

UNITED NATIONS  
**General Assembly**

FORTY-FIFTH SESSION

*Official Records*

FOURTH COMMITTEE  
6th meeting  
held on  
Friday, 12 October 1990  
at 10 a.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 6th MEETING

Chairman:

Mr. ADOUKI

(Congo)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 112: 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 TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA  
(continued)

General debate (continued)

Consideration of draft recommendations

*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 corrigendum for each Committee

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.4/45/SR.6  
26 October 1990  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 112: 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 TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued) (A/45/23 (Part IV); A/AC.109/1018, 1020, 1024, 1027, 1028, 1030, 1032, 1034 and 1035)

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. AL-KINDI (United Arab Emirates) said that the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was one of the most effective documents of the United Nations and that his country supported all steps designed to ensure the exercise by all peoples and Non-Self-Governing Territories of the right to self-determination and independence. The world was watching with optimism the developments in the international arena which were facilitating the establishment of peace and stability everywhere.

2. However, that process had been brought to a halt by Iraq's aggression against and occupation and annexation of Kuwait. That action had been condemned by the international community, which had also demanded an end to the aggression and the restoration of Kuwait's sovereignty. The United Arab Emirates affirmed their support for all the resolutions adopted by the Arab countries and the international community condemning the aggressor and calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi troops and the return of the legitimate Government of Kuwait.

3. His country had itself been a victim of colonialism in the past and it condemned the activities of foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the attainment of freedom and independence by oppressed peoples. It also condemned the racism and discrimination in the activities of the administrations of Non-Self-Governing Territories encouraged by the administering Powers for the purpose of exploiting the natural wealth and undermining the economies of the Territories. The unbridled exploitation and plunder of natural resources and the degradation of the environment were causes for concern, for they violated the principle that the natural resources of Non-Self-Governing Territories were the property of the peoples living there. It was essential to take all possible steps to protect the natural wealth of the Territories under colonial rule and to prevent foreign hegemony.

4. In accordance with paragraph 9 of the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 35/118, annex), it was essential to take all possible steps to curtail military activities, nuclear weapons testing, the burying of nuclear wastes, the establishment of military bases, and the development of weapons of mass destruction. The basis of economic co-operation must be the right of peoples to self-determination, control of their own resources, freedom and independence. Only co-operation on that basis would bring benefits for

(Mr. Al-Kindi, United Arab Emirates)

all and ensure security. In view of the current situation, efforts must be redoubled within the United Nations to provide colonial countries and peoples with an opportunity to achieve independence, so that they could exercise their political, economic and social rights.

5. The United Nations had played a noteworthy role in ensuring Namibia's transition to independence. That was a positive step, but much remained to be done in order to put an end to apartheid and revoke the repressive and racist laws which were impeding the exercise of the economic, political and social rights of the whole population of South Africa. It was therefore necessary to take measures to ensure that the pressure on the racist régime was not relaxed and to put an end to apartheid once and for all.

6. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu) expressed his thanks for the kind words addressed to him in connection with his occupation of the Chair of the Committee at the last session of the General Assembly and he said that the success of the Committee's work at that session had been due to the efforts of delegations and of the Secretariat.

Consideration of draft recommendations (A/45/23 (Part IV, chap. V, para. 11 and chap. VI, para. 11))

7. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would now take up the two draft texts contained in document A/45/23 (Part IV) and invited delegations to speak in explanation of their vote before the vote.

8. Mr. TENNE (Israel) said that the draft resolution and the draft decision recommended by the Special Committee on decolonization contained in document A/45/23 (Part IV) condemned only Israel and no one else for co-operation with South Africa. That was a shameful and discriminatory practice. Such resolutions were usually adopted by an automatic majority but it was still required to support its accusations with evidence. In that connection it was necessary once again to dispel the myth of nuclear co-operation between Israel and South Africa. Anyone who was genuinely interested in the implementation of the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples must recognize that unjust and discriminatory resolutions based on fabrications did nothing to secure success in the just struggle against racism and apartheid. Such resolutions were in nobody's interest. Israel, which had always stated its readiness to support the developing countries and co-operate with them, was regrettably compelled to vote against the proposed draft resolution. However, it would never allow such resolutions to prompt it to renounce its policy of co-operation, not in the military or nuclear spheres, but in areas such as science and technology, agriculture and medicine, social security and the environment. Israel would continue to make its contribution to the attainment of the Committee's real goals.

9. Mr. SLABY (Czechoslovakia) said that the draft resolution proposed under agenda item 112 gave rise to serious objections on the part of his delegation, for the text was full of rhetoric, anachronisms and repetitions. Not only did the draft resolution not help the implementation of the Declaration, it might even have a negative impact on that process. His country regretted that the draft resolution did not duly reflect the activities of foreign economic and other interest which actually worked to the benefit of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories. At the same time, Czechoslovakia reaffirmed its adherence to the principles set out in the Declaration; for that reason alone his delegation would not vote against the draft resolution and decision proposed by the Special Committee. However, it should be borne in mind in future that its decision to abstain was of a preliminary nature and taken with reservations.

10. Mr. TRAXLER (Italy), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, reaffirmed their strong support for all efforts made in accordance with the Charter to eliminate colonialism and their commitment to the right of Non-Self-Governing Territories to self-determination. The Twelve opposed any activities of foreign economic and other interests which might impede the process of self-determination of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories. However, the draft resolution did not take into account the fact that foreign investments often contributed greatly to the economic and social development of those Territories and it drew no distinction between their beneficial and their harmful activities. The Twelve had reservations of principle with regard to the paragraphs of the draft resolution which did not conform with the provisions of the Charter concerning the division of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council. They also deplored the singling out of individual countries.

11. The Twelve expressed their concern that the Fourth Committee once again had to deal with a draft decision relating to military activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories, since that subject was not among the agenda items allocated to it by the General Assembly.

12. With regard to southern Africa, the Twelve recalled that the situation in Namibia had been the basis for the reference to apartheid under the item. In view of Namibia's accession to independence, they felt that matters relating to apartheid were no longer part of the terms of reference of the Fourth Committee, which dealt with decolonization. For those reasons they would not be able to vote in favour of the proposed draft texts.

13. Mr. KEMBER (New Zealand) said that his delegation had followed with considerable interest the debate on the question of the activities of foreign economic and other interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories. In New Zealand's view, investments in the Territories which did not bring a return to their peoples were unacceptable. Investments could and should be beneficial. His delegation welcomed the inclusion in the draft resolution of a paragraph on the protection of the natural resources of Non-Self-Governing Territories and of proper control over their development. One of the greatest threats to natural resources came from the impact of global warming. Unless the trend towards global warming was arrested it would lead to the physical disappearance of low-lying territories, including

(Mr. Kember, New Zealand)

non-self-governing ones. It was regrettable that the proposed draft texts contained language which once again prevented New Zealand from voting in favour of them.

14. It was also regrettable that the draft texts did not reflect the many changes taking place in the world and used inappropriate language. New Zealand was particularly pleased that one of the seminars organized by the United Nations had been on decolonization in the Pacific region. It was disappointing that the forward-looking thinking which had guided the final stages of the decolonization of Namibia and the conduct of the seminars had not been carried through into the draft texts. New Zealand would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution and the draft decision.

15. Miss BIRD (Australia) said that her delegation supported the reservations expressed by other delegations with respect to some outdated language used in the drafts under consideration. Her delegation also was against the practice of singling out individual countries. In the 30 years since the adoption of the Declaration on decolonization the Committee's agenda had changed considerably. Namibia's achievement of independence was the most recent example of the successful implementation of the right to self-determination by Non-Self-Governing Territories. However, that did not mean that the Committee's work had diminished in importance. Close attention was required in the case of each of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Her delegation firmly supported the role of the United Nations and the Committee in promoting decolonization. All the provisions of the draft resolution and the draft decision had been correct at the time they had been drawn up. Until the previous year Australia had supported them. However, ignoring the changes which had taken place would not be of any benefit to the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Accordingly, Australia would abstain in the voting on the draft resolution and the draft decision.

16. Mr. HAJNOCZI (Austria) said that the texts of the draft resolution and draft decision did not reflect the important developments that had occurred over the past year. Those texts seemed all the more untimely in that the General Assembly had adopted by consensus new formulations at the special session on apartheid and at the resumed forty-fourth session. Certain activities of foreign economic and other interests indeed impeded the process of decolonization. At the same time other activities undoubtedly promoted the economic and social development of Non-Self-Governing Territories. Therefore, a major shortcoming was that the draft resolution did not reflect sufficiently that basic reality. As far as specific paragraphs of the draft resolution were concerned, his delegation reiterated that the General Assembly should respect the prerogatives of the Security Council, and it deplored the continued practice in the texts of singling out individual countries. For those reasons, it would abstain in the voting.

17. Mr. TROLLE (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, reaffirmed their longstanding support for any realistic measures that were taken in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations in order to implement the Declaration on decolonization. The Nordic countries firmly condemned

(Mr. Trolle, Sweden)

the activities of foreign economic and other interests which impeded the process of decolonization in Non-Self-Governing Territories. However, the draft resolution under consideration failed to recognize that foreign economic and other activities could be beneficial to the economic and social development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Nordic countries also had reservations of principle with regard to a number of specific paragraphs in the draft resolution which failed to take into account the Charter provisions concerning the division of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council and deplored the continued practice of selectively singling out individual countries as supporters of the policies of the Government of South Africa.

18. Recently there had been important improvements in the international political climate, especially in southern Africa, as exemplified by Namibia's accession to independence. Yet the proposed texts did not reflect those significant developments, being virtually unchanged from those submitted in 1989. That deficiency was regrettable and, in the opinion of the Nordic countries, it was important for the international community to act with great care regarding the question of apartheid at the current critical juncture. It was especially important that the resolutions adopted should reflect adequately the existing situation in South Africa. The Nordic countries considered that the drafts failed in that respect. For those reasons, they would abstain in the voting on the draft resolution and the draft decision.

19. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution and draft decision in document A/45/23 (Part IV) because the condemnation of the activities of foreign economic interests contained therein was directed solely at the interests which impeded the implementation of the Declaration. The second case involved not all military activities but only those which prejudiced the rights and interests of colonial peoples, especially the right to self-determination and independence. He expressed the hope that, in the future, draft resolutions would reflect more adequately and accurately the unique circumstances of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and the evolving character of the economic and social conditions in those Territories. A more careful consideration of those factors would help to achieve the elimination of colonialism and would accelerate that process. His delegation was prepared, together with other delegations, to participate in drawing up such documents, which would as far as possible reflect reality and in the future would receive much broader support and might be adopted by consensus.

20. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution contained in chapter V, paragraph 11, of document A/45/23 (Part IV).

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho,

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Romania, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden.

21. The draft resolution was adopted by 79 votes to 10, with 21 abstentions.

22. A recorded vote was taken on the draft decision contained in chapter VI, paragraph 11, of document A/45/23 (Part IV).

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Romania, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey.

23. The draft decision was adopted by 77 votes to 12, with 22 abstentions.

24. Mr. SAVOV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting on both the drafts, which failed to reflect adequately the new spirit emerging in the Organization and the changing realities in southern Africa. They also contained inappropriate language and references to States and groups of States which his delegation was not able to accept. As far as the draft decision on military activities was concerned, his country's position was in conformity with the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 4 of that draft. His delegation favoured the gradual elimination of all military bases outside the national territory of any State and was committed to the important task of ridding Non-Self-Governing Territories of such bases and installations.

25. Mr. EHLERS (Uruguay) said that his delegation had again expressed its agreement with the draft resolution and the draft decision just adopted by the Committee. That position reflected his delegation's full support for the principles and ideals underlying the drafts and the goals they served. Nevertheless, his delegation would have preferred the drafts to omit any reference to specific countries. It reiterated its view that it was necessary to avoid provisions of a discriminatory or selective character which might impede the adoption of a resolution and the attainment of its goals.

26. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea) expressed his disappointment with the results of the voting on the drafts, which had not been supported by a number of delegations. He hoped that the Committee would find a way of achieving consensus and reflecting that consensus in its resolutions. His delegation endorsed the views expressed by the representative of Vanuatu. On the basis of its commitment to decolonization, it traditionally supported the resolution and decision on the item under consideration.

27. The CHAIRMAN invited Committee members to explain their votes if they wished to do so.

28. Mrs. KING-ROUSSEAU (Trinidad and Tobago) said that, had she been present during the voting, she would have voted in favour of the draft resolution and draft decision contained in document A/45/23 (Part IV).

29. Mr. SHEIKH ZEINELDDIN (Islamic Republic of Iran) expressed gratitude to the representatives of Vanuatu and Trinidad and Tobago for their explanations.

30. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 112 and suggested that, in accordance with past practice, the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly on the item.

31. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.