



FOURTH COMMITTEE
4th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 19 October 1983
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 4th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

later: Mr. KAREPA (Papua New Guinea)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 103: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

*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 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 103: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/38/23 (Part III); A/38/444; A/AC.109/731, 736, 737 and Corr.1, 738, 742, 743, 744)

1. Mr. SCHROTER (German Democratic Republic) said that in gross disregard of United Nations resolutions, corporations were continuing to plunder the natural and human resources of the Territories under colonial domination and to extract enormous profits. What the Western media cynically described as a "favourable climate" for investment meant nothing else but shameless exploitation and conditions of life unworthy of a human being. That was particularly true of Namibia and South Africa where the direct interrelationship between the military, strategic, economic and financial interests of transnational corporations, and of a number of States with jurisdiction over those corporations, and the search for spheres of influence, foreign sources of raw material and cheap labour were particularly obvious.

2. The German Democratic Republic shared the justified indignation of the African and other non-aligned countries about the \$50 million deal recently concluded, with the express approval of the United States Government, between United States corporations and South Africa which would enable the racist régime to strengthen its nuclear potential. It was no accident that the United States Government, at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, had voted against resolution 37/69 D on "military and nuclear co-operation with South Africa". In that decision, it had not been guided by the legitimate rights of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia but by the interests of United States corporations.

3. There was no doubt that the apartheid régime was able to survive and develop its economic and above all its military potential only because it received the support of imperialist corporations which had an interest in the preservation of colonial and racist slavery. In recent years, the number of foreign companies operating in South Africa had risen by more than 1,000. Foreign investment in 1980 had reached an amount of 30 million rand, 70 per cent of which came from the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany. Of the 88 corporations plundering the riches of Namibia, 53 had their headquarters in those States which had been pretending for years to work for the early granting of independence to Namibia and were continuing to emphasize their aversion to apartheid. Neither in South Africa nor in Namibia had the fate of the majority of the Africans improved. Proof had been furnished that the transnational corporations were the main obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Their complicity with South Africa was the reason for the failure of the efforts undertaken by the United

/...

(Mr. Schroter, German Democratic Republic)

Nations. As was shown by recent developments, the direct material, technological and financial support provided to the racist régime by corporations from the United States and other NATO countries had encouraged South Africa to further escalate its peace-endangering policy.

4. It now appeared, on the basis of documents provided by SWAPO that the so-called "development aid for Namibia" would be provided not to SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, but, through the puppets installed by Pretoria, to the régime of terror which denied the Namibian people their legitimate rights.

5. The document drawn up by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations (A/38/444) indicated which States and corporations had refused to co-operate with the United Nations in preparing a register indicating the profits that transnational corporations derived from their activities in colonial Territories. Those were above all States whose representatives to the United Nations constantly praised the so-called "social mission" of transnational corporations in those Territories. If such statements were true, there was no reason why they should refuse to provide the relevant information to the United Nations. That information should therefore be provided and States which had not yet done so, as well as scientific bodies, universities and institutes and trade unions, should be requested to co-operate with the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations in completing the register. The resolution to be adopted by the Committee should contain a decision on that matter.

6. The German Democratic Republic supported all measures of the United Nations aimed at putting an end to the harmful practices of transnational corporations in all Territories under colonial domination. It was imperative that all kinds of military, economic and political assistance to the apartheid régime should be ended. The German Democratic Republic hoped that the Security Council would impose effective sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. It believed that solidarity with the peoples of South Africa and Namibia and their national liberation movements was an important contribution to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

7. Mr. AMR (Egypt) said that a number of Territories had not yet acceded to independence and were still subjected to occupation and exploitation on the part of foreign interests which were concerned only with their own profits and not with the well-being of the inhabitants. The colonial and racist régime of South Africa continued to occupy Namibia, despite the wishes expressed by the international community in many resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly, and was exploiting its resources and trying to impose its racist system and philosophy. That attitude was motivated by the desire of the Pretoria régime to exploit the considerable natural resources of the Territory for its own benefit, at the expense of the local population. The consequences for Namibia were all the more serious in that those resources were essentially non-renewable so that South Africa and the foreign companies and interests with which it co-operated were committing a crime

/...

(Mr. Amr, Egypt)

vis-à-vis both present and future generations in Namibia. The South African régime and the foreign interests were pursuing the same goal: to exploit the natural and human resources of the Territory to the maximum and as rapidly as possible before the culmination of the struggle of the national liberation movements.

8. The situation in Namibia was the most striking example of colonial domination, but a number of characteristics of that domination were to be found to a lesser extent in other Territories where there was also an alliance between the occupying authorities and foreign interests aimed at preventing the independence of those Territories and exploiting their natural and human resources. Moreover, foreign interests were co-operating increasingly with the occupying régimes in exploiting colonial Territories.

9. Some companies and foreign interests claimed that their investment had no effect on the policy pursued by the occupying authorities and also claimed that such investment helped improve the living conditions of the inhabitants of the Territories under colonial domination. It sufficed to read many studies including those of the Centre Against Apartheid, to assess the value of those statements.

10. His delegation paid tribute to the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations for its report which contained the register requested by the General Assembly in its resolution 36/51. The Centre had not confined itself to the information supplied by Governments but had also sought to obtain information from the corporations which operated in the colonial Territories. It had encountered numerous difficulties: of the 904 corporations to which it had sent questionnaires 152 had replied and many of them had not wished to divulge the real value of the profits they derived from exploiting the resources of the colonial Territories. His delegation would have liked to see the corporations operating in Namibia listed separately. Such corporations were exploiting Namibia in co-operation with the South African Government in spite of the sanctions imposed by the United Nations and Decree No. 1 on the protection of the natural resources of Namibia. Moreover, Namibia's resources were essentially non-renewable or difficult to renew whereas the activities of foreign interests in the other Territories related mainly to tourism and finance. In future reports the Centre should emphasize activities which involved exploitation of the resources of colonial Territories to the detriment of both present and future generations. It should also mention activities which contributed to the economic development of those Territories.

11. By adhering to the Charter, Member States of the United Nations had accepted commitments and had also pledged, in numerous resolutions, to regulate the activities of corporations within their jurisdiction so as to prevent them from exploiting the wealth of the Territories under colonial domination against the will of their inhabitants. Accordingly, they must take legislative and administrative steps to implement General Assembly resolution 35/118, which contained the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and to condemn the policies of Governments which continued to support foreign interests engaged in the exploitation of the resources of colonial Territories, particularly those of

/...

(Mr. Amr, Egypt)

Namibia. His delegation urged that sanctions be applied against South Africa so that the latter might implement the resolutions of the United Nations and put an end to its occupation and exploitation of Namibia. His delegation whole-heartedly supported the peoples who were fighting to exercise their right to self-determination and independence and would continue to provide them with material and moral assistance.

12. Mr. BANDARA (Sri Lanka) recalled that the non-aligned countries as well as the General Assembly had adopted several resolutions on the activities of foreign economic and other interests whose operations in the colonial Territories, in Namibia and in southern Africa hindered the process of the granting of independence. As far back as 1964, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 1899 (XVIII), 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 undertaken a study on the implications of the activities of the mining industry and the other international companies having interests in the Territory which was currently called Namibia. The Special Committee had subsequently expanded the scope of its studies to include other parts of southern Africa.

13. Quite recently, the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries had reaffirmed the inalienable right of all countries and peoples, particularly the Namibian people, to exercise permanent, total and full sovereignty over their natural and other resources and their economic activities. Certain developed countries and the transnational corporations within their jurisdiction had been accused of using coercion, pressure and blackmail and of thereby undermining the sovereignty and fundamental right of the developing countries to pursue their own economic policies and programmes. The Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement had expressed grave concern with respect to transnational corporations which carried out illegal and undesirable policies and engaged in corrupt practices in developing countries and they had, in particular, condemned the activities of transnational corporations in South Africa which served to strengthen the oppressive machinery of the apartheid system. They had noted that the elaboration of a code of conduct on transnational corporations would strengthen the negotiating capacity of the developing countries vis-à-vis those corporations.

14. He paid tribute to the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations for having drawn up a register of foreign corporations operating in the colonial Territories. The Centre had encountered many difficulties in compiling that data because certain parent companies had been reluctant to disclose disaggregated financial data on their affiliates and because many parent companies as a matter of general policy did not disclose financial figures of their affiliates operating abroad. Many foreign interests which were so secretive about their operations in such Territories as Namibia were exploiting the natural resources of those Territories through indiscriminate mining, price fixing and transfer pricing and also through the unrestrained exploitation of labour with regard to wage levels as well as working conditions. They engaged in those practices while claiming to be engaged in a civilizing mission.

/...

(Mr. Bandara, Sri Lanka)

15. His Government would continue to support all initiatives that would hasten the process of the granting of independence to Territories and peoples under colonial domination.

16. Mr. WABUGE (Kenya) reaffirmed his Government's support for the programme of action adopted at the Paris Conference on Namibia in April 1983. Although more than 16 years had elapsed since South Africa's mandate over Namibia had been terminated by the international community and despite the many Security Council resolutions on the subject, the racist South African régime continued to occupy Namibia illegally and to launch frequent attacks against neighbouring States with the military support of its allies. The reason for that support was that the multinational foreign corporations were engaged in plundering the economy of that Territory. It was time to take action against those multinational corporations, with the co-operation of their respective Governments. Indeed, foreign exploitation of Namibia's natural resources remained the major obstacle to Namibia's independence.

17. It was high time Namibians were allowed to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence. Although the South African régime had accepted the proposal of the five Western Powers it had never shown any willingness to negotiate with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). The latter, on the other hand, had demonstrated its good will by participating constructively in all the political and diplomatic forums while searching for a peaceful solution on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978); it had made a major concession by accepting to sign a cease-fire. His delegation saluted SWAPO and expressed the hope that the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations would continue to give it the necessary assistance until the day it secured Namibia's independence. In that connection he pointed out that, with a population of nearly 1.5 million inhabitants and a vast amount of natural resources, Namibia needed plenty of assistance and resources to prepare its nationals for independence and to help them acquire the skills necessary for the development of their State once it became independent.

18. The General Assembly in resolution 3295 (XXIX) dated 13 December 1974, had approved Decree No. 1 on the protection of the natural resources of Namibia. In that connection the Namibian economy must be unconditionally freed from South African and foreign interests exploitation. Protection of economic interests was the root cause of the policy of segregation pursued by that country and the United Nations should view those unfair acts as crimes against humanity and should severely censure South Africa and its allies.

19. His country wished to reiterate the following points: first, the departure of Cuban troops from Angola should not be a pre-condition for granting Namibian independence; second, the people of Namibia must exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence, and Walvis Bay must be an integral part of independent Namibia; third, Kenya supported the United Nations Council for Namibia in the discharge of the duties entrusted to it by the General Assembly; fourth, Kenya recognized SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the

/...

(Mr. Wabuge, Kenya)

Namibian people; fifth, Kenya supported the armed struggle of the Namibian people as the only legitimate weapon for securing freedom and national independence; sixth, Kenya condemned the South African régime for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of United Nations resolutions, and it also condemned the exploitation of Namibia's resources by foreign corporations; seventh, Kenya called for the immediate implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978); eighth, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was the only basis for a negotiated political settlement of the question of Namibia.

20. Mr. HUQ (Bangladesh) said that it was a matter of profound regret that colonialism and exploitation persisted in South Africa and Namibia and that the racist South African minority continued to practice its hateful policy of racism and apartheid in total disregard of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law and justice. Bangladesh condemned the illegal minority régime's policy of "bantustanization" and the so-called constitutional reform which it had recently undertaken. It reaffirmed its support for the oppressed people of South Africa and believed that the intransigence and dilatory tactics of the racist régime should no longer be tolerated and that effective international measures should be taken to support the just and legitimate struggle of the majority population of South Africa to establish its rights in its own country.

21. Bangladesh also condemned the obstinate refusal of the Pretoria régime to recognize the legitimate demands of the Namibian people, in defiance of world opinion and numerous United Nations decisions and resolutions. The General Assembly had been trying for 37 years to prevent the annexation of Namibia by the Pretoria régime. It was 17 years since it had terminated South Africa's mandate over Namibia, and more than 12 years since the International Court of Justice had confirmed the illegality of the occupation of Namibia by South Africa. The will of the international community, and the aspirations of the Namibian people, had been manifested in subsequent Security Council resolutions delineating the framework for Namibia's independence. Yet the Pretoria régime had obstinately refused to co-operate in implementing the United Nations plan for Namibia and had pursued its systematic exploitation of the resources of the Territory.

22. Foreign economic interests had been collaborating in the plunder and illegal exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia by the Pretoria régime, in violation of the resolution of the General Assembly endorsing Decree No. 1 enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia. In some interested quarters it had been argued that investment by transnational corporations in Namibia was helping to build the Territory's economy. That assertion was not borne out by the facts. The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia estimated that the black workers of Namibia, who made up 92 per cent of the population, received only about 10 per cent of the gross domestic product, the remainder going as profits to large companies (50 per cent), as taxes paid to the illegal South African administration (15 per cent) and as remuneration for the white personnel of the companies (25 per cent). Moreover, the exploitation of Namibia's wealth was dependent on the

/...

(Mr. Huq, Bangladesh)

exploitation of African labour, and the plunder of Namibian resources had reached such proportions in recent years that there were fears that the country's known reserves would be rapidly depleted.

23. The militarization of Namibia by the occupying forces was aimed at crushing the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole authentic representative, for liberation and genuine independence. In that context, the nuclearization of South Africa and its military collaboration with countries like Israel posed a dangerous threat to the peace, stability and security of the region and the world at large.

24. The exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination, the elimination of colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination, and the observance of human rights depended entirely on the ability of the international community to implement the decisions taken by the United Nations, including those of the Security Council, concerning South Africa and Namibia. His delegation reaffirmed its support for those decisions and resolutions and believed that the United Nations plan for Namibia must be carried out without any modification as a matter of urgency and imperative need.

25. Mr. ŠILOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that Yugoslavia attached great importance to the issue of the activities of foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Where South Africa and Namibia were concerned, there was no doubt that the colonial policy of exploitation, racism and apartheid was intimately linked with the activities of foreign economic and other interests. As far back as 1966 the United Nations had terminated the mandate of South Africa over Namibia and hence its right to engage in economic activities in that Territory. Foreign corporations had been warned about the illegal character of further activities in that Non-Self-Governing Territory under United Nations mandate. In 1971, the International Court of Justice had pronounced South Africa's occupation of Namibia illegal and Member States had been called upon to refrain from all economic co-operation with South Africa in Namibia. In 1974, the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session had endorsed Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, which stipulated that no one had the right to exploit the natural resources of Namibia without the express permission of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

26. The reality was quite different. According to the information contained in the documents of the Special Committee against Apartheid and the Special Committee on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, some 3,000 foreign companies were currently operating in South Africa and Namibia, particularly in the mining of diamonds, uranium and precious metals. Namibia had become one of the world's largest producers of those products, and that immense wealth was being created by South African and Namibian workers whose earnings were considerably lower than those of white workers.

/...

(Mr. Šilović, Yugoslavia)

27. The United Nations Council for Namibia had highlighted the fact that the flow of capital into South Africa and Namibia had military implications and was helping the régime to continue occupying Namibia illegally. The capital was being used to subsidize South Africa's military forces and to strengthen the machinery for oppression not only in Namibia but in South Africa as well. It had become clear that if the racist régime was denied financial support in the form of foreign investments, freedom and independence for the people of Namibia and the end of the abhorrent system of apartheid would soon follow. Nothing could justify co-operation with a régime for which apartheid and racial discrimination were political dogma.

28. In certain other Non-Self-Governing Territories lacking the natural resources which Namibia had, foreign presence was often based on strategic considerations stemming from global rivalry between the great Powers. The administering Powers' efforts to improve the local economy were pointed to in order to justify the presence of foreign military bases in those Territories, overlooking the fact that if war broke out the inhabitants would automatically become the target of advanced means of extermination.

29. It was obvious that, in such conditions, the indigenous population could not freely express its national aspirations. Moreover, foreign military presence in Non-Self-Governing Territories likewise endangered the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring countries. A typical example of the situation was Angola, an independent, non-aligned country, which bordered on Namibia.

30. Completion of the decolonization process, to which the United Nations had made many historic contributions, must not be delayed in order to uphold military, strategic, political and ideological interests. With regard to decolonization and opposition to all forms of foreign domination, Yugoslavia, as other non-aligned countries, called for strict adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter, the policy of non-alignment and the relevant United Nations resolutions demanding an end to foreign economic and other activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was necessary and possible, in the Yugoslav delegation's view, to take a decisive step, during the General Assembly's thirty-eighth session, towards achieving Namibia's independence.

31. Mr. Karepa (Papua New Guinea) took the Chair.

32. Mr. KANIVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, since 1967, many resolutions had condemned the plundering of colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories by foreign economic and other interests - deeds which constituted one of the chief obstacles to full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. However, the Western Powers and their transnational corporations disdained the view of the majority of States Members of the United Nations. In southern Africa, for instance, those interests were even expanding their illegal activities. It was undoubtedly due to the economic and military assistance rendered by the Western Powers, chiefly the United States and Israel, and their imperialist monopolies, that the Republic of South

/...

(Mr. Kanivets, Ukrainian SSR)

Africa was able to maintain its policy of colonialism, racism and apartheid, thus seriously threatening the peace and security of the world at large.

33. Exploitation of the indigenous population of the Republic of South Africa and Namibia, and the plundering of southern Africa's natural resources, provided the transnational corporations with huge profits. It was notorious that some 3,000 banks and companies of Western countries were operating in South Africa, where their investments exceeded \$30 billion. The shameful decision of IMF to grant a \$1 billion loan to the Republic of South Africa was bound to arouse indignation. The apartheid régime was, in fact, using those resources to oppress the Namibian people in its struggle for independence. Western loans also enabled South Africa to overcome the economic crisis and clear its huge balance-of-payments deficits, and to increase its military might. As could be seen from United Nations documents, collaboration by the Western Powers and their transnational corporations with the Republic of South Africa was the chief cause of the aggression committed by South Africa against the neighbouring African States and enabled it to go on illegally occupying Namibia.

34. It was an established fact that foreign enterprises were seriously hampering Namibia's accession to independence. Pretoria, by occupying that Territory illegally, offered the most attractive conditions to transnational corporations. That was why much of the mining industry, one of the Namibian economy's most important sectors, was in the hands of a group of transnational corporations. As shown by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations in document A/38/444, out of 336 subsidiaries of transnational corporations operating in Namibia, 73 had their head offices in the United Kingdom, 33 in the United States, seven in Canada, six in France and five in the Federal Republic of Germany. The exploitation of Namibia's natural resources by those monopolies constituted a flagrant violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1974.

35. There were those who claimed that the operations of transnational corporations improved the living conditions of the Namibian people - but the average wage of a black was one tenth that of a white. International public opinion had to be mobilized against such exploitation.

36. The entire international community was disturbed about the tremendous military assistance provided to the racists of the Republic of South Africa by the NATO countries, chiefly the United States of America. And as aggressive a State as Israel dispatched more than 70 per cent of its military exports to the Republic of South Africa, which had increased its military spending 60-fold in 20 years, having spent 3 billion rand in 1982.

37. Military collaboration with Pretoria was a flagrant violation of the 1977 embargo on the supply of arms to South Africa. Every possible ploy, including recourse to third countries, as resorted to in order to evade the embargo. As a result, the South African arms industry was able to produce over 150 types of weapons.

/...

(Mr. Kanivets, Ukrainian SSR)

38. Even more disturbing were the efforts made by the Pretoria racists, with the help of the United States, Israel and certain other Western countries, to acquire nuclear weaponry, possession of which would constitute a threat to all mankind. The Ukrainian SSR supported any measure aimed at ending military and nuclear co-operation with South Africa and at applying immediate sanctions and the arms embargo against the apartheid régime under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

39. The activities of foreign economic, financial and other interests had dire consequences for many small territories which continued to live under colonial domination in the Caribbean and in the Pacific, Indian and Atlantic Oceans. The administering Powers and their monopolies sought at all costs to maintain their domination of the Territories, ruthlessly exploiting the natural and human resources and depriving the peoples of their legitimate right to independence. The military activity of the colonial Powers in the Trust Territories was most disquieting. One example in that respect was the policy pursued by the United States in Micronesia, where it was trying to divide the Territory and turn it into a strategic military base. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR whole-heartedly supported all measures taken by the United Nations with a view to ending those activities.

40. Mrs. SZOKOLOCZI-ALCALA (Venezuela) said that the persistence of colonialism was to a large extent attributable to the activities of economic, financial and other interests in the colonial Territories. The interests of Western monopolies and the large-scale collaboration of certain Western countries in political, economic and military spheres were in fact sustaining such odious régimes as that of apartheid and supporting South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia.

41. With regard to document A/38/444, her delegation appreciated the work done by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations in compiling important data. However, owing to a lack of co-operation on the part of the Governments of the administering Powers, Territory authorities and transnational corporations, the information was incomplete. The pretexts given by transnational corporations operating in those Territories for not providing information only served to prove their intention to go on exploiting their natural and human resources.

42. The illegal exploitation of the vast uranium deposits in Namibia was another cause for concern. By increasing their investments in the mining of uranium, the developed countries showed their wish to ensure access to other sources of supply in order to keep intact their own reserves and those of the so-called "politically stable" countries. That showed the close link between the economic and financial activities of certain Powers in the colonial Territories, where they prevented the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the unbridled arms race pursued by those same Powers.

43. With respect to the military activities of the colonial Powers in the Trust Territories, her delegation wished to point out that nothing could justify the establishment or utilization of military bases or installations in the colonial Territories with the aim of creating new colonial situations. Her delegation

/...

(Mrs. Szokoloczi-Alcala, Venezuela)

appealed to the countries which had not yet done so to implement immediately General Assembly resolution 35/118 which contained the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

44. On 24 July 1983, the date of the celebration of the bicentenary of the birth of Simón Bolívar, the liberator, the "Manifesto to the peoples of Latin America" had been adopted by the Presidents of the republics created by Bolívar: Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Panama, Peru and Venezuela. In that Manifesto, they stated that "Economic supremacy leads to political and cultural infiltration; at the same time, political and ideological domination involves economic control and exploitation. Co-operation programmes often conceal new forms of colonialism, reinforce existing injustice and help to deepen differences between rich and poor countries. Foreign investment, which has a useful role in supplementing domestic savings, must not become yet another instrument for the enrichment of the industrialized countries at the expense of the developing countries". In the same document, the Presidents reaffirmed "respect for the principle of the self-determination of peoples and their rejection of all direct or indirect intervention in the internal affairs of each State".

45. Mr. MUNIZ (Argentina) said that, owing to the possibility afforded them of exploiting to the maximum Namibia's natural and human resources, foreign interests favoured the continuation of the illegal South African administration. His delegation therefore considered that, at its thirty-eighth session, the General Assembly should reiterate its condemnation of the activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia. With regard to the activities of transnational corporations in the colonial Territories in general, the information which the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations had been able to collect and submit in document A/38/444, although scanty, nevertheless made it possible to calculate the extent of the participation of those corporations in the economic activities carried out in the colonial Territories.

46. With regard to the Malvinas Islands, the activities of United Kingdom companies were largely responsible for the obstacles which had always stood in the way of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In fact, in those islands - which could be called "company islands" - the Falkland Islands Company enjoyed privileges worthy of the eighteenth century. It owned 50 per cent of the pastures on the islands as well as three quarters of the sheep. It also held a monopoly - through subsidiary companies - of the maritime communications among the islands, the commercial sea transport serving the archipelago, the marketing of wool, and so on. From the economic and financial point of view, it imposed its laws on the population and constituted a de facto parallel government which determined the actions of the colonial administration. That monopoly had also played an important role in the organizing and financing of what had been called the "Falklands lobby" in the House of Commons. That lobby's role had been to undermine the diplomatic negotiations between Argentina and the United Kingdom, while bringing pressure to bear on the islanders to reject any form of settlement. That showed that the United Kingdom's

/...

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

policy on the question of the Malvinas Islands was governed not by the desire to defend the rights of the inhabitants, but by the need to guarantee the interests of the Falkland Islands Company in the islands which belonged to it.

47. With regard to military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration which might be impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Argentina fully supported the Special Committee's decision on that matter, particularly its condemnation of the expansion of the network of South African military bases in Namibia. It attached particular importance to the strong disapproval expressed by the Special Committee of the establishment by the colonial Powers of bases and other military installations in colonial Territories, which were incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter and with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

48. That position applied to the question of the Malvinas Islands, the colonial Power being the United Kingdom, the colonial Territories being the Malvinas, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and the obstacle to decolonization being the desire of the United Kingdom Government to preserve an imperialist and expansionist presence in the South Atlantic. The United Kingdom had installed in the Malvinas a powerful military base equipped with nuclear weapons. Those measures were not only contrary to General Assembly resolutions but also constituted a permanent provocation to Argentina and Latin America, contributing dangerously to the maintenance of tension in the South Atlantic. That military base would soon possess a strategic airport which could be used by the largest combat aircraft in existence. The United Kingdom clearly intended to prolong indefinitely its colonial presence in the Malvinas Islands and, what was just as serious, to incorporate them in a global strategic military plan. In that connection, the Latin American Ministers for Foreign Affairs had expressed their concern during the general debate at the current session of the General Assembly. In addition, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at its recent ministerial meeting in New York, had reaffirmed that the United Kingdom's massive military and naval presence in the Malvinas, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands as well as the building of a permanent strategic military base in the Malvinas was of deep concern to the Latin American region and might destabilize it.

49. The aim of the United Kingdom's policy was not new. It had already been announced in official and private statements and studies before the 1982 conflict. For instance, in an article on the Malvinas published in the United Kingdom Defence Yearbook for 1977-1978, the author, after referring to the possibility of a transfer of sovereignty to Argentina, mentioned the possible extension of Soviet naval power to the South Atlantic and recommended the maintenance of sovereignty over the islands, as well as a policy which had since been carried out: military reinforcement, the building of a strategic airport, and making naval bases available to some form of United Kingdom or multinational defence organization. Those objectives had been explicitly confirmed by the United Kingdom Defence Secretary, Mr. Heseltine, who had indicated in September 1983 that, if the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) were not an objective of the Soviet Union, they would become one

/...

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

during the next few decades, thus demonstrating the strategic value for the West of the new airport in the islands. He had added that the victory in the islands had proved the credibility of the Atlantic alliance's power of dissuasion and that the United Kingdom Government had decided to improve its strategic capabilities and air mobility to support operations outside the geographical zone covered by that alliance. That militarist and aggressive policy might make the South Atlantic a new theatre of East-West conflict, which would cause irreparable harm to the whole of Latin America, whose interests with respect to peace and security would be seriously affected.

50. In conclusion, he wished to reaffirm that the major British military presence in the Malvinas Islands and the construction of powerful military installations (including a strategic airport) already under way totally contradicted United Nations resolutions on the establishment of military bases and installations in Non-Self-Governing Territories. In the case of Argentina, whose legitimate rights and vital interests had already been dealt a severe blow by the mere British colonial presence in the Malvinas Islands, such a project was clearly nothing short of intolerable, since the decolonization and recovery of the Malvinas Islands were permanent, unwavering and priority objectives of all Argentines. Thus, the realistic solution for the two Governments was the implementation as soon as possible of General Assembly resolutions on the question of the Malvinas Islands, which provided the only possible framework for a negotiated, peaceful and internationally acceptable solution to that serious conflict over sovereignty.

51. Miss GORDON (Trinidad and Tobago) observed that, when properly and conscientiously managed, the activities of foreign economic interests in a Non-Self-Governing Territory could make a positive contribution to the Territory's economy and help accelerate its development, particularly through the provision of managerial and technical training and the transfer of technological know-how and equipment. Unfortunately, that did not generally happen: the colonial experience more frequently revealed the prevalence of the profit motive, which led to the exploitation of the natural resources and, at times, even the human resources of the colonized Territory.

52. Nowhere was that more true than in Namibia, where a handful of South African and foreign companies controlled the entire economy and means of production and virtually all sources of employment. The profits from that unbridled exploitation were immense and the bulk of them were repatriated, bringing no benefit to the Territory, as the Secretariat working paper (A/AC.109/744) indicated. The document showed that injustice and inequalities existed everywhere, in the profits registered by foreign corporations as well as in the distribution of income and land. In recent years, the situation had been compounded by the serious drought which was affecting the whole of southern Africa and by the drop in the prices of raw materials produced by the Territory. Unemployment, which had stood at 18 per cent of the entire population in 1981, had surely risen considerably since then, particularly among blacks. Moreover, in 1982, many foreign companies had taken steps to reduce labour in a bid to maintain their profit margins and had summarily dismissed thousands of black workers.

/...

(Miss Gordon, Trinidad and Tobago)

53. In order to preserve its hold on Namibia, South Africa maintained a massive number of troops at 85-90 bases throughout the Territory. Since October 1980, compulsory military service had been extended to all blacks between the ages of 18 and 25 years, with the result that thousands of young people had fled the country rather than fight against SWAPO in the South African army. The establishment of the South West Africa/Namibia Territory Force and the SWA/Namibia Police, which were used to fight SWAPO and for cross-border incursions, were further examples of South Africa's determination to sow fear and hatred among black Namibians. Her delegation strongly condemned those attempts to enmesh black Namibians in South Africa's conflicts. The vulnerability of their economic position made their determined resistance to those efforts all the more laudable.

54. Not content with exploiting Namibia's resources, certain economic interests operating in the Territory were actively strengthening South Africa's military machine and were integrated into its overall military strategy. In addition, the National Key Points Act had authorized certain companies to establish small private armies in order to ensure collaboration between commercial establishments and the security forces in the control and defence of key installations and industries in Namibia. It was inconceivable that at the end of the twentieth century the human rights of the majority of the population of a Territory and its inalienable right to self-determination and independence should be so subordinated to economic, military and strategic interests.

55. The international community had countless times called in vain on South Africa to end its illegal occupation and exploitation of Namibia. The United Nations had adopted scores of resolutions on the subject, but South Africa, confident of the support of powerful allies having important interests in Namibia, had responded by tightening its stranglehold on the Territory and intensifying its repression there. It was thus essential that concrete measures should be taken at once to put an end to that aberration.

56. Mr. AMARI (Tunisia) said that colonization and discrimination were scourges which his country knew well, but that no nation had suffered from them as much as Namibia had. Twenty-three years after the adoption by the United Nations of the Declaration on the granting of independence, the problem of decolonization had yet to be settled fully; the anachronistic situation which persisted, primarily in southern Africa, was due, at least in part, to the activities of certain foreign interests. It was to denounce those interests that the International Seminar on the Role of Transnational Corporations in South Africa, held in London in November 1979, had issued a declaration in which it had accused transnational corporations of being partially responsible for the maintenance of the apartheid system and the failure of international action for freedom and human dignity in South Africa.

57. In fact, as a result of their privileged position within the South African economy, transnational corporations were more or less directly involved in carrying out the policy of apartheid; they abetted that system because it guaranteed them considerable profits from their activities in South Africa and Namibia. Careful

/...

(Mr. Amari, Tunisia)

consideration of the role of transnational corporations in the strategic sector of the South African economy showed that, despite Security Council resolution 418 (1977), which had instituted an embargo on the sale of weapons to South Africa, transnational corporations had succeeded in setting up an arms industry in that country. In the financial domain, a United Nations study showed that, during the period from January 1979 to July 1982, 181 banks in 18 different countries had loaned a total of \$2.75 billion to South Africa. That financial support naturally helped strengthen the régime in power.

58. The highly significant role of transnational corporations in the Namibian economy had been denounced on numerous occasions. Those corporations had been particularly active in the mining industry, which was immensely profitable for them. According to 1978 estimates, while Namibia's GNP had been 1.4 billion rand, its GDP had been only 933 million rand, a difference of 467 million rand, which proved that significant amounts had been taken out of Namibia. Such massive transfers of capital by transnational corporations had contributed significantly to the country's underdevelopment.

59. The activities of foreign interests in the remaining colonial Territories were inherently incompatible with the principles of the United Nations Charter. The General Assembly itself had emphasized that such activities constituted a major obstacle to the realization of the legitimate hopes of those peoples who were still under colonial rule. The International Court of Justice had stated, in its advisory opinion of 29 June 1970, that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia was illegal. The Court had also recognized Decree No. 1 enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which prohibited anyone from searching for, prospecting for, exploring for, taking, extracting, mining, processing, refining, using, selling, exporting or distributing the Territory's natural resources without the consent or permission of the Council.

60. As long as the Pretoria régime had free access to foreign loans and investments which enabled it to consolidate its colonial economic régime and its military might, it would feel little inclination to take account of the opinion of those who called upon it to change its political and economic system. Developments in Namibia and South Africa gave rise to ever-greater pessimism. Urgent and effective action was required and everything must be done to bring the South African régime into line with international law. The Security Council, whose decisions had been ignored by the Pretoria leadership, should take strong measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to ensure that South Africa complied with the provisions of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

61. When the African countries, including Tunisia, had launched the final assault on colonialism, they had been fully confident in the advent of a world marked by greater respect for freedom and human dignity. They had rejected the colonial order in the belief that they were helping to build a better order based, inter alia, on the notion that the principles of equality and human dignity were universal. Respect for those principles by the Powers which had colonized Africa and then protected the interests that served them well in Africa might actually

/...

(Mr. Amari, Tunisia)

usher in an era of mutual respect and authentic co-operation. That would be one step towards the final liberation of Namibia and one of the foundations of a new international order consistent with the spirit of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

62. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Argentina had given such a distorted version of the facts that he was compelled to offer a more balanced picture of the situation. The representative of Argentina had claimed that the Falkland Islands Company had atrophied the political, economic and social life of the Islands, but he had neglected to say that the Company had played a very important role in the Territory's development. The United Kingdom denied that the Company dominated or exploited the Islands. Far from employing 40 per cent of the Territory's population, it employed less than 14 per cent. While it was true that the Company owned considerable property, it was just one of the 40 large land-owners in the Islands. In fact, the Company had been trying for years to sell some of its land to small farmers in order to encourage independent private ownership.

63. He also denied that the Falkland Islands Company had stripped the inhabitants of their political and social rights: they exercised those rights through their own free and democratic institutions, which were not subject to any influence. The Territory's Government was constituted on the basis of universal suffrage. There were no ex officio representatives of the Falkland Islands Company in the elected councils. Trade-union rights were fully exercised. The trade unions had 500 members working for various enterprises, and there were laws governing salaries, benefits, and the like.

64. With regard to the "militarization" of the Islands, the Committee was aware that British military strength in the South Atlantic was strictly limited to the level needed to deter Argentina from launching further attacks. The failure of that country to renounce explicitly the use of force and its refusal to declare officially a cessation of hostilities left the United Kingdom no alternative. The claim that the British Government was attempting to install a strategic military base in the Islands was totally absurd. He wished to cite some figures to show what the charges against his Government were worth. In April 1982, there had been 42 British soldiers in the Islands. At present there were 3,000. Naturally, that represented a considerable increase, but the number was low in relation to the 10,000 men sent by the Argentine Government to invade the Territory in 1982.

65. Mr. MOLTENI (Argentina), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said he was not surprised that the United Kingdom defended the Falkland Islands Company, since that Company was representative of colonialism in Africa and elsewhere. The United Kingdom had in 1833 occupied part of the territory of Argentina, a sovereign and independent country.

66. The information provided by the representative of the United Kingdom on the Falkland Islands Company might have been more detailed; he had said that there were other land-owners in the Islands, but had omitted to mention that they were

/...

(Mr. Molteni, Argentina)

absentee land-owners, all living in London. It was thus clear that there were interests in the Malvinas Islands which rightly came under the heading of the item under consideration by the Committee. With regard to the democratic nature of the institutions functioning in the Islands, it should be borne in mind that the Malvinas were currently a British colony whose institutions were consequently shaped by the colonial organization of the Islands. That colonial influence also determined how much weight could be given to the position adopted by the inhabitants of the Islands. The Government of the United Kingdom was trying to maintain its colonial administration under the guise of self-determination.

67. The representative of the United Kingdom had not referred to the many United Nations resolutions that stressed the need for negotiations between Argentina and the United Kingdom with regard to sovereignty over the Malvinas; he had stated that the increase in the number of British troops in the Islands had been due to the Argentine threat, without mentioning that the events of 1982 had taken place after 17 years of negotiations. During that time, the British Government had been happy to drag its feet for the simple reason that it did not want anything to come of the negotiations. Before the events, Lord Carrington himself, in a debate in Parliament, had said that the failure of negotiations could only result in confrontation. The authorities had taken no heed and a confrontation had occurred. Argentina and the other Latin American countries wanted to avoid further confrontation and called for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 37/9, adopted in 1982. The fact that the Government of the United Kingdom had embarked upon a "militarization" of the Islands and was currently building a strategically important airport which would be part of a series of military installations located in various parts of the world, notably on Ascension Island, would have serious implications and threatened to influence the future of the Malvinas. His Government's goal was to seek, as quickly as possible, within the framework of the United Nations, a negotiated settlement which would take into consideration the interests of the inhabitants. The British Government, on the other hand, was refusing to negotiate. That was a particularly serious mistake, considering that the United Kingdom was a permanent member of the Security Council and was behaving in that way for reasons of domestic politics. He hoped that the British Government would abandon that policy and agree to begin negotiations with Argentina.

68. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom), speaking on a point of order, said he did not understand why General Assembly resolution 37/9, concerning negotiations between the United Kingdom and Argentina, had been mentioned in the context of agenda item 103; it had nothing to do with the question currently under consideration by the Committee.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.