

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

FORTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records*



FOURTH COMMITTEE
9th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 7 October 1987
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 9th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus)

CONTENTS

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

AGENDA ITEM 109 : 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 DC2/350, 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.4/42/SR.9
12 October 1987

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (A/C.4/42/4/Add.4-6, A/C.4/42/6/Add.7-9)

New Caledonia

1. The CHAIRMAN said that three requests for hearings concerning New Caledonia (A/C.4/42/4/Add.4-6) had been submitted to the Committee.

2. Mr. TAIX (France), commenting on the request for a hearing received from a **representative** of FLNKS (Front de Libération nationale Kanak socialiste) (A/C.4/42/4/Add.4), said that FLNKS was a political party actively engaged in all etagen of the democratic process in New Caledonia. The petitioner **was himself a senior** elected official of the Territory and, as such, had no place at the **petitionera'** table.

3. Furthermore, since New Caledonian⁸ had voted against independence in the 13 September 1987 referendum, thereby determining the framework within which they **wished** the Territory's future to be **organized**, any discussion of that future should take place in either Nouméa or Paris. It was wholly inappropriate for it to be discussed at the United Nations. His delagation could not therefore be present if the **petitioner** came to address the Committee.

4. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no further objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to grant the requests.

5. It waa ao decided.

Namibia

6. The CHAIRMAN said that three requests concerning the question of Namibia (A/C.4/42/6/Add.7-9) had been submitted to the Committee. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to grant those requests.

7. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 109: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLDNIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN **NAMIBIA**, AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES **UNDER** COLDNIAL **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 (A/42/23 (Part III)) (continued)

8. Mr. RAVANCHI (Islamic Republic of Iran) speaking in exercise of the right Of reply, **said** that he categorically denied the **accusation** made by the **Zionist representative** at the Committee's 7th meeting that Iran had been conducting **secret** business with Pretoria. he condemned the Zionist **régime's** racism and drew

/...

(Mr. Rnvanchi, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

attention to the similarity between that régime and the Houth African régime, both of which attacked their neighbours and imposed discriminatory systems. The two régimes co-operated extensively, particularly in the military field.

9. Iran did not export oil to South Africa. It maintained a comprehensive embargo on trade with that country and actively promoted the elimination of racism.

10. Hr. SAVOV (Bulgaria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, challenged the unfounded assertions made by the United Kingdom representative at the Committee's 8th meeting with regard to fishing in the south Atlantic. Bulgaria's fishing activities in that area were conducted in strict compliance with international law. It was morally inadmissible for the United Kingdom to make such accusations when that country's negative vote in the Security Council was preventing Namibia from exercising its inalienable right of self-determination and independence.

11. Hr. JOFFE (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he stood by, and would be prepared to repeat, everything that he had said at the 7th meeting, notwithstanding the comments made by the representative of the nine Arab countries that had exercised their right of reply.

12. Mr. HILMI (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he and other representatives of Arab countries had had frequent occasion to make much charges in the past. No representative should make unsubstantiated statements. He challenged the Zionist representative to provide proof that the countries in question were exporting oil to South Africa. As far as he was concerned, that allegation was a complete lie.

13. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he had not challenged the legality of fishing activities in the south Atlantic by Bulgaria and other Eastern European countries, but had raised the question of whether such activities impeded implementation of the Declaration. It was his belief that such activities made no contribution to Namibia in terms of either employment or income.

14. Mr. SAVOV (Bulgaria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, repeated that his country's fishing activities complied strictly with international law and that there was therefore no danger of any depletion of Namibia's natural resources.

15. Mr. CHERNYY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the United Kingdom had tried yet again to divert attention from the substance of the agenda item under discussion. He wished to refer to the 1986 report of Standing Committee II of the Council for Namibia, containing detailed information on the Namibian economy, which firmly contradicted the United Kingdom's assertions as to the contribution made by transnational corporations to that Territory. By way of example, the report mentioned the very

(Mr. Chernyy, USSR)

Considerable difference in income between blacks and whites in Namibia and the funding provided by international banks in support of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia.

16. The **CHAIRMAN** invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution on foreign economic interareata and the draft decision on military interests proposed by the Special Committee (A/42/23 (Part III), chap. IV, para. 12 and para. 11).

17. **Ma. MILLER** (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that Canada had consistently supported the decolonization process and efforts to achieve a peaceful transition towards independence. A firm supporter of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), it had provided Namibians and the peoples of other colonial Territories with significant development assistance, which it believed promoted economic viability and accelerated the process of self-determination.

18. Notwithstanding its undoubted commitment, Canada did not readily accept assumptions such as the blanket condemnation of foreign economic and other interests in colonial Territories, the immediate withdrawal of colonial Powers from all military bases and installations or explicit or implicit support for armed struggle in processes of self-determination. It was particularly concerned that reports and proposed resolutions represented all foreign economic activities with colonial Territories as being inherently evil. In Canada's view, that representation was at odds with the facts. Transnational corporations could have a beneficial impact in terms of development and the transfer of technology.

19. Unless the Committee sought more common ground among its members and reexamined fundamental issues, there was a danger that it would hinder rather than help the process of decolonization. Those responsible for drafting the documents submitted to the Committee should seek to avoid the unduly polemical approach which reduced the content of such documents to an anti-western diatribe. Canada would not support the draft resolution and hoped that the more moderate tone adopted at the current session by many delegates would become widespread.

20. In the past, Canada would vote against the draft decision on military activities, which it considered inappropriate to the item under consideration. It objected to the language of the draft decision and to the singling out of Israel.

21. **Mr. POTTS** (Australia) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution on the activities of foreign economic interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories because it believed that such activities should not impede progress towards self-government and independence. His country had consistently condemned apartheid and supported Namibia's immediate independence on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and had taken specific action against South Africa. However, his delegation had reservations about certain aspects of the draft resolution. First of all, there was an inherent contradiction between blanket condemnation of foreign investment in Non-Self-Governing Territories and the appeals made in the draft texts on individual Territories that the latter's economic development be speeded up. Properly handled, foreign investment could

(Mr. Potts, Australia)

make a **useful** contribution to **economic** development through the injection of new technology and **skills**. Secondly, **his** delegation's support for the resolution should not be construed as acceptance by **Australia** of the **South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)** as the **sole** authentic representative of the **Namibian** people.

22. His delegation also **regretted** the omission from the draft resolution of any reference to foreign fishing activities off **Namibia's** coast. Such activities did not yield any revenue to the **Namibian** people, despite the call by the Council for **Namibia** for an exclusive economic zone to be **proclaimed** off that coast.

23. His delegation would **abstain** in the vote on the draft **decision** on military activity 9, not only **because** it had **substantive** problems with the text of the draft decision but also **because** it concerned an **issue** that **was** not an **item** on the Committee's agenda.

24. Mr. BERGEH-JOHANSEN (Norway) speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, said that **those** countries **condemned** the activities of foreign economic and other **interests** which impeded the **process** of decolonisation, both in **Namibia** and in other Non-Self-Governing Territories. The draft resolution, however, failed to distinguish between **various** kinds of activities in the **Different Territories**, some of which exploited their natural **resources** and some of which could be beneficial to their economic and **social** development. The **Nordic** countries also had **reservations** on a number of **specific** paragraphs which did not take account of the **division** of competence between the **General Assembly** and the Security Council, and they deplored the continuing practice of singling out individual countries and group of **countries** as supporters of the policies pursued by the **South African** Government.

25. With regard to the draft decision on military activities, the Nordic countries had reservations about the implicit endorsement of armed struggle.

26. For the above reasons, the Nordic countries would abstain in the vote on the draft **resolution** and the draft decision.

27. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey) said that his delegation would **vote for** the draft resolution **because** it generally supported its content, **although** it would have preferred a clear distinction to be **made** between the **various** activities of foreign economic **interests** so that only **those** which really **impeded** progress towards independence were actually condemned.

28. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, his country **was** totally committed to efforts to **secure** **Namibia's** independence. The United Nations must also ensure that the **Territory's** human and natural **resources** were protected. His Government **endorsed** the main thrust of the **Programme of Action** adopted by the Council at its Luanda session. The international community must increase the **pressure** on South Africa to implement the United Nations Plan for Namibia immediately. In that connection, his Government had no **diplomatic** or consular relations with **South Africa**.

(Mr. Akyol, Turkey)

29. His delegation would vote for the draft decision on military activities, although it considered that the text of paragraphs 2, 3 and 11, should have been drafted in a more balanced way.

30. Lastly, his delegation wished to enter a general reservation about the practice of making discriminatory references to countries and groups of countries when it was impossible to ascribe definite responsibility to them.

31. Mr. NTAKHAWANA (Botswana) said that he would vote for the draft resolution even though his country would be unable to implement the paragraphs on economic sanctions. His country's inability to do so should not, however, be invoked as an excuse by those who had no such material impediments.

32. Mr. ABE (Japan) said that the activities of foreign economic and other interests should be properly controlled in order to prevent them from depriving the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories of their rights to self-determination and independence or prejudicing their economic, social and cultural development. However, whether or not such activities were harmful depended on the nature of the activity and the situation prevailing in the particular Territory. Properly guided, such activities could make beneficial contributions to the social and economic development of Non-Self-Governing Territories, for instance, through the transfer of technology and managerial skills and the creation of job opportunities. Not only was the draft resolution unbalanced, but his delegation noted with strong disapproval that it once again mingled out individual Member States and groups of States for criticism. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

33. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution contained in the Special Committee's report (A/42/23 (Part III), chap. IV, para. 12).

In favour 2

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Norway, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden.

34. The draft resolution was adopted by 93 votes to 8, with 14 abstentionm.

35. A recorded vote was taken on the draft decision contained in the Special Committee's report (A/42/23 (Part III), chap. V, para. 11).

In favour- Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Lesotho, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden.

36. The draft decision was adopted by 90 votes to 11, with 14 abstentionm.

37. Hr. MUTSVANGWA (Zimbabwe) speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that reference had been made to him ignorance or intentional misrepresentation of the United States policy of "constructive engagement" in southern Africa. A commission of eminent experts met up by the United States Secretary of State had also made scathing remarks about that policy, however.

38. South Africa had long been the mentor and chief arms supplier of UNITA in the latter's war against the legitimate Government of Angola, yet the United States had recently delivered Stinger anti-aircraft missiles to the rebels.

39. Mr. BUCZACKI (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said that the **representative** of Zimbabwe was **supposed** to be speaking in explanation of vote and not in **exercise** of the right of reply.

40. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of Zimbabwe to bear that comment in mind.

41. Mr. MUTSVANGWA (Zimbabwe) said that **no** other **country** apart from the United States and South Africa had supported the idea of "**linkage**". The United States claimed to **seek** the removal of **foreign** forces from the **region**, but overlooked South Africa's illegal occupation of **Namibia**. It was **also strange** that Nelson Mandela had won **less** attention materially and **spiritually** than the renegade leader of UNITA.

42. **The representative** of France **must** be aware that the **issue** of New Caledonia was on the **Committee's** agenda and would remain there until the international community **felt** that the colonial Power had **discharged its** responsibilities correctly.

43. Mrs. BAGGE (Denmark), **speaking** on behalf of the twelve **Member States** of the European **Economic Community** (EEC), reaffirmed the Community's support for all efforts made, in conformity with the Charter, to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial **discrimination from** southern Africa **and** enable the peoples of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories to **exercise** their right of self-determination.

44. The main **focus** of the resolution just adopted **was** the **serious** situation in **southern Africa**. The EEC **unhesitatingly** condemned the activities of those foreign **economic** and other **interests which** impeded the **process** of **self-determination**, but the resolution failed to **recognize** that **some** activities were beneficial, and **even** essential, to the economic and social development of Non-Self-Governing **Territories**.

45. The EEC had reservations of principle with regard to paragraph 8 of the resolution which failed to take into account the division of competence between the General **Assembly** and the Security Council, and deplored the singling out of **individual countries**, in particular in the **sixteenth preambular** paragraph and operative **paragraph** 17. They had therefore been unable to support the resolution. They had **also been** unable to **support** the decision on military **activities**. That **decision dealt** with a **subject** which was not on the agenda of the Fourth Committee.

46. Ms. CHIANG (New Zealand) said that her **delegation's** support for the **resolution** on foreign economic interests reflected its **concern** that **such** interests should not be allowed to **impede** the **progress** towards development and independence of any Non-Self-Governing Territory, even though New Zealand did not believe that all foreign investment was necessarily detrimental. The United Nations had a responsibility to **ensure** that **Namibia's** natural **resources** and **those** of other Non-Self-Governing Territories were protected and **preserved** for the use of the people of those **Territories**. New Zealand therefore **endorsed** once again the call by the Council for **Namibia** for the proclamation of an exclusive economic zone off Namibia's coast in order to protect its valuable **fisheries** resources.

(Ms. Chang, New Zealand)

47. Her delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft decision for the same reasons as in previous years.

48. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted for the resolution and the decision because it supported the decolonization process. However, it regretted that they were essentially similar to the resolutions and decisions adopted in previous years. It would have been preferable to have more balanced texts on such a complicated issue. Moreover, his delegation's doubts as to the relevance of the decision to the item under discussion had yet to be dispelled.

49. Ma. MILLAN (Colombia) reiterated her delegation's support for decolonization and the elimination of apartheid. The international community must pursue its efforts to that end. Her delegation had voted in favour of the resolution on foreign economic interests because of the vital need to protect the natural resources of Non-Self-Governing Territories, especially their marine resources, but would have preferred a more balanced text. It also had reservations about discriminatory references to countries and groups of countries.

50. Mr. CISTERNAS (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of both the resolution and the decision because of his country's total rejection of colonialism, discrimination and apartheid and its full support for the cause of Namibian independence. However, it felt that an opportunity had been missed to produce more balanced texts and to distinguish between activities of foreign interests which were detrimental to the Territories concerned and those which could enhance their well-being and build a solid foundation for their economies once they became independent. His delegation also had reservations about singling out certain countries and groups of countries.

51. Mr. ABUHAJAR (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his country supported unreservedly both the resolution and the decision, which expressed the wishes of the international community to put an end to colonialism in all Non-Self-Governing Territories. The presence of foreign military bases and the plundering of natural resources by transnational corporations certainly impeded Territories' progress towards independence.

52. Mr. BASTELICA (France), speaking on a point of order, said that he had not wished to interrupt the representative of Zimbabwe when he had been exercising his right of reply during an explanation of vote. However, he wished to point out that such a practice was in contravention of the rules of procedure.

53. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 109. In accordance with established practice, he suggested that the Committee request the Rapporteur to submit the report on the item directly to the General Assembly.

54. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.