful change, inflict hardship on those whose livelihood depended on foreign investment, create serious economic problems for other African countries in the region and would lead to further intransigence on the part of the South African Government. The draft resolution contained in document A/39/23 (Part III) was, therefore, unacceptable to the United Kingdom in a number of respects.

33. The United Kingdom also had serious reservations, on both procedural and substantive grounds, concerning the draft decision on military activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories, and did not accept the draft's implicit assertion that all military activities in those Territories were, by definition, inimical to the interests of the inhabitants and an impediment to their right to self-determination. Self-determination had always been the linchpin of the United Kingdom's decolonization policy, and almost one third of the Member States of the United Nations bore witness to that. The presence of British military facilities in an inhabited Territory - and that was only the case in Bermuda - was with the consent of the local population, contrary to the affirmation of speakers who had accused the United Kingdom not only of militarizing the Falkland Islands, but also of using Bermuda as a target for the testing of Pershing missiles.

34. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina) said that the United Nations' work on decolonization was far from completed since South Africa persisted in delaying the independence of Namibia and in maintaining its apartheid system. Moreover, in most of the Territories which were still not self-governing, the economy was controlled from abroad and the colonial peoples received little economic benefit from the exploitation of their natural resources. Laws emanated from parliaments in which the colonial peoples lacked direct representation. Namibia was a clear example of that situation. Pretoria's economic control over Namibia was virtually complete, since the State or South African companies monopolized the mining and marketing of diamonds and other precious and strategic minerals and metals, as well as the transport, communications and administrative sectors of Namibia, as shown in document A/AC.109/782. The Government of Argentina strictly complied with the embargo on the sale of arms to Pretoria, condemned military collaboration with the apartheid régime, as well as the latter's attacks and pressures on neighbouring States with the aim of destabilizing them.

35. Foreign economic and military activities affected decolonization in other Territories such as Ascension Island, where there were military installations used to support the perpetuation of colonialism in the South Atlantic. In the Malvinas Islands, the colonial Power had constructed a combined air and naval base which exceeded its supposedly defensive requirements. Military personnel outnumbered the civilian population by three to one, and investment in the installation and

/...



(Mr. Pfirter, Argentina)

maintenance of strategic infrastructure far exceeded the meagre allocations for socio-economic development. There were those in London who claimed that the islands were important to NATO, and a strategic airport capable of accommodating the longest-range transport planes and bombers, was currently under construction there. South Africa had been used as a logistical support base for the construction of that airport and there were no guarantees that missiles or nuclear weapons had not been installed. Moreover, there were nuclear submarines belonging to the United Kingdom in the area. A foreign company, with headquarters in London, the Falkland Islands Company, practically monopolized commerce and the ownership of land and livestock. The Shackleton Report, an official British document which referred to those problems, contained a series of recommendations which had not been implemented. It was to be supposed that the petitioners sent by the colonial Legislative Council of the islands, who were shortly due to appear before the Fourth Committee would shed light on those problems.

36. Mrs. BERMUDEZ (Cuba) said that military bases, installations, tests and exercises in colonial Territories were used for attacks against independent countries, and constituted a danger to peace and security in many regions and an obstacle to the liberation of the peoples of those Territories. Documents A/AC.109/766, 778, 781 and others showed that in Namibia, South Africa had expanded and strengthened its military bases, increased by 21.4 per cent its military expenditure, which totalled \$3 billion, and had developed and perfected chemical and bacteriological weapons for use against national liberation movements or other independent countries in southern Africa. Such weapons were produced in secret research centres in South Africa, in violation of international norms and treaties.

37. In Guam, military installations of the United States Air Force and Navy occupied a third of the Territory of the island, depriving the population of a substantial portion of its territory. In Bermuda, the Turks and Caicos Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands the administering Powers were engaging in military activities in which, in the case of Bermuda, other Western countries were participating. Document A/AC.109/778 confirmed the strategic importance of that Territory for NATO, since in case of armed conflict, 90 per cent of defence supplies would be transported by sea across the Atlantic. In addition, a representative of the British Royal Navy had confirmed the strategic importance of that territory for Western Europe and the United States and had compared its importance to that of Ascension Island as a stopover point for the British task force in its conflict with Argentina over the Malvinas Islands, which confirmed the use of another colonial Territory, Saint Helena, for military attacks on other countries.

38. The United States maintained two naval installations in Bermuda which occupied a tenth of its total area. In 1983 two Pershing-II missiles had landed there. Two local groups had protested strongly on behalf of the population; the response by the United States Consul in the Territory confirmed that further tests of that kind were scheduled for the following months. Recently, United States Marines and Bermuda Police officers had participated in jungle warfare training operations and in exercises at the United States Marine Base at Camp Lejeune, in North Carolina.

/...

(Mrs. Bermudez, Cuba)

In the United States Virgin Islands, the United States Navy had a radar calibration station and underwater tracking range. Military activities were also being carried out in Puerto Rico and in Micronesia, which jeopardized the opportunities of those peoples for achieving independence.

39. Her delegation believed that, as a matter of urgency, the Committee should deal separately with the question of military activities impeding decolonization, and that the General Assembly should adopt more forceful resolutions on the subject than ever. In August of the previous year the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had adopted a text which had, among other things, blamed the United States, South Africa, Israel and other Western States for impeding the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV), and the Fourth Committee should endorse that condemnation.

40. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom), exercising his right of reply said that the representatives of Argentina and Cuba had referred to an alleged military base in the Falkland Islands, but that the United Kingdom had no strategic interest in the South Atlantic, and its military installations were only intended to defend the islands against a repetition of the events of 1982. The existence of a NATO base in the islands was pure fantasy, since the North Atlantic Treaty was only concerned with the northern hemisphere. As for the number of troops stationed in the islands, it was approximately double the number of inhabitants. The figure of 10,000 troops mentioned by the Argentine representative was the number of Argentine troops that had invaded the islands in 1982.

41. With regard to the economic aspects raised by the representative of Argentina, it was not surprising that that country should try to misrepresent economic conditions in the Falkland Islands, describing the Falkland Islands Company as an enterprise for colonial exploitation which disregarded the local population. It was surprising that the Argentine delegation had raised the question of the Falkland Islands Company in connection with an agenda item entitled "Activities of foreign economic and other interests ...". If the Falkland Islands Company was a foreign economic interest, it must be exploiting an indigenous population. The Argentine position had always been that the inhabitants of the Falkland Islands were not an indigenous population, but merely British employees. The representative of Argentina had to decide whether the Falkland Islands Company was a foreign economic interest, in which case the inhabitants of the Falkland Islands were an indigenous population, or whether the opposite was true.

42. It was even more surprising that the question of the Falkland Islands Company as a foreign economic interest was being raised in connection with an agenda item on activities impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It should be made clear what declaration and what implementation the representative of Argentina was referring to. He wished to know if that meant that Argentina was willing to accept the implementation of the Declaration to the Falkland Islands. If so, that would constitute recognition of the main argument of the United Kingdom, to the effect that the inhabitants of the Falkland Islands enjoyed the right to self-determination provided for in paragraph 2 of the Declaration. Moreover,

/...

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

paragraph 5 of the Declaration stated that immediate steps should be taken to transfer all powers to the peoples of those Territories, without any conditions or reservations, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom. He observed that the ultimate goal of Argentina's policy on the Falkland Islands was to incorporate them into Argentina. In conclusion, he suggested that the Argentine representative should keep in mind the agenda item under discussion when making his remarks if he did not wish to detract from the validity of his arguments.

43. Mr. CASTELLI (Argentina) and Mrs. BERMUDEZ (Cuba) said that they would exercise their right of reply at a later meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.