

2062nd meeting

Friday, 16 November 1973, at 3.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Leonardo DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela).

A/C.4/SR.2062 and Corr.2

In the absence of the Chairman, Mrs. Joka-Bangura (Sierra Leone), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 73

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 Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa (continued) (A/9023 (part III), A/9061)

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

1. Mr. DE ROSENZWEIG DIAZ (Mexico) said that, in the conclusions set forth in chapter IV of its report (A/9023 (part III), para. 6), 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 drawn attention to the extensive exploitation of human and natural resources in the colonial Territories by foreign undertakings and the absence of any legislative or administrative measures adopted on the subject by the Governments of the countries in which such undertakings had their headquarters. The economic structures of the Territories under colonial administration should be analysed within the traditional framework of European colonialism, which was skilfully developed to fit in with present-day political, social and economic conditions and designed to perpetuate the subjection of the former colonies to the metropolitan country. In such Territories, there were in fact two economic systems: the economy of the colonial Power based on exploitable natural and human resources, which benefited only the interests of that Power and consolidated the *status quo*; and the subsistence economy of the great majority of the indigenous population, deprived of any opportunity to achieve progress through access to more sophisticated forms of production. From that dual economy stemmed the unjust discriminatory practices which kept the indigenous inhabitants permanently at the bottom of the social pyramid.

2. In despoiling the colonial Territories of their non-renewable natural resources, to the detriment of their future economic development, the colonial authorities were assisted by business enterprises from the great economic Powers. Such enterprises also exerted a strong political pressure on their own Governments so that the latter took no steps to transform their activities into an instrument to promote the economic progress of the indigenous peoples themselves.

3. Such a situation obtained not only in the Territories under colonial administration; it also limited the economic

independence of some developing countries, from which it was not uncommon for the former administering Power to draw greater profits than in the colonial era. Owing to the educational and technical backwardness of their own peoples, the newly independent States were forced to allow nationals of the ex-colonial Power to assume direction of their economies in order to cope with their development problems. That situation should be provided for in working out a charter of economic rights and duties of States.¹

4. The international community should intensify its action to promote the social and economic welfare of the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories and co-ordinate its efforts through the regional economic commissions and the specialized agencies to eliminate the economic dependence of such Territories.

5. In Territories where natural and human resources were limited, foreign interests excluded those Territories from participation in economic development and consequently from the possibility of taking political decisions which would lead to their complete independence. The Committee should devote more meetings to the consideration of the problems of Territories with limited resources, whose inhabitants were entitled to the same rights as all other human beings.

6. His delegation would vote in favour of any proposal designed to promote the economic and social well-being of the Territories under colonial administration and to enable them to establish the healthy economic structure essential to the full enjoyment of complete independence.

7. Mrs. SEXTON (Philippines) said that her delegation supported the recommendations of the Special Committee (*ibid.*, para. 7). Since 1965, the General Assembly and the Special Committee had become increasingly concerned with the activities of foreign economic interests in colonial Territories and the working papers prepared annually on the subject by the Secretariat showed that such concern was not unfounded. The General Assembly had repeatedly condemned such activities and had called on the Governments concerned to put an end to them.

8. Her delegation wished to draw particular attention to conclusions (1) and (2) of the Special Committee (*ibid.*, para. 6). Decolonization had been one of the United Nations outstanding achievements. Under the aegis of the United Nations many Non-Self-Governing Territories had attained independence. The activities of the States referred to in the Special Committee's report, however, impeded the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of

¹ See *Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Third Session, vol. I, Report and Annexes* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.73.II.D.4), annex I.A, resolution 45 (III).

Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which had been adopted by a large majority at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly.

9. Her delegation would support a draft resolution providing for more effective measures to put an end to the undesirable activities of foreign economic and other interests in colonial Territories.

10. Mr. FADHLI (Democratic Yemen) said that the majority of speakers on agenda item 73 had conveyed their Governments' view that many of the capitalist States were willingly or unwillingly under pressure from the multinational corporations operating in colonial Territories. In South Africa, transnational corporations and imperialist interests had overthrown the constitutionally elected Government of Salvador Allende, in contravention of United Nations resolutions proclaiming the inalienable right of peoples to control their own natural resources and to change their social and economic structures. Another example was Puerto Rico: he fully supported the Cuban representative's statement on that subject at the 2059th meeting. In Africa, the activities of such corporations were proceeding with the co-operation of Portugal and the racist régime of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia.

11. In explaining their vote against the draft resolution on the situation in South Africa resulting from the policies of *apartheid*² adopted by the Special Political Committee at its 888th meeting, a number of delegations had said that they did not believe in the use of force. Surely they were not unaware of the violence to which the indigenous peoples of southern Africa were being subjected by the régimes which their Governments supported.

12. His delegation was convinced that the only way to ensure freedom and independence for the African peoples was by giving full support to the national liberation movements in their struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism. His delegation would support any draft resolution condemning the activities of foreign economic interests in the colonial Territories and calling on all States Members of the United Nations to adopt firm measures against the racist and imperialist régimes.

13. Mr. ARAIM (Iraq) said that the agenda item was of great interest to all who opposed colonialism because it revealed the undeniable link, based on common interests, between the colonial Powers and the multinational corporations. The former depended on the latter to perpetuate their domination by keeping the people in the colonial Territories so backward that they were unable to devote themselves to the struggle for independence. The African peoples would, however, finally emerge victorious.

14. The multinational corporations, for their part, had a vital stake in the colonial Territories. Representatives of the national liberation movements had provided valuable information about the ways in which such corporations impeded the implementation of United Nations resolutions by their influence over the policy-makers in the United States and in the Western European countries. Multina-

tional corporations were not concerned with developing the economy of colonial Territories for the benefit of the indigenous population but only with their own interests and those of the colonial régimes. If developed countries were serious in their desire to uphold the Charter, they should put an end to the co-operation of the corporations with headquarters in their countries with those régimes. His delegation would support any draft resolution which would further such an end.

15. Mr. MAUERSBERGER (German Democratic Republic) said that the struggle against foreign economic and other interests was a most important aspect of the struggle against colonialism and *apartheid*. The United Nations had concerned itself with the problem for many years and had adopted a number of resolutions on the subject, resolutions which had unfortunately been disregarded by the States concerned. Monopolies from the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) had been particularly active in southern Africa, with the support of the racist régimes of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal, their object being to perpetuate colonial domination. The extent of their activities was clearly shown in the appendices to chapter IV of the Special Committee's report (A/9023 (part III)).

16. Foreign monopolies, increasingly supported by their national Governments, were plundering the mineral wealth of Southern Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique and Namibia, the last-named being the Territory most subject to their exploitation. The principal purchasers of chrome from Southern Rhodesia were the major Western industrial Powers, the monopolies of which used a variety of expedients to defeat the implementation of United Nations sanctions. Many monopolies made no attempt to hide their expanding activities, which were confirmed by press releases from South African embassies. He gave a list of the companies exploiting or prospecting the mineral resources of Namibia and stated that mining investments constituted 60 per cent of the \$70 million of foreign capital invested in Namibia in fishing, mining and manufactures. He also cited some examples of increasing direct economic co-operation in Angola and Mozambique between foreign monopolies and Portugal.

17. As the Cuban representative had stated at the 2059th meeting, such facts proved that it was not a question of the activities of individual firms; the political, economic, military and strategic interests of imperialist circles were being co-ordinated to ensure supplies of strategic raw materials and petroleum in times of crisis, since many independent States had now put an end to the economic exploitation of their resources by foreign monopolies. That was another reason why foreign monopolies helped the colonialist régimes to remain in power.

18. His delegation considered that sanctions should be extended to all the colonialist racist régimes in southern Africa and should include all goods of economic importance, including petroleum and petroleum products. The United Nations should take effective action to ensure that the embargo imposed by the Security Council on the supply of arms was strictly complied with. All States should undertake to ban exports from South Africa and Southern

² Subsequently adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 3051 (XXVIII).

Rhodesia. His delegation supported the Special Committee's recommendations (*ibid.*, para. 7).

19. Mr. ZIMBA (Zambia) noted that, despite repeated discussion of the item in the past, little had been done owing to the refusal of the colonial Powers to implement United Nations decisions. The NATO Powers, which had been helping Portugal, had now been given a stake in the Cabora Bassa dam project, which, in addition to providing electricity, would make all kinds of mineral and industrial development possible in Mozambique, thus attracting an extra 1 million white settlers to the country, who would strengthen Portugal's presence there. Undoubtedly most of them would be demobilized soldiers and their families and they would take more and more land from the Africans, thus presenting southern Africa with another phase of colonialism and imperialism. While agreeing to help in the construction of the multi-million-dollar project, the Western Powers had demanded security, which could only be provided through South African involvement. The consortium which had been awarded the contract included, in addition to a South African firm, monopolies from four Western countries, some of which were participating in the work of the Committee. The fact that Portugal had only been committed to putting up 20 per cent of the total cost showed its economic weakness and the extent to which it was being supported by South Africa and the Western nations. Although British companies had withdrawn from the actual project, British factories were being set up in Mozambique as a result of the project. Moreover, the Governments of France and the Federal Republic of Germany were also directly involved. Firms in the Federal Republic were to receive a loan through the Government-controlled Reconstruction Loan Institute repayable in 1975, when the dam was expected to be completed. Thanks to the decision to build the dam, South African troops had penetrated into Mozambique, although the South African Government claimed that they were male nurses sent to help in the fight against communism.

20. South African involvement in the Territories under Portuguese domination was further illustrated by the fact that, under the Transvaal-Mozambique Convention,³ Africans from Mozambique were recruited to work in Transvaal mines in return for guaranteed transit through Lourenço Marques of 40 per cent of the total tonnage of commercial sea-borne imports to the heart of the Transvaal. In addition, in 1969 South Africa had undertaken to provide about \$640 million for the Cunene River Basin scheme in the form of non-reimbursable grants and long-term loans.

21. The situation with respect to Southern Rhodesia was the same, for the strength of that régime lay outside the Territory itself. Certain countries had undermined the effect of United Nations resolutions by giving the Smith régime moral and material support, thus furthering the aims of the rebellion. The Commonwealth Sanctions Committee had discovered that Southern Rhodesia was able to import a number of items with the help of some neighbouring

countries and to export a number of products under the guise of exports from Mozambique and South Africa. A startling discrepancy had been revealed between the figures for the quantities of tobacco exported from South Africa and Mozambique to Western Europe and the amounts imported into Western Europe from those two countries. Undoubtedly the discrepancy was due to the fact that much of the imported tobacco came from Southern Rhodesia. Moreover, Southern Rhodesian exports had risen by \$34 million between 1970 and 1971. There was no doubt that South Africa and Portugal were mainly responsible, together with the United States, which was importing Southern Rhodesian chrome.

22. In Namibia Western European mining companies and Western Governments were openly flouting United Nations resolutions. The involvement of the Governments of the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany in uranium mining had strengthened South Africa's hold on Namibia. Of the 800 million German marks so far invested in the new uranium mines, 600 million had been provided by the Ministry of Economic Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany. Moreover, the Atomic Energy Authority of the United Kingdom had contracted to buy £25 million worth of uranium oxide from South Africa between 1976 and 1983. Although the United States representative had said as far back as the twenty-fifth session (1898th meeting) that his country would no longer guarantee investments made by its nationals in Namibia, it was reported that the Bethlehem Steel Corporation had decided to work fluorine deposits with the Tsumeb Corporation, Ltd., which had one of the biggest lead mines in Africa.

23. At the present stage of Namibia's development *apartheid* was a stimulant to economic activity, its fundamental purpose being to create copious supplies of cheap labour in order to permit high returns on capital: South Africa was extending its racial and political legislation to Namibia. Africans, who represented 82 per cent of the population in Namibia, had only 25 per cent of the land, all industrial and mining areas being for whites only. The Africans were also deprived of basic trade union and political rights. Western capitalism had a vested interest in the *status quo* and was helping Pretoria to consolidate its hold on Namibia with a view to making it a buffer State to protect its own security.

24. If any country was to be blamed for the situation in southern Africa, it was South Africa. Without South Africa's support Portugal would have relinquished its so-called provinces and in Southern Rhodesia Ian Smith would not have declared independence. It was therefore necessary for the international community to put South Africa in a position where it would not be able to help other régimes to remain in power. In addition, countries with companies which had investments in the occupied Territories should bring pressure to bear upon them to identify those investments with the national liberation movements.

25. Mr. FARGHAL (Egypt) pointed out that the struggle against imperialism and colonialism required a multidimensional approach, for it was necessary to fight both the colonial Powers themselves and the economic exploitation

³ Convention regulating the Introduction of Native Labour from Mozambique into the Province of the Transvaal, Railway Matters and the Commercial Intercourse between the Union of South Africa and the Colony of Mozambique, signed at Pretoria on 11 September 1928.

by means of which the colonial régimes were consolidating their power. The activities of foreign economic and other interests in the dependent Territories constituted a serious obstacle to liberation, for it was thanks to such activities that the colonial Powers were able to confront the liberation struggle and the international pressure brought to bear upon them and challenge any action taken against them.

26. The main aim of the international monopolies in the colonial Territories was to make the largest possible profits, regardless of the interest of the indigenous people. They were able to do so by exploiting the natural resources and cheap labour in those Territories and by taking advantage of the discriminatory laws enacted by the colonial Powers. In agriculture, the economies of the colonial Territories consisted of two parallel sectors, a cash economy controlled by colonial interests and a traditional subsistence sector. By maintaining that separation, colonialism and international monopolies had impeded the economic development of the colonial Territories. In addition, the indigenous people were being driven out of the fertile lands. Deprived of their means of subsistence, they were obliged to work in industries or on white-owned farms, for discriminatory minimal wages. In the mining industry, it was common knowledge that the natural resources were being depleted. Indeed, it was reported that at the present rate of mining the diamond deposits mined by the De Beers company would be exhausted in 20 years. Those activities had brought the people of Namibia no profit, for there was no trace of economic development and the average African wage in mines was one twentieth of that of the whites.

27. The Lisbon-Salisbury-Pretoria axis had been consolidated and encouraged by the foreign monopolies. An example of that was the Cunene River Basin project, which was designed to sustain the colonial presence of Portugal in Africa and which had been brought about by increased co-operation between South Africa and Portugal. Apart from the economic benefits which the project brought to the colonial economy, the regrouping of the local population in that area had increased the Portuguese authorities' control over them and enabled more Europeans to settle in the area, thereby creating a white buffer zone in southern Africa.

28. In an attempt to entrench their position in southern Africa, foreign monopolies were supporting the racist régimes militarily. In the case of Angola and Mozambique special taxes were levied to support the military budget for the purpose of waging a war against the national liberation movements. Not only did such action delay the attainment of independence by the Territories but it constituted a threat to the security of neighbouring independent States. Consequently, the first step in the eradication of colonialism should be the liquidation of foreign economic activities in the colonial Territories and the provision of support by the international community to the liberation struggle.

29. Mr. WOOD (Panama) said that it was the ineluctable obligation of the delegations present to live up to the hopes placed in them by the peoples of the world. Although it was true that the Powers best equipped to fight had by means of great sacrifices and diplomacy averted the

outbreak of a third world war, it was also true that they had permitted the humiliation of countless people by condoning racial discrimination and economic exploitation. In that connexion he pointed out that Panama, a peace-loving country and one where the races had fully blended, was sending 40 well-trained units as part of the United Nations contingent to keep the peace on the Suez Canal.

30. Although political oppression had not entirely disappeared, it had given way to economic oppression. The relationship between international peace and security and the existence in many places of under-development which produced discontent, confrontation and violent clashes had long been recognized. Moreover, the principle of the sovereign equality of all Members of the United Nations would not be fully implemented until nations were able to dispose freely of their resources. The interdependence resulting from technological progress should be based on co-operation, in other words on the sharing of financial and technical resources. Referring to the Cabora Bassa dam and the Cunene River Basin projects he noted that the true extent of the profits of multinational corporations could not be disclosed for fear of condemnation.

31. His Government would welcome positive action from those Powers who had control over the enjoyment of resources to show their desire to close the gap between rich and poor.

Mr. Díaz González (Venezuela) took the Chair.

32. Mr. ALIO (Niger) said that, as long as foreign companies assured the colonial Powers that they would receive outside support, those Powers would continue to defy the United Nations. Far from helping to improve the living conditions of the non-white population in the colonial Territories, foreign investments in those regions led to the removal of the indigenous population from fertile to barren areas, where they were faced with unemployment and starvation. That had happened in the case of the Cabora Bassa dam project and the Cunene River Basin project, the latter financed by South Africa. Through the resettlement of the African inhabitants and their replacement by Europeans, those two projects would create a white buffer zone. The elaborate security measures adopted to guard against possible action by the liberation movements was proof of the determination of the colonialists to achieve their ends whatever the cost.

33. Despite General Assembly resolutions, the flow of capital to southern Africa had continued unabated; indeed, foreign economic interests were hastening to exhaust the non-renewable resources of the dependent Territories in order to ensure that they would remain economically dependent. The manufacturing industries remained in the hands of foreign capital and all the profits derived from those activities were repatriated or shared with the colonial régimes. Similarly, the taxes and other royalties paid by those companies filled the coffers of the racist Governments and were used to finance repressive measures against the liberation movements. The interference of foreign companies in the affairs of the Territories was such that they had their own police and security forces and did not hesitate to use them against the indigenous workers, whose wages were far lower than those paid to Europeans. The

violation of the sanctions imposed against Southern Rhodesia and the proliferation of South African companies there and in Namibia illustrated the capital role that the South African régime was playing in southern Africa. The foreign interests which benefited from that situation were thus accomplices of racism and *apartheid* and were helping to impede United Nations action. His delegation therefore endorsed the recommendations of the Special Committee on the subject (A/9023 (part III), para. 7).

34. Ms. WHITE (United States of America) said that her delegation was once again obliged to take issue with the recommendations of the Special Committee. It would appear from chapter IV of that Committee's report that the conclusions were probably formulated in advance and that the evidence included in it had been chosen to support the conclusions, or at least not to contradict them.

35. Although by law the scope of the United States Government's authority over the trade and investment activities of private United States firms was limited, the United States permitted neither trade with nor investment in Southern Rhodesia, except for humanitarian goods and strategic minerals. Despite the fact that it had a major balance-of-payments problem and that South Africa was an economically attractive market, it refrained from promoting trade with South Africa or investment there and it neither guaranteed nor insured such investments. Prospective United States investors in South Africa were counselled on the economic as well as political conditions in that country, but the United States Government neither encouraged nor discouraged them. Its commercial activities were restricted to minimum facilitative services. In line with its position that South Africa's presence in Namibia was illegal, the United States Government had since May 1970 followed a policy of discouraging further United States investment in Namibia and had advised potential investors that it would not intercede to protect their investments against claims of a future legitimate Government.

36. With regard to the Territories under Portuguese administration, the United States neither formally encouraged or discouraged trade or investment. It had not encouraged involvement in major projects in those Territories.

37. While it did not consider withdrawal of investment or trade embargoes to be feasible courses of action, her Government had sought to counsel United States firms in southern Africa on ways of modifying their policies to provide greater benefits for their African employees. It had published information which suggested areas where advancement could be made. Some of the larger American firms had already taken commendable steps towards eliminating discriminatory practices based upon race. It was logical to ask whether the trade and investment activities of foreign firms served to perpetuate white minority rule, but it was also necessary to consider whether restricting the involvement of foreign firms in southern Africa would help to bring about the desired changes. The Africans most directly affected by the presence of United States companies in South Africa had, by and large, opposed suggestions that they should leave and had expressed the hope that they would help to remove the injustices of the South

African system. The Committee should certainly take those people's views into account.

38. Referring to the statement made by the representative of Cuba at the 2059th meeting, she pointed out that the question of Puerto Rico was not before the Committee and that the General Assembly had decided, in resolution 748 (VIII) that the Declaration regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories formulated under chapter XI of the United Nations Charter could no longer be applied to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. That decision had been dramatically reaffirmed by the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session, when the proposal to include an item on Puerto Rico on the agenda had been rejected by an overwhelming majority.⁴ The Committee could not make a mockery of plenary decisions. If it ignored them it would make a sham not only of past decisions by the General Assembly but also of the rules of procedure. Such a procedure would, of course, eventually destroy the United Nations.

39. Mr. SKOFENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation regarded foreign economic involvement as a means of perpetuating colonialism in southern Africa. The numerous studies of the activities of foreign economic interests had revealed that fabulous profits were made from the exploitation of natural resources and cheap labour; that, because of their greed for profits, the foreign monopolies had a vested interest in maintaining the colonial régimes in southern Africa; and that they provided both overt and covert assistance to those colonial régimes, thus impeding the process of decolonization. Chapter IV of the report of the Special Committee (A/9023 (part III)) showed that foreign monopolies had continued to intensify their activities to the point where they controlled virtually the entire economies of southern African countries. Such predatory activities brought untold profits: in 1972, the Anglo American Corporation of South Africa had increased its profits by 58 per cent and Lonrho, Ltd. had increased its operations in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. With the support of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, foreign monopolies were endeavouring to entrench themselves even more firmly in that country. In addition, 34 corporations were engaged in prospecting operations in Namibia, in flagrant disregard of United Nations resolutions. The demands of the General Assembly that Member States should cease their support for projects such as the Cabora Bassa dam had been heeded by very few countries.

40. The introduction of foreign capital into the Territories of southern Africa had been seen to have an even more pernicious influence than the introduction of foreign troops. The profits made by foreign monopolies were used not to benefit the indigenous population, but to support the colonial régimes. In Angola and Mozambique, foreign monopolies paid a special tax to the military budget, thus openly assisting the colonial régimes. Africans were herded into reservations and African workers were paid only one sixth of the wages paid to non-Africans. There was a total absence of social legislation and the African inhabitants were deliberately kept in a state of illiteracy.

⁴ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1938th meeting, para. 110.

41. His delegation condemned the activities of foreign economic interests and demanded that they should be brought to an end, since they were tantamount to enslavement of the indigenous population. His delegation fully supported the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee (*ibid.*, paras. 6 and 7) and hoped that the General Assembly would take effective action to put an end to the activities of foreign monopolies.

42. Mr. HEIDWEILLER (Netherlands), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, noted that the representative of Sierra Leone had stated at the 2059th meeting that the Netherlands was a major consumer of Angolan coffee. He wished to point out that that situation no longer obtained. Two years previously, the Netherlands Angola Committee had launched a campaign against the import of products from Angola. The Chairman of that Committee had given an account of the Angolan coffee boycott to the Special Committee at its 845th meeting on 28 March 1972. The campaign had received the support of many sectors in the Netherlands and had achieved significant results. Consequently, imports of coffee from Angola had become minimal.

43. Anyone wishing for further information on the matter could obtain the address of the Angola Committee from the Permanent Mission of the Netherlands to the United Nations.

44. Mrs. JIMENEZ (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, pointed out to the representative of the United States that General Assembly resolution 748 (VIII) had been superseded by General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The countries to which that resolution related included Puerto Rico, since it was still a colonial Territory.

45. Furthermore, at its twenty-seventh session (2078th plenary meeting) the General Assembly had approved the report of the Special Committee by an overwhelming majority. That report had included a resolution relating to Puerto Rico and recognizing the inalienable right of its people to self-determination and independence.⁵ In 1973, the Special Committee, acting on the recommendation of the General Assembly, had continued its consideration of the case of Puerto Rico. The Special Committee's recommendations on the situation in Puerto Rico were to be found in chapter I of its report (A/9023 (part I), para. 84).

46. Her delegation could not accept the statement by the representative of the United States that Puerto Rico was a free, associated State. A country could only be called a State if it exercised the fundamental rights of national sovereignty, independence, self-determination and territorial integrity. Puerto Rico was nothing but a vast United States military and economic base with no control over its foreign or defence policies or the administration of justice. It was, in effect, simply an area of exploitation and oppression. Furthermore, in Puerto Rico the word "freedom" was entirely meaningless, since each manifestation of servitude was called freedom by the imperialists. Finally, Puerto Rico could not be an associated State, since it was governed by laws which were heavily weighted in favour of the imperialists.

47. It was not surprising that the statement made by the representative of the United States had been an attempt to vindicate the activities of United States multinational companies, since those companies acted with the full support of the United States Government.

48. Ms. WHITE (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Special Committee had made no recommendation on Puerto Rico either to the General Assembly or to the Committee. Consequently, General Assembly resolution 748 (VIII) still applied. She pointed out that the people of Puerto Rico had made clear their views on the question of independence in the elections of 1972.

49. Mrs. JOKA-BANGURA (Sierra Leone), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, welcomed the statement made by the representative of the Netherlands. She expressed the hope that other countries would exercise their right of reply to indicate that they, too, had ceased trading activities with the colonial Territories in southern Africa.

50. The CHAIRMAN said that, in her statement, the distinguished representative of the United States had alluded to the discussion which had taken place at the 2059th meeting of the Committee during the general debate on agenda item 73 and had said that the Committee not only had made a mockery of the decisions taken by the General Assembly but had also violated the rules of procedure.

51. In order that there might be no doubt about the Chairman's action, he wished to make the following explanatory statement.

52. It was established practice in the Committee that in speaking on one item delegates could refer to other colonial questions. That procedure was quite logical, since colonial questions were closely interrelated. Although the colonies might be situated in different parts of the world, the principle of colonialism was one and the same, whatever the colony might be and whoever might be the colonial Power.

53. As he had brought out in his opening statement (2026th meeting), the historic General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) was applicable equally, and in its totality, to all colonial Territories, in whatever continent they were situated and no matter who was the colonial Power.

54. The item on Puerto Rico had been studied by the Special Committee at its plenary meetings during 1973, having already been studied in 1972, and in accordance with a resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 28 August 1972, at its 890th meeting.⁵

55. At its 938th, 941st to 944th, 947th and 948th meetings, between 16 and 30 August of the current year, the Special Committee had discussed the item on the basis of the report submitted by its working group, which had been "instructed" in the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 28 August 1972 to submit "a report relating specifically to the procedure to be followed by the Special

⁵ *Ibid.*, Twenty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 23 (A/8723/Rev.1), chap. I, para. 85.

Committee for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) with respect to Puerto Rico".

56. The result of the consideration by the Special Committee of the question thus posed had been the resolution adopted by the Special Committee 30 August 1973, at its 948th meeting (A/9023 (part I), para. 84).

57. In the fifth preambular paragraph of that resolution, the Special Committee considered "the necessity of furthering the study of all pertinent aspects of the situation with respect to the procedure for the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) regarding Puerto Rico".

58. Then, in the operative part, it:

"1. *Reaffirms* the inalienable right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960;

"2. *Requests* the Government of the United States of America to refrain from taking any measures which might obstruct the full and free exercise by the people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, as well as their economic, social and other rights, and in particular to prevent any violation of these rights by bodies corporate under its jurisdiction;

"3. *Requests* its Rapporteur, with the assistance of the Secretariat, to collect all pertinent information on the question, including the views of all the parties concerned, for the purpose of facilitating its consideration of the question in 1974;

"4. *Decides* to keep the question under continuous review."

59. Thus, as could be seen, that question was among the items submitted for the consideration of the General Assembly and the Fourth Committee and it had been on those facts that the Chair had based itself in proceeding in the way it had done, which he considered just and correct.

60. If the members of the Committee had no objections on that score, he would like his statement to appear *in extenso* in the record of the meeting.

It was so decided.

61. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he resented the implication in the statement by the representative of the United States that foreign investments in countries under colonial domination were designed to help the African

population of those countries. It was quite clear that such was not the case.

62. The representative of the United States had said that, if the United Nations endeavoured to put an end to foreign economic activities in colonial countries, the people of those Territories would suffer. His delegation believed that it was better for people to suffer in order to achieve a happier life in the future than to continue to be subject to colonial domination.

63. Ms. WHITE (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the United States delegation could not agree with the Chairman's interpretation of the relevant resolutions and reserved the right to revert to the question later.

64. Mr. BENYAHIA (Algeria) said that his delegation had been astounded that a great Power should try to obstruct the Committee's consideration of the entire problem of decolonization, since the purpose of the Committee was to promote decolonization. He noted that the Powers affected by decolonization expressed what they considered to be the views of the peoples subject to colonialism, but those peoples did not accept those views.

65. At the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers in September 1973, a declaration on the struggle for national liberation had been adopted, dealing with the problem of colonialism and possible solutions to it. That declaration had emphasized the importance of the attainment of independence by countries under the colonial yoke. The non-aligned countries had adopted the declaration because they felt that their own freedom was meaningless if other countries in Africa were not free.

66. His delegation protested vigorously against certain statements made by the representative of the United States with regard to Puerto Rico and the Territories under colonial domination in southern Africa. In explaining the attitude of the United States towards economic sanctions, the representative of the United States had said that the United States Government was refraining from encouraging private investment or from offering any guarantees for such investment. Since the United States Government knew that such investments were being made, his delegation would be interested to hear what positive steps the United States Government was taking to prevent violations of sanctions.

67. His delegation felt that the Committee had a duty to ensure the speedy implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in all Territories under colonial domination, including Puerto Rico.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.