

**United Nations**  
**GENERAL**  
**ASSEMBLY**

**FORTIETH SESSION**

**Official Records\***



**UN/SA COLLECTION**

**FOURTH COMMITTEE**

**4th meeting**

**held on**

**Wednesday, 16 October 1985**

**at 4 p.m.**

**New York**

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 4th MEETING**

Chairman: Mr. CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua)

**CONTENTS**

**REQUESTS FOR HEARING**

**AGENDA ITEM 110: 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**

**ORGANIZATION OF WORK**

\*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.

**Distr. GENERAL**

**A/C.4/40/SR.4**

**23 October 1985**

**ENGLISH**

**ORIGINAL: FRENCH**

The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.

REQUESTS FOR HEARING (A/C.4/40/2 and Add.1 to 4, A/C.4/40/3 and Add.1, A/C.4/40/4 and Add.1 and 2 and A/C.4/40/6 and Add.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had before it several requests for hearing on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (A/C.4/40/2 and Add.1 to 4). If he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee decided to grant the requests.
2. It was so decided.
3. Mr. BADER (United States of America) recalled that according to Article 83 of the Charter the Territory came under the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council, not under a Committee of the General Assembly, and that it was inappropriate for a petitioner to speak on that item in the Committee.
4. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom) reiterated his previous objection and recalled that the Security Council was the organ that was competent to consider that item.
5. The CHAIRMAN assured the representatives of the United States and of the United Kingdom that their reservations would be reflected in the summary record of the meeting.
6. The Committee also had before it requests for hearing on the question of Guam (A/C.4/40/3 and Add.1), on the question of Western Sahara (A/C.4/40/4 and Add.1 and 2) and on agenda item 110 (A/C.4/40/6 and Add.1). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to grant the requests.
7. It was so decided.
8. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received three communications containing requests for hearing under agenda items 18 and 110. In accordance with the usual practice, he suggested that they should be circulated as documents of the Committee and be considered at a subsequent meeting.
9. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 110: 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

10. Miss SWENGBE (Liberia) said that the liberation of peoples still under the colonial yoke had not yet been completed because of the opposition of the reactionary forces of colonialism, particularly the commercial corporations with ties in certain Western countries.

/...

(Miss Swengbe, Liberia)

11. In Namibia, in particular, foreign corporations were plundering the country's natural resources, thereby violating the rights of the people and transforming what had once been a rich country into a graveyard. She noted with concern that the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, set forth in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), had yet to be implemented. Liberia, like other peace-loving countries, condemned the strengthening of the military presence in Namibia and the massive attack launched recently in the northern part of that Territory and called on the Security Council to take urgent measures to expand the scope of resolution 418 (1977). Lastly, she appealed to all States to give increased support to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). Neither arrest nor imprisonment would stop the black leaders from fighting the apartheid régime or prevent them from gaining their freedom; it was the duty of the international community to convince the apartheid régime to abandon its defiant attitude.

12. Mr. SKOFENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) noted that the dominant role played by foreign monopolies in the economic life of colonial and dependent countries resulted in the plundering of natural resources, the exploitation of manpower, the adaptation of the local economy to the needs of those monopolies and, for the local population, a lack of decent living conditions.

13. Thus, for example, South Africa had led Namibia to the brink of economic bankruptcy. Seventy-five per cent of the Territory's resources served to maintain the army of occupation, the police and the other forces of oppression. At that rate, Namibia's external debt would be equal to its GDP by 1987. Western economic groups were also collaborating with Pretoria; the latter was granting them licenses to exploit Namibia's human and natural resources. The apartheid system which South Africa had extended to Namibia enabled those corporations to divert more than 60 per cent of Namibia's GDP for their own benefit.

14. In the mining sector three foreign corporations - the South African company Consolidated Diamond Mines of South West Africa, Tsumeb Corporation, which was controlled by American capital, and Rossing Uranium, in which British capital predominated - were making investments which exceeded Namibia's GDP by almost 40 per cent; they alone were exporting approximately 95 per cent of Namibia's minerals and 80 per cent of all its mining resources. In order to make it difficult for Namibians to gain access to skilled work those large corporations did not allow the mining industry to establish ties with the other branches of the economy and they forbade on-the-spot processing of the ore. In the case of uranium, the policy of foreign business circles, particularly South African circles, was to make sure that the Namibian problem was solved in such a way as to enable them to continue their exploitation. A whole chain had been set up for the import of Namibian uranium into the United Kingdom and other countries through intermediaries. South Africa also exploited Namibian diamonds, zinc, tin, lead, copper, vanadium and tungsten while the transnational corporations endeavoured to conceal their origin by including the production figures for Namibia in the export figures for South Africa.

15. Foreign business circles were also exploiting Namibia in the field of banking and petroleum and in the areas of salt production, fisheries and the export of astrakhan pelts. Agriculture was virtually the only activity that remained open to the local population, but it was undergoing a crisis. Namibian industry was

/...

(Mr. Skofenko, Ukrainian SSR)

fundamentally based on the processing of materials imported from South Africa. As for the indigenous inhabitants, their income was 24 times lower than that of whites and they were not covered by any social legislation. Investment in southern Africa, which amounted to over \$30 billion, was therefore indeed investment in apartheid.

16. The South African racists and the Western imperialists had a joint policy in southern Africa, which consisted in fighting the national liberation movements of the region. His delegation resolutely called for an end to the activities of the imperialist monopolies and transnational corporations that were exploiting the natural and human resources of Namibia. Those resources must be exploited in the interest of the Namibian people, thus facilitating the removal of one of the major obstacles to economic independence and racial equality in that country.

17. There were other small colonial Territories where the economic weight of foreign corporations was delaying the awakening of peoples and impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It was thus that, in the course of 40 years of trusteeship, the United States of America had not established any satisfactory infrastructure in Micronesia. The inhabitants of the islands, who had formerly gained their livelihood from fishing, now lived on charity. The total economic dependence of Micronesia enabled Washington to impose on the Territory a political status that made it the equivalent of a colony. The United States of America had a similar policy in respect of Puerto Rico, where the standard of living was often below the official poverty level.

18. His delegation believed that, wherever it might be occurring in the world, the plundering that the imperialist monopolies were engaging in must be tirelessly denounced, because it was an obstacle to decolonization. The United Nations had sufficient data on the subject, and the Organization had a duty to make a serious and determined effort to remove one of the major obstacles to the definitive elimination of colonialism.

19. Mr. GUERRA MENCHERO (Cuba) said that in the current year, which marked the fortieth anniversary of the victory over fascism, the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the questions before the Committee took on a particular importance.

20. The defeat of fascism, the collapse of the colonial empires and the advent of socialism as a world-wide system had paved the way for independence for many African and Asian peoples; that was a historical process in which the United Nations and its committee on decolonization had played a fundamental role. However, it had to be said that there were still major tasks in the field of decolonization that could not be deferred any longer. That frequently used expression, "the vestiges of colonialism", was nothing but a euphemism concealing the actual situation of millions of men and women who were still the victims of domination and colonial exploitation, while colonialism under a new guise, namely, that of neo-colonialism, was endeavouring to keep many sovereign and independent States in economic, political and cultural subjection and under its domination in the area of information.



(Mr. Guerra Menchero, Cuba)

21. It was in that light that the economic and military activities of the colonial Powers in the Territories still under their domination must be considered.

22. In April 1985 a regional seminar had been held at Havana by the Special Committee, at which non-governmental organizations from the whole of Latin America and the Caribbean had reaffirmed that the economic and military activities of the colonial Powers in the Non-Self-Governing Territories not only constituted a major obstacle to the implementation of the declaration on decolonization but also represented a serious threat to the security of the independent States of the region, and had called upon those Powers immediately and unconditionally to dismantle their military bases and installations in the colonial Territories in Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as in other regions of the world.

23. A brief analysis of the activities of the colonial Powers in question revealed the reason for the concern expressed at the Havana Seminar: in southern Africa, the United States policy of "constructive engagement" in respect of the racist Pretoria régime and the support provided to that régime by the United States in all fields were the motivation for the arrogant attitude of the Pretoria régime to the numerous resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly. Namibia continued to be occupied illegally and was being used as a springboard for acts of aggression against neighbouring States, particularly the People's Republic of Angola, and at the same time the natural resources of the Territory were being exploited to the point of total depletion by North American and South African enterprises and the enterprises of other Western countries. Those same economic interests, together with other interests of a geopolitical and military nature, particularly of United States and Israeli origin, had enabled South Africa to strengthen its war machine, to pursue an increasingly aggressive policy directed against neighbouring African States and to develop its nuclear capability, which constituted a serious threat not only to Africa but also to international peace and security.

24. Also in Africa, the Sahrawi people were still engaged in a bitter struggle for self-determination and independence in the face of the vain attempts made by Morocco, with encouragement in the form of the military assistance it was receiving from the United States, to obstruct a solution in keeping with the decisions adopted by the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations.

25. Other small so-called Non-Self-Governing Territories, such as Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Puerto Rico, the Malvinas Islands and Bermuda, were the victims of economic exploitation by transnational corporations that was matched only by the military activities of the colonial Powers, which used them as bases for carrying out acts of aggression against other independent countries; in that connection he wished to refer to the criminal war against the Vietnamese people, the invasion of Grenada and the colonial war against the Argentine people.

26. For example, Puerto Rico, the most important colony of the United States, was a kingpin in the economic and military system of imperialism in the Americas. The major transnational corporations were making enormous profits, while the Puerto Rican population lacked employment, was dependent on food aid and was being increasingly obliged to emigrate in order to survive. Moreover, the naval and air

/...

(Mr. Guerra Menchero, Cuba)

bases in the Territory played a prominent role in the military strategy of the United States, which had been denounced by the Association of Puerto Rican Lawyers.

27. In the South Atlantic, the Malvinas Islands, as well as the Sandwich Islands and South Georgia, which had been seized from the Argentine Republic in 1833, were undergoing increasing militarization, which gave reason for legitimate concern on the part of all the peoples of Latin America.

28. In Asia, the use by the United States of the Territory it was occupying in Micronesia and Guam in order to carry out nuclear tests and expand its network of military and naval bases in the Pacific was particularly alarming. Those military activities, particularly the nuclear activities, represented such a threat to the exercise of the inalienable rights of the peoples concerned to self-determination and independence, as well as to their very physical integrity, that the Special Committee had been prompted, at its extraordinary meeting held at Tunis in May 1985, to express its firm belief that the existence of military bases and installations in the colonial Territories could constitute an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration, and to call upon the colonial Powers to refrain from placing nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction in those Territories.

29. When the Member States had adopted the Charter of the United Nations, they had recognized, in Article 73, that the interests of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were paramount and had accepted as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost the well-being of those inhabitants and to ensure their political, economic, social, and educational advancement in order to lead them to self-government. The United Nations therefore had a duty to do everything within its power to ensure that the colonial Powers fulfilled their obligations under the Charter and the relevant United Nations resolutions and desisted from using the colonial Territories as their private domain, increasing their profits and exploiting natural and human resources, ceased to keep them economically dependent on the metropolitan countries, immediately and unconditionally dismantled their military bases and discontinued any military activities involving the colonial Territories and their inhabitants in the global strategy of imperialism.

30. The highest tribute that could be paid to the United Nations, on the occasion of its fortieth anniversary, would be to make appropriate statements on those important decolonization issues.

31. Mr. PANDEY (Nepal), invoking the anti-colonialist and anti-racist principles set forth by His Majesty King Birendra, condemned outright the abhorrent policy of apartheid being pursued by South Africa and reaffirmed his country's solidarity with the people of Namibia in their unrelenting struggle for the just cause of independence under the leadership of SWAPO.

32. The whole of South Africa and Namibia had been converted into a gigantic prison in which thousands of black South Africans, including Nelson Mandela, were being confined and tortured. Others, such as Mr. Solomon Mahalangu, had been murdered. It was therefore not surprising that that same racist régime of South Africa should commit aggression against peace-loving countries such as Mozambique and Angola.

/...

(Mr. Pandey, Nepal)

33. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and subsequent General Assembly resolutions had helped create greater global awareness of the nature of the Pretoria régime and it was revealing as well as encouraging to note that that régime had to face growing political opposition, even from some influential sectors of its white population.

34. Responsibility rested not only with the Pretoria régime, which would have been forced to abrogate its racist constitution and to negotiate with the genuine leaders of the people had it not been for the support of certain major Western Powers and financial organizations. Nevertheless, there was no doubt that time and world opinion were on the side of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia and that they would attain their goals.

35. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina) said that the reports of the Special Committee on decolonization, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations showed that in various colonial Territories foreign economic, military and other interests seriously impeded implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). In cases such as Namibia, those interests encouraged policies which were clearly contrary to the United Nations Charter and jeopardized international peace and security.

36. It was in Namibia itself that foreign interests made their harmful influence felt most strongly because they collaborated in exploiting the Territory's human and natural resources and in strengthening its illegal domination by South Africa. The South African State and its enterprises exercised a virtual monopoly over the mining and marketing of diamonds and other precious and strategic minerals and metals such as uranium, as well as over transport, communications and administration in Namibia. It must be borne in mind that the General Assembly had stated that that exploitation was illegal and constituted a serious threat to the integrity and prosperity of a future independent Namibia. No less serious were the measures taken by South Africa in the strategic area. Pretoria continued to militarize Namibian territory and to use it as a launching pad for armed aggression against neighbouring States. South Africa had also intensified its repression against SWAPO, which the General Assembly had recognized as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. The imposition of obligatory military service on the Namibians and the conspicuous violence of South Africa's policy in Namibia in general had greatly increased the flows of refugees and deeply affected the family life of the Namibian people - all of which highlighted the urgent need to stop all technical, strategic and nuclear co-operation with South Africa.

37. Argentina, which faithfully implemented the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa, condemned the military collaboration with the apartheid régime that facilitated the maintenance of South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia and generally served to encourage Pretoria's racist and expansionist policy. Once again, emphasis must be placed on the need for the international community to redouble its efforts to help the oppressed people of Namibia in their just struggle against South African colonialism. Like the vast majority of the members of the General Assembly, Argentina felt that the Security Council should adopt effective additional measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter, so as to isolate Pretoria in the political, economic, military, nuclear, cultural and sports areas.

/...

(Mr. Pfirter, Argentina)

38. The adverse effects of the activities of foreign economic and military interests made themselves felt in other colonial situations also. Some Territories had been integrated into strategic plans and economic systems which were incompatible with a true implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

39. For example, on Ascension Island there were military installations which were being used to maintain colonialism in the South Atlantic. The General Assembly had frequently expressed its concern over those installations because the island, apart from its strategic role, was an important centre for telegraphic communications between Europe and South Africa.

40. The Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands were also the object of growing and large-scale militarization, quite exaggerated and disproportionate to so-called defence needs and explainable only as part of a world-wide strategic plan. In May 1985, the United Kingdom had opened a strategic airport in the Malvinas which could accommodate the largest and most advanced combat planes. That new military installation served to reinforce the presence in the region of warships and nuclear-powered submarines. One third of the United Kingdom's naval forces were stationed in the South Atlantic, where there were also rocket installations, highly advanced radar systems and thousands of military personnel. In three years the United Kingdom would have spent \$3 billion to fortify the Territories which it occupied in the South Atlantic, while earmarking only £31 million for the five-year development plan for 1983-1988. Instead of ensuring a stable political future in the Territories under consideration, that only impeded the restoration of a climate suitable to the realization of that goal. It was therefore not surprising that the so-called "Fortress" Falklands policy did not have unanimous support and was increasingly questioned in the United Kingdom itself.

41. Certain distortions in the economic structure of the Malvinas Islands were also apparent. A foreign company with headquarters in London, the Falkland Island Company, owned 43 per cent of the usable land and directly or indirectly controlled 76.5 per cent of the production and 60 per cent of the local marketing, of wool. It monopolized commercial maritime transport between the islands and the rest of the world, owned all the port installations, was the sole insurance agent and also controlled most of the commerce and the local bank. Headway towards remedying that situation had been modest, slow and inadequate.

42. The major factor holding back the islands' economy was quite obviously the lack of contacts with the American continent, as a result of the impasse in the conflict of sovereignty between Argentina and the United Kingdom. It was obvious that the Malvinas Islands must gear most of their economic relations to the American continent, which was only 200 nautical miles away, and not with London, which was 12,000 kilometres away. The abnormal state of relations between Argentina and the United Kingdom also adversely affected the rational and systematic exploitation of the region's biological resources.

43. It was therefore quite natural that in the United Kingdom itself a growing number of representative voices were being raised calling for the resumption of negotiations between Argentina and the United Kingdom, which would make it possible to settle the outstanding problems between the two Governments, including the

/...

(Mr. Pfirter, Argentina)

fundamental question which separated them, namely, the conflict of sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands.

44. Mr. FAN Guoxiang (China) stressed the special importance of the current year, which marked the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

45. Over the past 40 years, major successes had been achieved in decolonization, but in many parts of the world the fundamental rights, such as the right of peoples to self-determination and independence, remained a dead letter. The United Nations must therefore make greater efforts in that direction.

46. In that connection, his delegation felt that the Fourth Committee should devote special attention to the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the colonial territories, especially in Namibia and in South Africa, where those interests monopolized economic activities, plundered natural resources and accumulated great wealth while keeping the black masses in a clear state of poverty and exploitation. A white worker earned more than 20 times as much as a black worker, and half the gross domestic product was exported.

47. In addition to the economic exploitation they practised, the economic interests provided significant political support to the South African régime. Almost 20 years earlier, the General Assembly had, in a solemn resolution, terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia. Any activities being pursued under an illegal occupying régime were therefore themselves illegal. They continued, nevertheless, thus preventing the Namibian people from exercising their right to self-determination.

48. It was deplorable to note that there were today still some who believed that not all foreign economic activities were harmful to Non-Self-Governing Territories. Of course, exploitation and co-operation must not be confused. Once independent, Namibia could, as a sovereign State, engage in co-operation with foreign corporations on an equal footing, which was something entirely different from the way in which Namibia was currently being exploited and manipulated unscrupulously in order to bring in the highest profits to the corporations.

49. Again in the current year, the South African racist régime had engaged in a flagrant provocation of the international community by refusing obstinately to grant Namibia its independence and by openly invading the neighbouring countries and carrying out sabotage operations against them. It had brutally repressed all public demonstrations against apartheid, arousing great indignation throughout the international community. In the face of such a situation, the fact that certain foreign interests, aligning themselves with the forces of colonial oppression, continued to impede the implementation of many United Nations resolutions imposing sanctions could only be a source of deep disquiet. It was true that a number of Governments had adopted legislative and other measures to limit transactions between their nationals and South Africa and that world public opinion clamoured for the imposition of economic sanctions against that country. China believed that all Member States, especially those with interests in South Africa and Namibia, should scrupulously implement United Nations resolutions and force their companies

/...



(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

to halt any dealings with South Africa, in order to compel it to do away with apartheid and grant independence to Namibia.

50. With regard to military activities, China reaffirmed its opposition as a matter of principle to the stationing of troops and the installation of military bases in another State, a colony or a Non-Self-Governing Territory. South Africa's stand in that regard should be condemned even more harshly.

51. A great many countries had become independent since 1960, and current conditions were more favourable to the trend towards independence. Taking their inspiration from the Charter and the Declaration on decolonization, Namibia and other Territories still under the yoke of colonialism must surmount all obstacles and exercise their sacred right to self-determination and independence.

52. Mr. DJOKIĆ (Yugoslavia) drew attention to the symbolic value and the importance of the fortieth anniversary of the Organization and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, since for four decades the struggle for decolonization had been inseparably linked to the history of the United Nations. At their recent Conference in Luanda, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the non-aligned countries had extolled the historic importance of the Declaration and the role the United Nations had played in the process of decolonization. The liberation of each new country had given added strength to the policy of the non-aligned countries and their Movement, which had thus become an authentic expression of the will to decolonization.

53. Yugoslavia, as a non-aligned country, had always considered that the activities of foreign economic and other interests in areas under colonial rule were at the core of the struggle for independence, equality and independence. There was abundant evidence that foreign interests were closely linked to the imposition of archaic policies and methods of domination. The continuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia was the most glaring example of that practice. An unacceptable situation incompatible with the norms of contemporary international relations was therefore being maintained in some Non-Self-Governing Territories primarily in order to safeguard foreign interests.

54. With regard to Namibia, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the non-aligned countries had condemned the activities of foreign economic interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration and were contrary to the relevant United Nations resolutions, to the advisory opinion of June 1971 of the International Court of Justice and to Decree No. 1 adopted in 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia. Even though the United Nations had terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia as early as 1966, the racist Pretoria authorities, together with a large number of transnational corporations from certain Western countries, were still, almost two decades later, continuing their reckless exploitation of Namibia's natural resources, in disregard of the demands of the entire international community. Yugoslavia therefore reiterated the call made in Luanda by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the non-aligned countries for the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to Namibia in 1986, on the twentieth anniversary of the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia.



(Mr. Djokič, Yugoslavia)

55. Having noted the detailed and updated list of transnational corporations with interests in Namibia and South Africa issued by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations, Yugoslavia supported the decision of the United Nations Council for Namibia to institute legal proceedings in the national courts of the countries concerned, in application of Decree No. 1.

56. The United Nations Council for Namibia had earlier pointed out that the transfer of capital to South Africa and Namibia also had military implications and helped to strengthen South Africa's military arsenal, used for oppression not only in Namibia but also in South Africa. Such a situation gave a new lease on life to a régime whose manifesto was apartheid and racial discrimination. It was therefore necessary to implement forthwith and without delay Security Council resolution 435 (1978), containing the United Nations Plan for Namibia, as well as Security Council resolution 566 (1985), condemning the neo-colonialist manoeuvres of the Pretoria régime. If the régime continued to reject the implementation of the Security Council decisions, it would be necessary to consider imposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. His delegation called attention to the important decisions adopted by consensus by the Special Committee on decolonization at its extraordinary session held in Tunisia, whereby it gave unequivocal support to the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

57. There was no justification whatsoever for the activities of foreign economic interests being pursued in the Non-Self-Governing Territories in defiance of the legitimate aspirations of the indigenous population. The situation in the Territories was very complex, since economic, political, military, strategic and ideological interests were often intertwined. That was particularly true in the case of those Territories where military bases had been installed for the strategic advantage which they offered in the global rivalry of the great Powers. The militarization of Non-Self-Governing Territories threatened the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring countries, which were most often non-aligned. His delegation regretted that certain administering Powers had not yet taken steps towards an immediate and unconditional dismantling of their military bases and installations in Non-Self-Governing Territories. With regard to decolonization, Yugoslavia maintained that there could be no freedom and independent development in the world unless decolonization was a possibility for all. It called for strict respect for the principles of the Charter and the Declaration on decolonization, and expected the administering Powers to fulfil their responsibilities and allow the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories finally to realize their legitimate aspirations.

58. Mr. SMERAL (Czechoslovakia) said that, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, it could be said that great progress had been made. Dozens of new States had become independent and more than 70 million people had liberated themselves from colonial rule. And yet, colonialism still existed. Namibia was still occupied by the racist South African régime, and there were a number of Non-Self-Governing Territories remaining on the map of the world.

59. One of the main obstacles to the full implementation of the Declaration was the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the colonial Territories. Despite the condemnation by the General Assembly of their practices

/...

(Mr. Smeral, Czechoslovakia)

in violation of the political, economic and social rights of colonial peoples, the position of foreign monopolies in the dependent Territories had not weakened. That was because the Western States had so far not taken effective measures to prohibit or limit the activities of transnational corporations in the Territories. On the contrary, those States were facilitating the penetration of foreign capital into the Territories, claiming that the activity of the monopolies had a favourable influence on their development. Such false claims were designed to conceal the true state of affairs, namely, the outrageous exploitation of local manpower and natural resources.

60. The detrimental effects of the activities of foreign corporations in the Non-Self-Governing Territories were also felt in the social sphere. The indigenous populations, which were underpaid, had no social or political rights. The local inhabitants, which only recently had been provided with minimum social services, received education only to meet the needs of modern technology.

61. Namibia was the choice territory for the activities of the transnational corporations based chiefly in South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States. Its raw materials and marine resources were systematically and illegally plundered in defiance of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia. The exploitation of Namibia's natural and human resources brought the racist régime of South Africa immense profits - of which Namibia received less than 20 per cent - which enabled the Pretoria régime, inter alia, to increase its supply of weapons, particularly in the nuclear field. That situation had disastrous effects for Namibian workers, who were not protected by any labour legislation and of whom more than 20 per cent were unemployed.

62. The situation was similar in the small colonial Territories, where the activities of the transnational monopolies were also detrimental to the exercise by the local populations of their inalienable rights to self-determination and independence. That was also true of the nations which had already become independent, but which were experiencing difficulties because of geographic, climatic or ecological reasons.

63. Lastly, his delegation considered that the predatory activities of foreign economic, financial, military and other interests in the colonial territories should be strongly condemned once again as a flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

64. Mr. AL SAUD (Saudi Arabia), speaking in exercise of a right of reply, said that the claim by the Zionist entity that Saudi Arabia and some other oil-exporting countries were supplying oil to the racist régime of South Africa was pure invention designed solely to divert attention from the large-scale collaboration between Israeli circles and the racist régime of South Africa; in that regard, he drew attention to document A/39/22/Add.1.

65. Saudi Arabia strictly respected the trade embargo imposed on South Africa by the United Nations, particularly with respect to oil. It also strictly respected resolution 25/5 of the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries, of 6 May 1981, which imposed a comprehensive oil embargo against South Africa. His

/...

(Mr. Al Saud, Saudi Arabia)

country required certificates of delivery at the destination point from all purchasers of Saudi oil and the guarantee that the oil would not be resold, in crude form or as a derivative, to outlawed countries such as racist South Africa. Whenever it was learned from a credible source that a purchaser violated that rule, the Saudi Government imposed sanctions.

66. Mr. AL SABAH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the Zionist entity was only employing the usual tactic which he resorted to when he felt threatened: whenever the Zionist collusion with the racist régime of South Africa was denounced, he poured forth a stream of false accusations in order to divert attention from the close co-operation between Israel and South Africa in the field of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, and the diamond trade.

67. Kuwait was beyond reproach because it implemented to the letter the oil embargo imposed against South Africa. The member countries of the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting countries, furthermore, had taken the initiative to strengthen their embargo against South Africa, thus preparing the way for the imposition of a mandatory embargo on oil deliveries to South Africa, as approved by the United Nations. Kuwait had even chaired the Group of Experts whose task it was to consider the measures to ensure the effective implementation of that embargo, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 37/69 J, on which Israel had abstained. When approving contracts for the sale of oil, his Government made sure that the product would not be re-exported to South Africa. In 1979, it had prohibited the sale of oil to a company which had violated that rule. In that connection, he drew attention to the documents of the Shipping Research Bureau, an organization which was based in Amsterdam and was well known internationally. Those documents attested to the fact that no Kuwaiti companies had dealings with South Africa and that no ships left Kuwait bound for South Africa.

68. Mr. BADER (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, pointed out to the representative of the Ukrainian SSR that, in addition to resolution 1514 (XV), the General Assembly had also adopted resolution 1541 (XV), which provided solutions other than independence to the process of the self-determination of peoples, such as free association with an independent State or integration with an independent State. In view of its own status, the Ukrainian SSR could hardly be unaware of that solution.

69. With regard to Puerto Rico, he could only repeat that the question was not on the agenda of the Fourth Committee. In 1982, the General Assembly had decided, by 70 votes to 30, not to include Puerto Rico on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories to which the Declaration applied. He also drew attention in that connection to the opinion of the United Nations Legal Counsel which supported that view. As for the prosperity of the Territory, although it was indeed possible that the average income of Puerto Ricans fell below the official poverty threshold for the United States (\$10,000 annually for a family of four), that figure was certainly much higher than that of the Ukraine or its ally in the Caribbean.

70. With respect to the statement by the representative of Cuba on the militarization and nuclearization of the Caribbean, he drew attention to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which was designed to prevent the production, storage and deployment of nuclear weapons in Latin America, and its Protocols. That Treaty and its

/...

(Mr. Bader, United States)

Protocols were open to signature by all the States of Latin America, the States which had territories in that region and the nuclear Powers. The United States had signed the two Protocols and had scrupulously implemented them. Practically all the countries of Latin America had done the same, with one notable exception: Cuba, which no doubt wished to keep open the possibility of stationing nuclear missiles in its territory, as it had done in 1963. It was therefore curious that Cuba was so alarmed at the nuclearization of Latin America.

71. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that Ascension Island had indeed been used for military purposes, but only in order to repel the unprovoked invasion of the Falkland Islands in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter on self-defence and Article 73 of the Charter which imposed on Member States the obligation to protect the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories against abuses. Furthermore, Ascension Island did not fall within the questions considered by the Fourth Committee because that island was totally uninhabited and had no indigenous population, unless one wished to grant the right to self-determination and independence to a few turtles and migratory birds.

72. As for the provocative allegations concerning the purpose of the new airport, it was false that that airport had any strategic purpose. Such allegations contradicted the protestations by Argentina concerning its peaceful intentions, which it should have perhaps demonstrated three years earlier. It could not be denied that the unprovoked aggression by Argentina had brought about the current situation. The new airport, in fact, served to improve communications between the Falkland Islands and the outside world and encourage transit passage and the export trade and, therefore, promoted the economic and social development of the islands. In addition, the airport made it possible not to increase, but to reduce the number of British soldiers stationed on the islands and who, moreover, were there only for the purpose of deterrence.

73. Although the Falkland Islands Company was indeed based in London, its Board of Directors would certainly be very surprised to hear it described as a "foreign company".

74. With regard to the right of the population of the Falkland Islands to self-determination, he said that Argentina did not in any way recognize that right for the population and, indeed, the last thing it wanted was the accession of the islands to independence. Argentina should therefore pay attention to what it said because it might later suffer the consequences of its statements.

75. Argentina's attitude at the present meeting was not the correct way to approach a bilateral dispute. It would do better to facilitate the resumption of normal relations, rather than raise questions which were totally extraneous to the debate.

76. Mr. TADLAOUI (Morocco) wished to correct a misapprehension on the part of the Cuban representative when he had accused Morocco of placing obstacles in the way of the application of OAU and United Nations resolutions on the Western Sahara. Morocco was not opposed to self-determination in the Western Sahara. On the contrary, it had proposed a free and democratic referendum and had fully and unreservedly endorsed the decisions of the Implementation Committee of the OAU,

/...

(Mr. Tadlaoui, Morocco)

which had set out in detail all the conditions governing that consultation and had undertaken, at its thirty-eighth session, to accept the outcome of the referendum, regardless of what it might be.

77. The obstacle to exercise of the right of self-determination of the people of the Sahara must be sought elsewhere, among those who feared a popular verdict and did all they could to delay it by setting pre-conditions to block the process. The problem would only be settled when such persons understood that their subterfuges and evasions were of no avail and that the peoples of the Sahara must be allowed the freedom to express themselves.

78. Mr. JOFFE (Israel) said that, regardless of what had been said by the representatives of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, there were undeniable links between Kuwait and South Africa concerning oil and between Saudi Arabia and South Africa concerning air routes. For example, the Greek oil tanker Salem, which had sunk in mysterious circumstances in April 1980, had been carrying oil from Kuwait to Europe but had been diverted to Durban, where it had discharged 90 per cent of its oil, and in exchange the Arab countries had bought minerals, gold and diamonds.

79. As for Saudi Arabia, South African Airways had established a daily flight between Johannesburg and Jeddah via the Comoros in January 1985. It had even given the Comoros a South African airliner to fly the route under the Comorian flag.

80. Mr. GUERRA MENCHERO (Cuba), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that in dealing with the question of the Western Sahara, he had merely reflected the views of a large sector of the international community, which supported the recent agreements reached by the Organization of African Unity. He had had no intention of offending Morocco, whose people had played an important part in the struggle against colonialism.

81. With regard to Puerto Rico, Cuba disputed the fact that the Puerto Rican people had exercised their right to self-determination in 1953 and the United States claim that there was no further need to keep the item on the agenda. The 1953 elections had been conducted in the presence of armed troops belonging to the colonial Power. Moreover, the United Nations was at that time under United States control, a fact recognized by President Reagan in his report to the United States Congress on the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly. According to resolution 1514 (XV), a people could only exercise its right to self-determination if the Administering Authority had previously transferred all powers to it. That had not happened in Puerto Rico and that was what was being demanded by the Special Committee of 24. The United States had retained all the sovereign powers accorded it at the signing of the Treaty of Paris. Resolution 748 (VIII) of 1953, which the United States had invoked to prevent an examination of the colonial status of Puerto Rico, had been adopted by the General Assembly only because the United States, backed at the time by eight colonial Powers and the puppet Governments of the time, had majority support.

82. With regard to the presence of nuclear installations in Puerto Rico, the policy followed by the United States Government was neither to deny nor to confirm the existence of such installations, which prevented any consideration of the accusation made on the subject by the Puerto Rican Law Association. On the question of Cuba's non-participation in the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the subject

/...



(Mr. Guerra Menchero, Cuba)

appeared to him to have been somewhat overlaboured. The United States representative seemed to have forgotten the Bay of Pigs, the economic blockade of Cuba, the assassination attempts on the Cuban President and the continuing aggression to which that part of the world was subjected. Why should Cuba, despite its support for nuclear non-proliferation, agree to sign a treaty under such unequal conditions?

83. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that he appreciated the explanation the United Kingdom delegation had given as to why resolution 1514 (XV) was not applicable to the island of Ascension. Argentina had, however, merely quoted the facts given in the report of the Committee of 24, such as that Ascension served as a staging post between Europe and South Africa. The Government of the United Kingdom had itself recognized that the island had been used to give logistic support to United Kingdom action in the Malvinas Islands. With regard to the airport established by the United Kingdom on the Malvinas, he (Mr. Pfirter) had merely described it as a strategic airport, which was no more than a repetition of the definition that the United Kingdom Government had itself given.

84. The representative of the United Kingdom had, in addition, considered the Argentinian delegation's attitude to the dispute between the two countries as somewhat unconstructive. Argentina had nevertheless endeavoured to create an atmosphere conducive to negotiation. The United Kingdom, for its part, had adopted an intransigent attitude, which posed a major obstacle to settlement of the question and, consequently, to a return to stability in the South Atlantic. That attitude was the less understandable in that an increasingly representative sector of opinion in the United Kingdom itself (the official opposition and the Liberal Party) considered that negotiations should be resumed without delay in order to settle the dispute between the two countries and ensure a stable future for the islands over which they claimed sovereignty.

85. Mr. AL-MOSFIR (United Arab Emirates), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the representative of the Zionist entity had been inventing figures and had ended in believing them. The Zionist press in the United States and Western Europe had taken those figures up on their own account. The facts submitted by the representatives of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia were uncontestable since they came from the Amsterdam Research Office. The only intention of the Zionist entity's representative in making such untruthful assertions with such apparent objectivity was to mislead the members of the Committee and the international community as a whole.

86. Mr. SKOFENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the information on the activities of American business and other Western circles in South Africa, the pillage of the natural resources of Namibia and the close collaboration with the apartheid régime in economic, military and other fields had been taken from official United Nations documents (General Assembly, Security Council and various committees).

87. The Western Powers' assertion that Micronesia was a Trust Territory and therefore referable only to the Trusteeship Council and the Security Council was not a new one. The majority of members of the Organization were, however, of the opinion that the Fourth Committee was not only empowered to consider matters

/...



(Mr. Skofenko, Ukrainian SSR)

relating to that territory but also that it was obliged to do so, because Micronesia was on the list of territories recognized by the General Assembly as covered by the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The people of that territory were therefore entitled to assistance from the international community in acceding to independence.

88. Mr. BADER (United States of America), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that he would not engage in polemics with Cuba on the question of whether or not there had been free elections in Puerto Rico, a fact that was self-evident. He merely hoped that the members of the Committee would respect the opinion of the Legal Counsel and the judgement of the General Assembly on the issue.

89. With regard to the allegation that Pentagon policy was neither to confirm nor to deny the presence of nuclear weapons in Puerto Rico, which was correct, that policy in no way affected the United States obligations under the treaties, and particularly the Treaty of Tlatelolco, to which it was a signatory. With regard to the remark by the representative of Cuba that his country could not sign the Treaty of Tlatelolco because of the threat posed by the United States, he said that, if Cuba was so concerned by that so-called threat, it would deploy its troops on its own territory instead of sending over 30,000 of them to Angola, the Horn of Africa and elsewhere.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

90. The CHAIRMAN informed the members of the Committee that the Special Committee against Apartheid was to hold a meeting that would be addressed by the Indian Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, and a further meeting that would be addressed by the Prime Minister of New Zealand, Mr. David Lange. All members of the Committee were asked to attend.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.