



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 7th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VASILYEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)

CONTENTS

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)

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (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.

87-55031 0587S (E)

118

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/42/SR.7
14 October 1987
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

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) (A/42/23 (Part III); A/AC.10^a/897, 900, 901, 902 (reissued), 905, 908, 909, 912, 914 and 916; A/AC.131/241 and 243)

1. Mr. AHOZOU (Togo) said that the economic and strategic interests of certain Powers were the main reason that entire regions of the world were still under foreign domination and exploitation in the southern Atlantic, the Pacific and the Indian Ocean and, above all, in southern Africa, an area of tension that was a threat to international peace and security. A régime in collusion with transnational corporations was attempting to plunder the natural resources of Namibia for quick profits and to subject the native population to arbitrary racist laws and impose a latter-day form of slavery.
2. More than 1,100 of the world's largest corporations, with headquarters in South Africa, Europe and North America, were operating in Namibia under licences granted by the illegal colonial South African régime in disregard of the relevant United Nations resolutions and Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia. In South Africa itself, an alliance of motley interests directed against the black population and its heritage was aggravating an already serious situation. For some time, certain Powers had considered South Africa to be a strategic ally and offered it economic and military assistance; that collusion enabled the Pretoria régime to flaunt world opinion, committing acts of aggression and destabilization against the independent and peaceful States of the region.
3. Namibia must regain its independence. Togo rejected the policy of "linking" that independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops stationed in Angola, which was a delaying tactic designed to maintain Namibia under the colonial yoke in order to continue the systematic plundering of its resources. Under no circumstances could Namibian independence be made contingent upon extraneous factors. Similarly, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) continued to be the sole valid basis for solving the Namibian question.
4. Togo wished to reiterate its support for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the African National Congress (ANC), which were fighting for the liberation of their peoples, and to add its voice to those of the many States calling for the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime. The holding of international conferences and seminars on the subject in recent years and the gradual withdrawal of foreign investments from South Africa were encouraging signs that that goal was being attained.
5. As in the case of southern Africa, the economic and strategic interests of the administering Powers in the southern Atlantic, the Pacific Ocean and the Indian

(Mr. Ahouzou, Togo)

Ocean constituted a threat to international peace and security inasmuch as they impeded the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization. Togo firmly defended the rights of peoples to self-determination and offered its unconditional support to all initiatives and efforts by the United Nations to promote and guarantee fundamental human rights and to foster fraternal relations between all the peoples of the world.

6. Mr. JOFFE (Israel) said that Israel condemned racism in all its forms. Israel was the people of the Holocaust: 6 million Jews had been exterminated in the Nazi camps simply for being Jews. Racism had no place in the world and should be eradicated. Israel had expressed that view in resolutions adopted in its Parliament, in declarations by its Government, in joint communiqués with other countries and before various organs of the United Nations.

7. On 18 March 1987, the Israeli Government had reiterated its condemnation of apartheid and had decided to curtail its relations with South Africa and to refrain from any new commitments in defence matters. For that purpose, it had set up a special interministerial committee to examine and recommend steps to be taken in line with policies adopted by the Western democracies. In response to General Assembly resolution 41/35 H, the Government of Israel had reiterated its total condemnation of apartheid and its intention to continue to relax its ties with South Africa. It had also declared that it would not enter into new defence contracts with that régime, that it was not co-operating with South Africa in the nuclear field, that it was not exporting oil to that country and that it had reduced its cultural ties with it.

8. On 16 September 1987, the Government of Israel had adopted other measures, including a ban on government investments in South Africa and loans to that country, a freeze on all steel and iron imports from South Africa, a reduction in official visits to South Africa, a ban on the use of Israeli ports for transit to or from South Africa, a reduction in sports, cultural and scientific exchanges with South Africa, a prohibition of the sale and transfer of oil and its by-products to and from South Africa, a prohibition of the import of krugerrands from South Africa and the establishment of an educational training fund for South African blacks and persons of mixed race. Furthermore, Israel's General Federation of Labour had ordered ties with South Africa to be severed and was developing links with the black trade unions of that country.

9. Israel was repeatedly condemned for alleged nuclear collaboration with South Africa, but the Israeli Government had categorically rejected that allegation. In the report contained in document A/CONF.137/CRP.2 on nuclear collaboration with South Africa, Israel was not mentioned. The Arab claims that significant economic and military links existed between Israel and South Africa were part of a baseless political campaign to discredit Israel in the eyes of black Africa. But the Arabs and their supporters were discovering that African leaders could not be fooled by distorted facts and lies, and it was becoming increasingly difficult to influence African countries not to renew diplomatic relations with Israel, as evidenced by the fact that five leading African countries had renewed such relations and, in so doing, had reasserted their right to determine their own foreign policy.

(Mr. Joffe, Israel)

10. While some Arab countries denounced Israel as supporting apartheid and proclaimed solidarity with black Africa, it was a well-known fact that they themselves had been in the past and were to date the worst offenders against the rights of blacks. Slavery was still practised in the Arab world. According to The New York Times of 4 May 1986, Arab tribesmen from Sudan's north had abducted hundreds of women and children of the black African Dinka tribe, selling them as slaves in Arab countries. The same newspaper had reported on 27 September 1987 that more than 1,000 Dinka tribesmen had been slaughtered by the Rizayquat Arabs in a new pogrom in the city of Daien. In Chad, a protracted conflict between Arabs and Africans had been raging for years because of Libya's occupation of the northern part of that country; the leaders of Côte d'Ivoire, Zaire, Cameroon, Gabon, Central African Republic, Niger and Senegal had declared that only the withdrawal of Libyan forces would bring about a solution to the conflict. As a result of such comments, tension had mounted between the African presidents and Qaddafi. A commentator on Libyan television had said that the African leaders were monkeys and slaves and understood nothing but the whips of France. Recent victories by Chad in the fight to liberate its territory had prompted Qaddafi to recruit Arab mercenaries; Libyan oil was sold to whoever paid in dollars, and those dollars were used to buy Arab mercenaries who shed the blood of black Africans. On 22 September 1987, The New York Times had reported that a group of 800 Lebanese militiamen had left for Libya in a plane provided by that country. On 21 September 1987, the same newspaper had reported that PLO sources had divulged that its guerrillas had been fighting alongside the Libyans in Chad for the past two years. Syria had also sent 40 pilots to help Libya against Chad. That was an example of so-called Arab-African solidarity and co-operation: members of the PLO received valuable military training in their service with the Libyans by killing Chadians.

11. Distortion and hypocrisy characterized the discussion of Israel's attitude towards South Africa. Israel was accused of conducting large-scale trade with South Africa, as if the two countries were co-operating in virtually every field. The Arabs believed that if they repeated that lie over and over again, as with their slander regarding zionism and racism, it would be accepted as fact. Yet Israel's diplomatic and commercial relations with South Africa in no way implied support for South Africa's policies. There were diplomatic missions of 26 other countries in Pretoria, and many others maintained clandestine ties.

12. As for Israel's trade with South Africa, it was virtually unnoticeable compared with that of Europe, other States and the Arab world. International Monetary Fund statistics showed that Israeli trade with South Africa amounted to less than 0.5 per cent of South Africa's exports and less than 0.1 per cent of its imports. Israel's imports from South Africa amounted to 1.7 per cent of its total imports, while its exports to South Africa came to 1.8 per cent of total exports. Israel ranked seventeenth among the countries receiving South African exports, and twenty-third among those supplying that nation's imports.

13. Until recently, there had been virtually no information on trade by the Arab States with South Africa. In the last three years, however, Israel had brought to

(Mr. Joffe, Israel)

the attention of the General Assembly certain statistics published by the Shipping Research Bureau of the Netherlands, an anti-apartheid organization which monitored tankers making oil deliveries to South Africa. From 1980 to 1984, Arab oil exports to South Africa amounted to nearly \$US 10 billion. In 1981, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Oman, Kuwait, Iraq, Qatar, Bahrain and Iran had supplied 38 per cent of South Africa's oil reserves; in 1984, 76 per cent; and in 1985, 95 per cent. That last figure had been confirmed on 9 July 1985 by the State Secretary of Norway's Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

14. Although Iran denied shipments of oil to South Africa, oil experts affirmed that Iran had an overriding reason to do secret business with Pretoria, since the National Iranian Oil Company still owned a 17.5 per cent stake in the South African NATREF oil refinery in Durban. More recently, the Shipping Research Bureau had published findings showing that, from 1979 to date, there had been a steady flow of crude oil to South Africa from Saudi Arabia.

15. The facts spoke for themselves. Yet his country continued to be judged by a double standard. Apartheid was too great an evil to be cynically manipulated in a campaign of defamation and slander, particularly when the slander served as the tool of an obsessive hatred of Israel. All mankind should unite in a common effort to wipe out apartheid, anti-zionism, anti-semitism and all other forms of racism and intolerance that plagued the world.

16. Mr. WAMANIALA (Uganda) said that his country attached special significance to decolonization and the eradication of apartheid because it considered colonialism and apartheid to be direct violations of the rights of peoples and an affront to the Charter. When the founding fathers of the United Nations had set forth the obligation of administering Powers to ensure the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the Territories under their administration, they had foreseen that colonial peoples would eventually regain their independence, though they had not conceived that some of them could be too small, too poor or too rich to be independent, as the modern colonialists argued. The selfish interests of the colonialists, both economic and otherwise, were still the main impediment to decolonization.

17. Despite the adoption by the General Assembly some 20 years earlier of resolution 1514 (XV) and its subsequent adoption of many other pertinent resolutions, self-determination was still, to millions of people throughout the world, but a myth. The situation was still sadder when some influential Member States continued to disregard those General Assembly resolutions, motivated by their greed for short-term economic gain.

18. Without minimizing the situation in other Non-Self-Governing Territories, Namibia represented a classic colonial situation. Twenty-one years earlier, the United Nations had revoked South Africa's mandate over Namibia and established the United Nations Council for Namibia to administer the Territory until independence. In 1978, the Security Council had adopted resolution 435 (1978), which had been intended to lead Namibia to independence within the year. None the less, South Africa was continuing to occupy Namibia illegally for reasons that were clearly set

(Mr. Wamaniala, Uganda)

forth in the report of the Special Committee (A/42/23 (Part III)), namely, the economic, financial and military interests of the illegal régime and its major Western trading allies, which pursued their uncontrolled exploitation of the natural and human resources of Namibia.

19. Uganda believed that, if certain Western countries joined the world community in condemning the racist South African régime, its illegal occupation of Namibia would be weakened. Namibia's mineral and marine wealth was the inviolable and incontestable natural heritage of the Namibian people, yet the Pretoria régime had stepped up its plunder of those resources, realizing that the Territory's independence was inevitable. Uganda called upon all Member States to bring pressure to bear on the foreign economic interests involved to pay compensation to the future legitimate governments of an independent Namibia.

20. Transnational corporations had helped to sustain the inhuman policy of apartheid, because thanks to it they accrued enormous profits, which they repatriated. In collaboration with certain Western countries, the Pretoria régime had built up sophisticated nuclear and military capabilities which it was using not only to suppress popular opposition to its occupation of Namibia but also to commit acts of aggression and intimidation against the neighbouring African States. Uganda expressed its solidarity with the front-line States, faced as they were with such unjustifiable attack.

21. Attempts to situate the question of Namibia within the context of East-West confrontation, by linking Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops, were merely a ploy by Pretoria and some Western countries to stall its independence. Consequently, the only peaceful means of ending apartheid and South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia was the imposition of sanctions. Uganda appealed to all peace-loving nations which had not done so to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist South African régime, and it pledged its unwavering support for and solidarity with the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, in their justified struggle for independence.

22. Mr. RIANOM (Indonesia) said that the United Nations and its specialized agencies paid particular attention to the question of Namibia because in no other colonial Territory had the illegal occupying régime devised a system of such pervasive exploitation. The Special Committee on decolonization, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations had compiled exhaustive and irrefutable evidence on that state of affairs. It emerged from their findings that numerous corporations had stepped up their operations and had stockpiled vast quantities of minerals outside the Territory. South Africa had no intention whatsoever of ending its illegal occupation of Namibia as long as it could continue sucking the Territory's life-blood, thus denying the Namibian people their economic heritage.

(Mr. Rianom, Indonesia)

23. Given the worsening situation and the increasing repression and exploitation in Namibia, it was imperative to intensify efforts to totally isolate the Pretoria régime. Indonesia had long supported the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa by the Security Council, but South Africa's powerful friends must still be prevailed upon to relinquish their unconscionable holdings and operations in Namibia and co-operate with the international community. It was equally important to increase moral and material assistance to the people of Namibia and to SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative. In that regard, Indonesia concurred fully with the call to secure an increased flow of funds so that the relevant United Nations bodies could prepare extended programmes of assistance.

24. As a member of the Special Committee on decolonization and of the Council for Namibia, not only did Indonesia always maintained a strong sense of solidarity with Namibia's struggle for self-determination and independence, but it had also repeatedly denounced the exploitation of the Territory's natural and human resources by the transnational corporations which collaborated with the racist Pretoria régime. It had complied consistently with all the pertinent decisions of the United Nations, including Decree No. 1 of the Council for Namibia. Moreover, the Government of Indonesia, in co-operation with the relevant international bodies, would continue to extend whatever material assistance might be required to support the Namibian people's liberation struggle and to prepare Namibian cadres for the future task of administering and rebuilding an independent nation. Lastly, Indonesia believed that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remained the only viable and internationally acceptable plan for the exercise by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

25. Although the situations in the Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories of the Pacific, the Indian Ocean and the Caribbean, were diverse and complex, colonial peoples shared the yearning to determine their own future. The military, economic and other policies of the administering Powers must not impede but rather facilitate the process of decolonization. That must be the single overriding consideration in regulating the operations of transnational corporations, which should be directed towards economic development in the exclusive interest of the indigenous population. Military activities were inimical to the interests of the populations concerned and should be suspended, and the resources thus released should be used for more constructive, developmental purposes.

26. Mrs. NAVCHAA (Mongolia) said that, on the eve of the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution and more than 25 years after the adoption of resolution 1415 (XV), most peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America had achieved independence and social progress. Some 20 colonial Territories still remained, however, because the relevant resolutions were not being implemented fully. The activities of foreign, economic and other interests were the main obstacle to the decolonization process. She commended the work of the Special Committee and supported its recommendations (A/42/23 (Part III)).

27. Document A/AC.131/243 contained abundant information on the plundering of Namibia by transnational corporations. Between 16 and 20 per cent of the gross

(Mrs. Navchaa, Mongolia)

national product was being remitted abroad, in blatant defiance of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Mongolia condemned the foreign monopolies which were impeding the Territory's development and the Western countries which, through their collaboration with South Africa, were only making the situation worse. It also condemned United States and Israeli aid thanks to which South Africa possessed nuclear weapons and launched subversive attacks against the front-line States. She expressed her country's solidarity with SWAPO in its just struggle for self-determination and supported the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions as the only peaceful solution to the question of Namibia.

28. Other Territories were also victims of colonialism, even if it was disguised under such labels as "Commonwealth". In the Pacific, the administering Powers used those Territories for their military interests, as firing ranges and test sites for new weapons. That was the case in Micronesia, which the United States Government had annexed despite its being under the authority of the United Nations. The utilization of the Territories of Guam, Bermuda, the Malvinas (Falkland Islands), New Caledonia and Diego Garcia by the United States and other countries as military bases was a threat to regional peace and security and international stability and an inadmissible violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

29. Mrs. SHI YANHUI (China) observed that Namibia was the largest of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and that its colonial situation was an affront to humanity. Supporting the Namibian people in order to expedite their independence was the most urgent task of decolonization.

30. In total disregard of the relevant United Nations resolutions, the South African authorities had continued their illegal occupation of Namibia and had used it as a springboard to launch armed invasions against the front-line States which supported the struggle of the Namibian people. Not only did such actions prolong the sufferings of the Namibian people under South Africa's brutal colonialist rule, but they also jeopardized peace and stability in southern Africa. Under the leadership of SWAPO, the Namibian people had waged a heroic struggle for national independence, with the support of the front-line States and backed by the efforts of many other States to promote the cause of Namibia's independence at the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations. The South African authorities, however, were stubbornly perpetuating their occupation of Namibia.

31. Her delegation opposed attempts to link the independence of Namibia to irrelevant issues and to complicate the question by introducing the factor of East-West conflict. The international community, particularly countries influential with South Africa, had the obligation to support the struggle of the peoples of southern Africa and to bring greater pressure to bear on the South African Government by adopting effective sanctions to compel it to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) unconditionally and grant early independence to Namibia.

(Mrs. Shi Yanhua, China)

32. The political independence of a country and its economic development were inseparable. The peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories could not exercise their sovereign right over their natural resources if they lacked political independence and were not yet masters of their own land. South Africa and other foreign economic interests had plundered the heritage of the Namibian people, in contravention of United Nations resolutions and Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia. China condemned that action and believed that the only effective way of protecting the Territory's natural resources was to give Namibia its independence as soon as possible.

33. The Chinese people had suffered for a long time from imperialist and colonialist oppression and had waged a dauntless struggle to win independence and freedom. They sympathized deeply with the plight of the peoples of colonies and Non-Self-Governing Territories who were struggling for their independence and economic development.

34. Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia) said that the United Nations had played a crucial role, and made a unique contribution to, the process of decolonization. Regrettably, however, over 3 million people continued to live under colonial domination. Consequently, the occasional assertions that the decolonization process had mainly been terminated and that the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories were unable to survive as independent subjects of international relations, due to their size, population and level of economic development, were unacceptable, as were the claims that the local populations of Non-Self-Governing Territories were not opposed to their existing ties with the Administering Powers and that there was therefore no need to include those Territories on the agenda of the United Nations.

35. Yugoslavia considered that it was not only the right but also the obligation of the United Nations to make every effort to bring about the final elimination of colonialism and implement the Declaration on the Granting of independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. There were various obstacles to the attainment of that goal, for instance, the activities of foreign economic, military and other interests and the behaviour of certain Administering Powers which, through concessions to foreign corporations and other forms of economic exploitation of Non-Self-Governing Territories, were trying to create new forms of colonial dependence and domination.

36. The assertions that such activities were beneficial to the local population of those Territories, since they represented a source of income and helped prepare them for the international division of labour, in no way justified their exploitation.

37. As the non-aligned countries had rightly pointed out at their numerous meetings, including the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government held at Harare in 1986, the activities of foreign economic and other interests were one of the main obstacles to completion of the decolonization process. The militarization of some Non-Self-Governing Territories was making it difficult for their populations freely to express their wishes concerning their future. The situation

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

of the populations of Non-Self-Governing Territories located in sensitive strategic areas of exceptional military and political significance in global confrontation was particularly difficult.

38. The example of Namibia was certainly the most drastic. The mineral wealth of that Territory was well known, as was its sensitive geographical position between the free African States and South Africa. Yugoslavia was convinced that Namibia would now be a free and independent country and a State Member of the United Nations were powerful foreign interests not behind its illegal occupation.

39. There was abundant evidence that the activities of foreign corporations, backed by some developed countries, served to maintain the military machinery of the South African racist régime, thereby prolonging the obnoxious system of racial discrimination, apartheid and terror against the majority population. At the same time, that régime continued to use Namibia as a springboard for armed aggression against and destabilization of neighbouring independent States.

40. His delegation considered it the duty and obligation of all to persevere in bringing pressure to bear on the régime in South Africa, and on those who condoned its intransigent and arrogant behaviour, until the people of Namibia attained freedom and independence. The only remaining peaceful means of making that pressure effective was the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. Yugoslavia resolutely supported the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), as well as the United Nations Plan for Namibia. It also endorsed the appeal adopted at the special commemorative meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia at Luanda and earnestly hoped that the recent ministerial meeting of that Council would provide fresh impetus for solving the problem. Namibia's independence would not only redress a historical injustice against the people of that Territory, who had waged a long struggle for liberation and emancipation under the leadership of SWAPO, but also eliminate a dangerous source of international tension, the consequences of which were felt widely in Africa.

41. Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the purpose of the statements made by the representative of Israel at the current meeting was to distract the Committee's attention from the relations between Tel Aviv and Pretoria, which had been condemned year after year by the General Assembly. The Tel Aviv régime practised the most odious form of racism against the Palestinian Arabs, the indigenous inhabitants of the area.

42. Various articles in the United States, United Kingdom and South African press, as well as statements by Israeli personalities, proved the existence of relations between Israel and South Africa. On 31 January 1977, the Israeli Ambassador to Johannesburg had said that the 20,000-strong Jewish community in South Africa was more important than the Black population and had added that nothing would be solved by the imposing sanctions against South Africa. According to an article published in The New York Times of 3 April 1979 the United States Department of State had revealed that Israel was giving military assistance to South Africa, in

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab Republic)

violation of the international arms embargo against that country. According to another article published on 19 March 1987, Israel's military industry had earned substantial profits from exporting arms to South Africa. Lastly, according to an article published on 27 January 1987 in The Financial Times of London, the Israeli Defence Minister had gone to Pretoria to conclude certain agreements with the South African Government and to explain to it that the sanctions imposed by Israel had been prompted by requests from the United States Government.

43. Israel disregarded United Nations resolutions on South Africa. It responded only to the pressures exerted on it by the United States Government. Israel's commercial, industrial and economic relations in general with South Africa were statistically documented. Its military contracts and diamond transactions, which represented millions of dollars, were kept secret, however.

44. Mr. HILMI (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he had taken note of the statements made at the current meeting by the representative of Israel, which were intended to deceive the Committee. That representative had used the same clichés as in 1986, claiming, for instance, that Iraq was one of the Arab countries which sold all to South Africa. He defied anyone to provide any proof to substantiate that claim. Israel, however, was co-operating with South Africa in the nuclear sphere. According to an article published recently in The New York Times, Israel also carried on exclusive military trade with South Africa; the exact figures were not known because they were treated as military secrets.

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (continued) (A/C.4/42/4/Add.3, A/C.4/42/6/Add.5 and 6)

45. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received requests for hearings concerning the question of New Caledonia (A/C.4/42/4/Add.3) and Namibia (A/C.4/42/6/Add.5 and 6). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to grant those requests.

46. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at noon.