



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 3rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GBEMO (Ghana)

CONTENTS

REQUESTS FOR HEARING (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 36: QUESTION OF NAMIBIA

HEARING OF PETITIONERS

AGENDA ITEM 105: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2 750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

10P

The meeting was called to order at 10.3<sup>h</sup> a.m.

REQUESTS FOR HEARING (continued) (A/C.4/41/2 and Add.1, A/C.4/41/3 and 4)

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had before it several requests for hearing on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (A/C.4/41/2 and Add.1). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to grant the requests.
2. It was so decided.
3. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom) recalled that, under the terms of Article 83 of the Charter, the Territory was a matter for the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council, and not for the Fourth Committee. Furthermore, the Focus on Micronesia Coalition had already had an opportunity to submit a petition on the same subject before the Trusteeship Council, and it was therefore open to question whether the Fourth Committee would be making effective use of the time allotted to it in taking up the question again.
4. Mr. TAIK (France) endorsed the reservations expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom.
5. Mr. CHACON (United States of America) said he wished to associate himself with the reservations expressed by the representatives of the United Kingdom and France with regard to the requests for hearing on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. That question, which was not before the General Assembly, should not be considered by the Fourth Committee. In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 83 of the Charter, it was a matter for the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council; moreover, as recently as May 1986, the same petitioners had duly presented their views to the Trusteeship Council.
6. The CHAIRMAN assured the representatives of the United Kingdom, France and the United States of America that their reservations would be reflected in the record of the meeting.
7. Mr. PEKURI (Finland), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, said he wished to make a clarification: the granting by those five countries of a request for a hearing on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands should not be construed as an acknowledgment on their part that the General Assembly was empowered to assume any functions with regard to that Territory. On that point they based themselves on Article 83 of the United Nations Charter.

Western Sahara

8. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to a communication containing a request for hearing on the question of Western Sahara (A/C.4/41/3). If there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to grant the request.

9. It was so decided.

Guam

10. The CHAIRMAN noted that he had received two communications containing requests for hearing on the question of Guam. If he heard no objection, those communications would be issued as Committee documents and considered at a later meeting.

11. It was so decided.

Namibia

12. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to a communication containing a request for hearing on Namibia (A/C.4/41/4). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to grant that request.

13. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 36: QUESTION OF NAMIBIA (A/C.4/41/4)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS

14. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with the decision just taken, he intended to proceed at once with the hearing of the petitioner. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee endorsed that procedure.

15. It was so decided.

16. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Ralston H. Deffenbaugh (Lutheran World Federation) took a place at the petitioners' table.

17. Mr. DEFFENBAUGH (Lutheran World Federation) recalled that the Lutheran World Federation was a non-governmental organization in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council; it represented 104 Churches, including the three Lutheran Churches in Namibia, whose members made up half the population of the Territory. Thus, the prevailing injustice and oppression in Namibia aroused the concern and indignation of the Federation, which sought to serve as a voice for the voiceless.

18. What then was currently happening in Namibia? Conveying the sentiments of many Namibians, Bishop Kleopas Dumeni of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Namibia had recently spoken of a deterioration of the situation: the number of people killed had risen, members of the South African Defence Forces (SADF) were trying to

(Mr. Deffenbaugh)

extract information about SWAPO guerrillas by every means - beatings, electric shocks, etc. South African armoured vehicles were sowing destruction in their paths, with the result that the people of Namibia fervently wanted national elections to be conducted in order to put an end to the acts of violence perpetrated by the South African armed forces as soon as possible.

19. He himself had visited Namibia, where, especially in the north, i.e. in Ovambo-land, where 50 per cent of the population lived, he had observed a major South African military presence: four to five bases every few kilometres along the roads, anti-aircraft batteries, check-points and constant movements of troops.

20. Human-rights violations, including the use of torture, were endemic. A South African decree prohibited the Namibian courts from questioning the validity of the South African Terrorism Act, even though it seemed to contradict the bill of rights contained in the legislation establishing the interim government. Freedom of movement was limited, particularly in the north of the country, where travel was impossible without a police permit.

21. The illegal military occupation of Namibia, combined with the imposition of the apartheid system, had resulted in the Territory's economic and social decline. What economic activity existed was of benefit primarily to the white population and the foreign companies that controlled most of the natural resources. With unemployment on the rise, more and more Namibians were falling victim to alcoholism, sexual immorality and crime, and it was becoming easy to bribe some of them into becoming informers and even to recruit them into the South African army. Yet those were only a few, since the hope and remarkable spirit of resistance of the Namibian people were far from being broken.

22. That resistance was shown in many ways: rejection of the "interim government" imposed by South Africa and support for SWAPO - 13,000 to 15,000 Namibians had attended the Organization's first public meeting in five years at Windhoek, a significant figure, given the town's total population of about 100,000. Finally, resistance was clearly evident in the Ai-Gams Declaration, in which churches, political parties and other Namibian organizations, representing 70 to 80 per cent of the population, had rejected the "interim government", condemned the continued South African occupation of Namibia and had called loudly and clearly for the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

23. Confronted with that situation, the Lutheran World Federation sought above all to ensure that the question of Namibia was not forgotten, specifically by disseminating information in its weekly newsletter and supporting the Namibia Communications Centre. The Federation was also providing many forms of material and financial assistance to the churches and people of Namibia: facilities, legal aid, support for church educational and health institutions, provision of material aid and scholarships to Namibians in exile and support for a chaplaincy programme for Namibians. Finally, the Federation stood ready to assist in the repatriation of Namibian refugees and the reconstruction of the country as soon as Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was finally implemented.

(Mr. Deffenbaugh)

24. The Lutheran World Federation believed that the international community should take three types of action: calling for the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978); imposing comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa; and intensifying support for the struggle being waged by the Namibian people against foreign occupation.

25. In conclusion, he expressed his conviction that, as Bishop Kleopas Dumeni had said, Namibia would one day be independent, peace would prevail and Blacks and Whites, enjoying the same rights, would live together in peace and harmony, and that it was necessary to act now so that the day of freedom might come soon.

26. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom) said that he wished to know whether Mr. Deffenbaugh believed that an increase in foreign investments in Namibia would help to check the rising unemployment that he had just mentioned in his statement.

27. Mr. DEFFENBAUGH (Lutheran World Federation) said that his organization and a number of others believed that any foreign investment would serve only to strengthen the occupation of Namibia by South Africa. The Lutheran World Federation had, moreover, launched an urgent appeal on behalf of the application of sanctions and divestment in Namibia and South Africa with a view to accelerating Namibia's accession to independence.

28. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom) asked the petitioner what were then the means envisaged by his organization to reduce unemployment in Namibia.

29. Mr. DEFFENBAUGH (Lutheran World Federation) said that the problem would not be properly resolved until Namibia was free, any development being impossible under the yoke of military oppression and occupation. To increase investments would be tantamount to supporting the occupation régime, which was inconceivable, just as it would have been inconceivable to invest in Norway when that country was the victim of German occupation.

30. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom) wondered whether one should then conclude that, pending Namibia's accession to independence, nothing could be done to assist the Namibian people.

31. Mr. DEFFENBAUGH (Lutheran World Federation) said that it was possible to provide the Namibian people with some material, social and legal assistance, as the Lutheran World Federation was doing. Nevertheless, economically, it was difficult to conceive of any assistance provided within the context of the occupation of Namibia by South Africa that did not constitute collusion with the South African authorities.

32. Mr. Deffenbaugh withdrew.

AGENDA ITEM 105: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/41/23) (Parts III and IX), A/41/341 and Corr.1; A/AC.109/850, 852, 854, 855, 858 and Corr.1, 860, 862, 863 and 865; A/CONF.138/4-A/AC.131/79/Add.1, A/CONF.138/7-A/AC.131/203; A/C.10/1986/9).

33. Mr. AMARI (Tunisia) said that the scope of the activities of foreign economic interests and the co-operation between certain countries and the Pretoria régime made the situation in southern Africa a subject of serious concern for the international community. While the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was intended to mark the end of the colonial era, the United Nations, which had contributed effectively to the accession to sovereignty of a large number of countries, had not succeeded in completing the work entrusted to it by the authors of the Charter and showed a singular lack of authority on the question of Namibia which should, however, be one of its priorities. Despite the many resolutions on the question, despite the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and despite Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, foreign economic and other interests continued to exploit the resources of the Territory. Seeking only immediate profits, foreign corporations intensified their collaboration with the Pretoria régime and exploited to the utmost the non-renewable natural resources of Namibia and South Africa. By their investments, they contributed to the maintenance of the racist régime, which promulgated new discriminatory laws, intensified its policy of oppression and committed acts of aggression against neighbouring African states.

34. In Namibia, the accelerated exploitation of the Territory's natural resources fell within the context of the illegality of all South African activity in the Territory since 1966. Scorning international censure, South Africa continued to squander Namibian resources despite a whole series of sanctions. However, Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, promulgated in 1974, offered an international legal basis which should be taken into consideration for the purpose of ensuring justice for the Namibian people and permit them to demand reparations for all damage to their natural wealth and their national patrimony.

35. The consensus on the question of Namibia was clear; it was summarized in resolution 435 (1978), which the Security Council had adopted eight years earlier. Since then, the Pretoria régime had multiplied its dilatory manoeuvres in order to perpetuate its illegal occupation, attempting to pass off a decolonization question as an East-West conflict and to link the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

36. The situation in South Africa, which might in the near future lead to a conflagration with unforeseen consequences, was based on a formidable combination

(Mr. Amari, Tunisia)

of all sorts of overlapping economic, financial and other interests. Unceasingly lengthening the list of its crimes, the racist régime was intensifying the massive repression of the oppressed South African majority, and, rejecting a just, peaceful and negotiated settlement of the conflict with the authentic representatives of the vast majority of the population, it had decreed the state of emergency in the country and detained thousands of opponents of apartheid. It was multiplying its acts of aggression and destabilization against independent African states.

37. If the growing threat to peace and security in southern Africa was to be averted, the recommendations of the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, the international Programme of Action elaborated by the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia and the decisions taken by the General Assembly at its fourteenth special session on the question of Namibia must be implemented without delay. There was still time to take strong action. The economic boycott of South Africa would undoubtedly lead to suffering for the Africans, but they were prepared to pay that price in order to put a speedy end to the bloodshed. Albert Luthuli, President of ANC, Desmond Tutu and the Commonwealth Group of Eminent Persons had all stated that economic sanctions offered the only possible solution.

38. Considering resolution 435 (1978) to be the only acceptable basis for a peaceful and negotiated settlement of the Namibian question, Tunisia categorically rejected the argument of linkage and urged those Powers which had so far shown complacency with respect to Pretoria to change their attitude in that regard. Those who had made appropriate pressure on the South African Government impossible ran the risk of bearing a heavy responsibility, not only for the suffering of the South Africans but also for the destabilization of southern Africa and a growing danger for Africa and, in the final analysis, for peace and security in the entire world.

39. The imposition of global and mandatory sanctions against South Africa was the only means of bringing about peaceful change in that country and the only means of removing ambiguities and demonstrating that the States Members of the United Nations wished and were finally prepared to face up to their responsibility and to organize a common front for the inauguration in southern Africa of a new era based on equality, justice, freedom and respect for human rights.

40. Mr. ORAMAS-OLIVA (Cuba) said that the exploitation of the natural and human resources of colonial Territories and their utilization for military purposes were an obstacle to the independence of those Territories and that only the colonial Powers, the racist Government of South Africa and its allies, or the leaders of monopolistic transnational corporations today had the affrontery to deny it. Cuba, formerly subjected to foreign domination, forcefully denounced that exploitation, which ran counter to the principles of the Charter, General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and all other relevant resolutions of the United Nations, which imposed on administering Powers the obligation to promote political, economic, social and educational advancement, of the inhabitants of the Territories which they administered and to protect the natural and human resources of those Territories against abuse.

(Mr. Oramas-Oliva, Cuba)

41. In Namibia, the South African racist régime and over 300 transnational corporations were engaged in shameless plunder of the natural resources of the Territory, in violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. The growing co-operation between certain Western countries and the Pretoria régime had enabled the latter to build up its nuclear capacity and its military strength, brutally repress the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of the region, and use the Territory of Namibia as a springboard for its acts of armed aggression against neighbouring independent countries, particularly Angola.

42. In other regions of the world, too, the natural resources of Territories under colonial domination were being sacrificed to the capitalist economic interests, which were closely associated with the strategic interests of the metropolises which kept those Territories in a state of independence and underdevelopment. That was the case, in particular, in the Caribbean and the Pacific, especially in Puerto Rico, the Malvinas, Guam and Micronesia.

43. The reason why Namibia was still not independent was that the United States, with its policy of "constructive engagement", the United Kingdom, Israel and other Western States were supporting the racist régime and opposing the adoption of sanctions. Cuba condemned the policy of the Governments of those countries, especially the Washington-Pretoria alliance which was endangering regional, and hence international, peace and security.

44. The year 1986, which had been declared by SWAPO to be a year of general mobilization and decisive action for final victory, had been marked by many meetings and conferences against apartheid, including the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, the summit conference of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries and the recent special session of the United Nations General Assembly on Namibia, which had all firmly condemned the apartheid régime and its allies and the activities of economic and military interests which were obstructing the independence of the countries under colonial domination. The United Nations must join in that international crusade, and Cuba would support any draft resolution along those lines.

45. Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the persistence of the colonial phenomenon explained the continuing exploitation of the natural and human resources of the colonial Territories, as had been confirmed by the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries. Were it not for the support it was receiving from certain Western countries, especially the United States, the racist régime of Pretoria would not be able to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia and to defy the international community with impunity.

46. That support had been condemned by the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held at Vienna in July 1986, which had reaffirmed that the natural resources of Namibia were the inviolable heritage of the Namibian people and had expressed its concern about the rapid depletion of



(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab Republic)

those resources, which were being plundered in violation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia; the Conference had condemned the activities of foreign economic and other interests which were depriving the indigenous population of its resources and obstructing the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The United Nations Council for Namibia had also taken a decision, in the context of the efforts it was making to ensure the application of Decree No. 1, to institute legal proceedings in national courts against the corporations or individuals which were exploiting Namibian natural resources. In that respect, he referred to the report on the activities of foreign economic interests operating in Namibia (A/CONF.138/7-A/AC.131/203) which contained a list of transnational corporations operating in Namibia.

47. At its fourteenth special session, devoted to Namibia, the United Nations General Assembly had also condemned the plunder of Namibia's natural resources by South Africa and by other foreign interests, in violation of the relevant resolutions.

48. His delegation denounced the co-operation between the racist régime of Pretoria and the Tel Aviv régime in the political, economic, military and nuclear fields, and the support received by those two ideological partners from the United States Government.

49. The Syrian Arab Republic believed that the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the colonial Territories were highly prejudicial because they were preventing the colonial peoples from making their own economic and political choices and were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It condemned military co-operation of all kinds with South Africa, particularly in the nuclear field, and especially the co-operation of the United States and Israel, which was increasing tension in the region, extending the area of confrontation and creating an explosive situation. It believed that the military activities which were being carried out in the colonial Territories, including the maintenance of military bases, constituted a serious obstacle to the economic and political independence of those Territories.

50. Syria remained determined to support the liberation struggle being waged by the peoples of southern Africa and that of other peoples struggling for freedom, dignity and the right to sovereignty and self-determination by all means at their disposal, including armed struggle. It believed that, in the last resort, that struggle was the only means of liberating Namibia and bringing down the racist régime, which brought shame on mankind. The Security Council, for its part, must take measures guaranteeing the application of the sanctions envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter, the only peaceful means which Pretoria would understand.

51. Mr. CHACON (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that since 1963 the United States had imposed a military embargo on all

(Mr. Chacon, United States)

supplies of military items to South Africa and had always scrupulously respected that embargo, as well as the Security Council embargo imposed 15 years later.

52. With regard to the alliance which, according to the representative of Cuba, existed between the United States and South Africa, it should be made clear that "linkage" was not a shorthand formulation for a non-existent alliance between the United States and South Africa. It was a recognition, however, of the reality that South Africa was unlikely to agree to implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) until agreement had been reached with the Luanda authorities on a schedule for the withdrawal of the Cuban troops which had intervened in what had been a civil war, thereby transforming the situation in Angola into an East-West conflict.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.