United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records*



FOURTH COMMITTEE 5th meeting held on Thursday, 18 October 1984 at 10.30 a.m. New York

NOV 6 1984

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 5th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea)

CONTENTS

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

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, <u>APARTHEID</u> 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 (<u>continued</u>)

•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.

84-56816 3395S (E)

Distr. GENERAL A/C.4/39/SR.5 22 October 1984

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (A/C.4/39/3, 4 and 5)

Sec. 2

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to a communication containing a request for a hearing concerning the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) (A/C.4/39/3), a communication containing a request for a hearing concerning Namibia (A/C.4/39/4) and a communication containing a request for a hearing concerning the 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 (A/C.4/39/5). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to grant those requests.

2. It was so decided.

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, <u>APARTHEID</u> 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 (<u>continued</u>) (A/39/23 (Part III), A/39/133, 478; A/AC.109/766, 778, 779, 781, 782, 786 and 787)

3. <u>Mr. LAL</u> (Pakistan) said that many of the hopes and aspirations embodied in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted 24 years earlier, remained unfulfilled and many peoples and communities around the globe still remained deprived and exploited. Despite a number of resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and other international bodies, foreign interests were still continuing to exploit and plunder the natural resources of Non-Self-Governing Territories. Those policies were impeding the Territories' economic growth and social progress and preventing the elimination of colonialism, <u>apartheid</u> and racial discrimination from the regions concerned. The most striking example of that situation was that of the Namibian people, who were still subject to the domination and exploitation of the <u>apartheid</u> régime of South Africa.

4. After referring to Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, approved by the General Assembly and enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1975, and General Assembly resolution 38/36 C of 1 December 1973, he said that there was still no indication that the South African and other foreign interests which had monopolized the Namibian economy for 100 years intended to abandon their shameful exploitation of Namibia's considerable natural wealth. Although the exploitation of those resources had led to a substantial flow of profits to foreign economic interests, it had not benefited the people of Namibia in any way. Its beneficiaries were and remained the transnational corporations, the racist régime of South Africa and the white minority of Namibia.

1 ...

(Mr. Lal, Pakistan)

5. Years of foreign economic investment in Namibia had encouraged the hardening of South Africa's intransigence with regard to the liberation of Namibia. The support given to South Africa's racist minority régime by certain Powers in the form of increased foreign capital investment had actually increased over the years. As they witnessed the increased collaboration between countries professing and proclaiming their commitment to justice, on the one hand, and the perpetrator of the worst crimes against humanity, on the other, the indigenous inhabitants of Namibia were justified in feeling that such collaboration reflected a deepening commitment on the part of the collaborating countries to the maintenance of the status quo. The outcome of such ignominious deals was the further entrenchment of the racist régime's illegal domination over the international Territory of Namibia and the strengthening of the <u>apartheid</u> system.

6. The investment of capital and export of foreign equipment and technology to assist South Africa in developing its nuclear capability represented a new and ominous form of the immoral collaboration between some industrialized countries and the racist régime in South Africa. Apart from being a potential threat to regional and international peace through proliferation of nuclear weapons, the development boded ill for the future of Namibia. Pakistan called upon all States engaged in nuclear collaboration with the racist régime in South Africa to stop such collusion forthwith, and also appealed to all States which had not yet done so to comply with Security Council resolution 418 (1977) imposing an arms embargo on South Africa. As the current Chairman of the Committee established by Security Council resolution 421 (1977), Pakistan was involved in monitoring the military collaboration of Member States with South Africa and in exerting concerted pressure on the Security Council to implement the recommendations contained in the Committee's report of 1980.

7. His delegation also wished to place on record Pakistan's deep concern over the conditions in colonial territories in the Pacific region. Despite numerous appeals by the General Assembly, foreign economic and financial interests were continuing to exploit the human and natural resources of some of those territories to the detriment of the rights of the indigenous peoples; in particular, inhabitants were being deprived of their lands owing to the absence of restrictions on the sale of land to foreigners.

8. Turning once more to Namibia, he said that the time had come to move beyond the stage of condemnations and to take effective measures against the forces which continued to provide economic strength to South Africa. The reluctance of certain Powers to restrain their multinational corporations from joining with the South African régime in the shameless plunder of the colonial territories belied their professions of loyalty to the cause of independence and self-determination of peoples. Public opinion in countries responsible for collusion with South Africa should be further informed through a still more intensive publicity campaign of the role played by those countries' national enterprises in propping up the colonial and racist régime in South Africa at the cost of the indigenous peoples' inalienable rights.

1

(Mr. Lal, Pakistan)

9. In conclusion, he commended the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples for its work during 1984. His delegation supported the resolution on the activities of foreign economic and other interests adopted by the Special Committee on 21 August 1984 and hoped that the measures recommended in that resolution would receive unanimous support in the Fourth Committee.

10. <u>Mr. AL SABAH</u> (Kuwait) said that despite all the efforts of the United Nations to put an end to colonialism, <u>apartheid</u> and racial discrimination in southern Africa, certain Powers were still perpetuating South Africa's domination of Namibia in the region and denying the Namibian people's right to the use of its own natural resources. Foreign economic interests assisted in depleting those resources, thereby encouraging South Africa's further entrenchment in Namibia. Furthermore, the establishment of foreign military bases and installations was directly contrary to the indigenous population's interests.

11. His Government supported all efforts to impose sanctions on South Africa and, at the same time, to impose an overall embargo on trade with the South African régime. In view of the non-compliance of certain Western countries with the clearly expressed international will for sanctions, Kuwait felt that it would be useful to focus attention on an embargo on arms and oil, and had already taken decisive practical measures in respect of an oil embargo. It was regrettable indeed that certain Western countries were still trying to find justifications for their failure to associate themselves with such measures and, worse still, encouraging the development of military installations and bases in a Non-Self-Governing Territory. Arguments that such action was in the interest of the indigenous population as it provided employment opportunities could be dismissed as flimsy pretexts. Those who genuinely wished to help the peoples of Non-Self Governing Territories should strengthen their basic economic structures and provide all possible chances for the development of their natural resources. His Government, for its part, supported all General Assembly decisions and resolutions concerning the use of Non-Self-Governing Territories for military purposes.

12. <u>Mr. HANANIYA</u> (Nigeria) said that Nigeria knew from its own experience of colonial rule the harrowing and degrading nature of colonial domination, which was a negation of freedom and the principle of self-determination. Africa had borne the brunt of the worst form of colonialism, manifested in South Africa's obnoxious <u>apartheid</u> policy and its continued illegal occupation of Namibia, despite the termination of its mandate over the Territory by the General Assembly almost 20 years earlier.

13. It was ironic that the very countries which often proclaimed the superiority of their values of freedom and democracy and had made themselves the apostles of democratic choice had aligned themselves with the <u>apartheid</u> régime, whose institutionalized system of racial discrimination had been universally condemned as a crime against humanity. The reasons for the double standard were not difficult to discern: South Africa's supporters, drawn by the wealth of Namibia's natural resources, were motivated by narrow economic expediency as well as by so-called

(Mr. Hananiya, Nigeria)

strategic interests. It was the involvement of foreign economic interests - chief among them corporations from South Africa, Western Europe and North America - which had emboldened South Africa to entrench itself in the Territory.

14. The exploitation extended to human resources as well. The transnational corporations had instituted discriminatory labor policies, causing summary dismissals of black workers, job insecurity, the denial of their right to unionize, and subsistence wages.

15. The countries whose enterprises were engaged in the illegal exploitation had argued that investments made by transnational corporations yielded profits which in turn were helping to build Namibia's economy. That assertion was not borne out by the facts: there was a big gap between Namibia's gross domestic product and its gross national product, and over 60 per cent of the gross domestic product was appropriated in the form of company profits before taxation. The per capita income ratio between whites and blacks was shamefully inequitable and the black population's per capita share of the gross national product was one of the lowest in the world.

16. The militarization of the Territory by the <u>apartheid</u> régime constituted another great obstacle to Namibian independence. Nigeria was committed to the struggle of the Namibian people and strongly condemned attempts to predicate the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on the settlement of extraneous issues: there could be no linkage between the withdrawal of Cuban defensive forces in the Republic of Angola and the independence of Namibia.

17. A recent seminar sponsored by the Government of Nigeria and the Special Committee against <u>Apartheid</u>, held in Lagos, Nigeria, had examined the illegal status of the <u>apartheid</u> régime and other legal aspects of the struggle against <u>apartheid</u> and had produced far-reaching conclusions and recommendations which, when implemented, would help in the elimination of <u>apartheid</u>.

18. The <u>apartheid</u> régime had in the previous few weeks tried to trick the international community into believing that it was about to begin the process of power-sharing by introducing so-called constitutional reforms. The massive boycott of those so-called reforms showed that the majority population had not been deceived. Those who had nursed the hope that the <u>apartheid</u> régime could be persuaded to reform the system through engagements, constructive or otherwise, should have realized that such hopes must be abandoned; and they should now rally to the fight against <u>apartheid</u>. The racist régime in Pretoria did not understand the language of appeasement. The only language it understood was that of sanctions. Nigeria reiterated its call for the immediate imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

19. <u>Mr. FAN Guoxiang</u> (China) said that colonial authorities and foreign economic interests were interdependent, the former acting to shield the latter and the latter supporting the former. Namibia was a typical case in which foreign economic interests had collaborated with the South African colonial authorities to obstruct the people's independence. The abundant natural resources of the Territory, which

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

ought to belong to the Namibian people and to have brought them benefit, were almost entirely in the hands of South African and other foreign interests, which were engaged in a frenzied plunder that was exhausting the resources. Three well-known transnational corporations had seized about 80 per cent of Namibia's mineral resources and controlled about 95 per cent of its mineral production and export; the fishing industry was totally monopolized by South African corporations and the fur industry by transnational corporations. Foreign economic interests also had a complete hold on Namibia's finances, communications, transport and trade. Moreover, the people themselves were being cruelly exploited by racial discrimination and oppressive labor conditions.

20. China appealed to the international community to impose economic sanctions on South Africa, to demand that the Governments concerned apply legal and administrative measures to enterprises under their jurisdiction active in Namibia, and to demand that foreign economic interests cease all activities harmful to the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

21. China knew from experience that colonialists brought nothing but endless misery and that only sovereign, independent countries could possibly carry on mutually beneficial economic co-operation with other countries or foreign corporations on a basis of equality. World opinion should be mobilized in support of early independence for Namibia, the largest colony remaining on earth.

22. <u>Mr. HELLER</u> (Mexico) said that the United Nations had been most successful in playing a relevant role precisely in the area of decolonization, where the face of the contempotery world had been changed in recent decades in large part thanks to the work of the Organization.

23. Yet the persistence of colonialism, <u>apartheid</u> and racial discrimination presented a continuing challenge. The illegal occupation and plunder of Namibia by South Africa had been made possible not only by the régime's own repressive practices and military domination but also to a great degree by the collaboration of foreign economic interests and the largely Western States supporting them in all spheres.

24. Mexico condemned the activities of foreign economic and other interests in Namibia because they violated United Nations principles and resolutions and consolidated South African racial policies and exploitation, thus encouraging the aggressiveness, intransigence and arrogance that made South Africa a grave threat to regional and international peace.

25. Working to end colonial domination was not the only responsibility of the international community. It had to guarantee the viability of any newly independent State by ensuring a proper economic framework for its political independence. If foreign economic interests continued operating under current terms, the economic and social future of colonial peoples and Territories was imperiled.

:

(Mr. Heller, Mexico)

26. Mexico also wished to emphasize its concern over military activities which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, such as the military collaboration of certain States with South Africa, especially in the nuclear field, and the use of colonial Territories for military operations in southern Africa, the Caribbean and elsewhere.

27. Some States were seeking to place the decolonization process within the context of East-West confrontation. However, the struggle against colonialism was not negotiable and could not be made secondary to any such confrontation. To maintain the reverse would mean to deny peoples the possibility of forging their own way free from the imposition of external conditions.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.