



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 6th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic)

later: Mrs. KING-ROUSSEAU (Trinidad and Tobago)

CONTENTS

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)

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

*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, 1 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

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.131/179/Add.1, A/CONF.138/7-A/AC.131/203; E/C.10/1986/9)

1. Mr. SKOFENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) noted that the objectives of the Declaration on decolonization had not been achieved in their entirety because foreign economic interests continued to exploit the natural and human resources of certain countries and territories.
2. In that connection, Namibia was a typical case. In violation of the decisions of the United Nations and Decree No. 1, hundreds of South African, United States, British and other companies were plundering that country's resources. For example, 60 per cent of Namibia's GDP was repatriated by transnational corporations, foreign companies mined and exported 95 per cent of its uranium, copper, lead, zinc and diamonds and 70 per cent of its banking operations were handled by branches of Barclay's Bank and the Standard Chartered Bank, whose headquarters was in Great Britain.
3. One sometimes heard it said that the investments of transnational corporations benefited the local population because they created jobs and raised living standards. For evidence of the contrary, it was enough to recall that the black population of Namibia was subject to apartheid, that it had no legal protection and that it was most frequently reduced to living in unhealthy conditions.
4. To make the Namibian economy more dependent on the South African infrastructure, Pretoria had in 1977 annexed the port of Walvis Bay and, according to the press, intended to dismantle part of the Namibian railway system. At a time when the South African régime was unleashing a campaign of repression against the black population and perpetrating increasingly numerous acts of aggression against neighbouring States, the foreign monopolies were providing increasing support to the key branches of the South African economy, including the armaments industry. Western investments in South Africa amounted to \$17 billion and transnational corporations continued to provide South Africa with advanced technology. South Africa continued to receive loans with the result that its foreign debt currently amounted to \$24 billion. Moreover, the foreign monopolies were selling arms to the Pretoria régime in violation of Security Council resolution 418 (1977). With the support of certain Western States and Israel, South Africa was working to develop atomic, as well as chemical and bacteriological, weapons.

/...

(Mr. Skofenko, Ukrainian SSR)

5. Finally, it should be recalled that foreign economic interests were continuing to operate in other colonial territories, thus inhibiting the growth of national consciousness and the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization. Those territories often had various forms of dependence imposed upon them under the label "commonwealth" or "free association". Furthermore, they often served as military bases for the administering Power. Micronesia, Guam, Puerto Rico, Diego Garcia, Bermuda and the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) were cases in point.

6. In line with the principles underlying its policy, the Ukrainian SSR condemned the plundering of Namibia by the transnational corporations. It also condemned the policy of "constructive engagement" of the United States and a number of Western countries and joined the African and other non-aligned countries in demanding the adoption of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Finally, it recalled that it was the duty of the United Nations to take all necessary measures to enable peoples to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

7. Mr. ALMURAD (Kuwait) said that in the area of decolonization the United Nations had many successes to its credit but that there were still territories subject to foreign domination and exploitation, which was a denial of the political rights of the population and was contrary to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

8. Namibia was a striking example. Thanks to the support of certain industrialized countries and Israel, South Africa maintained its illegal occupation there and was robbing the Namibian people of its resources in violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. Kuwait favoured the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa and joined in the appeal of the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia that all States, organizations or individuals which had ties with the racist régime in any field whatsoever, should end them immediately. Kuwait demanded the implementation of all United Nations resolutions concerning Namibia, and particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

9. The administering Powers had an obligation to protect the natural and human resources of the territories they administered, which meant developing them harmoniously without exploiting any of them to excess, with the aim of promoting the welfare of the population. The presence of military bases in dependent territories was also a form of exploitation and a further obstacle to decolonization.

10. Mr. BARTKEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the military activities of the colonial Powers in the territories under their administration or trusteeship were preventing colonial countries and peoples from achieving independence. Those activities, which were an integral part of the imperialist policy of neo-globalism, constituted a threat to international peace.

(Mr. Bartkevich, USSR)

11. In order to carry out its repression of the Namibian people, Pretoria was strengthening its bases in Namibia and deploying new military units and detachments of mercenaries. The Territory had thus become a kind of barracks, with one soldier for every 10 inhabitants. Moreover, Pretoria was imposing compulsory military service on young Namibians and incorporating them in tribal formations, thus laying the groundwork for a fratricidal civil war.

12. Not content with occupying Namibia, Pretoria was launching attacks on the neighbouring African countries: Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Botswana and Lesotho. Those manoeuvres would certainly not be possible if Pretoria did not feel protected by the member countries of NATO, with the United States in the forefront.

13. The efforts of South Africa to obtain nuclear weapons could not fail to cause concern in the international community. The General Assembly had, of course, frequently urged Member States not to co-operate with South Africa in the nuclear field, but that prohibition should also apply to the companies, organizations, institutions and individuals under their jurisdiction. The pilot plant at Valindaba was already producing enough enriched uranium to build two to three bombs a year and might have produced enough plutonium for 15 to 25 bombs. Once modernized, it would be able to produce enough fissionable material to make 40 to 100 weapons per year. As for conventional weapons, Israel, the United States and other Western countries had not stopped trading with South Africa, which had set a goal of exporting \$150 million in armaments annually.

14. In the other colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories, the colonial and administering Powers continued to disregard United Nations decisions. Contrary to their statements, their bases and military installations in Guam, Puerto Rico, Micronesia, Diego Garcia and Bermuda did not result in improving the economic situation of those Territories and creating jobs because they diverted resources which could be better used for development. In fact the only raison d'être for those bases was a strategic one. Puerto Rico, for example, had become an outpost from which American rapid strike forces could be sent to any part of Central America or South America.

15. Mr. FENDRICK (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, reminded the representative of the Soviet Union that the General Assembly, in resolution 748 (VIII) of 1953, had recognized that, when choosing their constitutional status, the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico had effectively exercised their right to self-determination. The question of Puerto Rico was therefore not on the agenda of the Fourth Committee.

16. Mr. BARTKEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replied that a de facto colonial status had been imposed upon the population of Puerto Rico.

17. The United States had also imposed a military co-operation agreement on Micronesia with a view to setting up firing ranges, naval bases and military airstrips on those islands. It was therefore obvious, as had been pointed out by Mr. Gorbachev, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, that the

/...

(Mr. Bartkevich, USSR)

Pacific Ocean was about to become the scene of political and military confrontation.

18. The recent military expedition undertaken by the United Kingdom to consolidate the colonial status of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) clearly demonstrated the threat to peace and security posed by such hotbeds of colonialism and neo-colonialism. In that connection, the Soviet Union supported the Brazilian proposal to make the South Atlantic a zone of peace and co-operation.

19. The Fourth Committee should recommend that the General Assembly condemn the activities of the States which were continuing to co-operate with the racist régime of South Africa and relied upon it as a "strategic ally", and request all States strictly to apply the embargo on arms deliveries to South Africa. The Soviet delegation, together with the African States and other countries, called upon the Security Council to adopt global and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Moreover, it supported the recommendations made by the Committee of 24, especially the recommendation calling upon the administering Powers to refrain from involving the colonial territories in conflict and to observe scrupulously the principles of the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly respecting decolonization.

20. Mr. BENNOUMA (Morocco) stressed that, in view of the stubbornness of the Pretoria régime, the General Assembly was fully justified in giving priority to the elimination of the disgraceful system of apartheid and the liquidation of that last bastion of colonialism.

21. The situation in Namibia reflected the extent to which the activities of foreign economic, military and other interests contributed to the maintenance of colonial domination. For example, 80 per cent of Namibia's mineral resources were controlled by transnational corporations, and the per capita income of the whites was 24 times higher than that of the blacks. In the military sphere, South Africa was endeavouring to turn the liberation struggle into a fratricidal war by recruiting Namibians by force. Moreover, in total disregard of unanimous condemnation by world public opinion, the South African armed forces were violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring States with impunity.

22. The threat to peace and security to which the Pretoria régime was subjecting the region called for strong international action in support of the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia. In view of the South African minority régime's continuing disregard for the resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council, only the effective and universal application of global and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa was likely to cause that intransigent régime to falter.

23. The Kingdom of Morocco, for its part, unreservedly condemned and categorically rejected South Africa's policy of apartheid as well as its prolonged and illegal occupation of Namibia. Morocco's solidarity with the peoples of the region would not be shaken, and it actively supported the efforts made by the United Nations to

(Mr. Bennouma, Morocco)

accelerate Namibia's accession to independence in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which could be implemented only if sanctions were imposed on South Africa. The Kingdom of Morocco called for the promotion in South Africa and in Namibia of democratic and egalitarian societies based on cultural and racial coexistence for mutual benefit. Zimbabwe provided an admirable model in that respect. The Moroccan delegation was still convinced that the necessary and inescapable changes required if all the countries of southern Africa were to enjoy a new era of progress, prosperity and peace could only be brought about by sustained and vigorous action on the part of the United Nations.

24. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina) said that it was in Namibia that the adverse influence of foreign economic, military and other interests was strongest. Those interests contributed to the consolidation of the illegal occupation of that Territory by South Africa and monopolized the exploitation of Namibia's human and natural resources. The General Assembly had repeatedly spoken out against that illegal monopoly for it constituted a serious threat to Namibia's future integrity and prosperity as an independent State. Strategically, the Pretoria régime was continuing to militarize Namibian territory and to use it as a springboard for its acts of armed aggression against neighbouring States, such as those perpetrated in May 1986 against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Those incidents which were inadmissible and contrary to the Charter, had been largely responsible for Argentina's decision, taken on 22 May 1986, to break off diplomatic relations with the racist régime of South Africa.

25. The activities of foreign interests were also having adverse effects on and were hampering the effective implementation of resolution 1514 (XXV) in other colonial situations. On the Ascension Island, for example, military installations had been set up with a view to maintaining colonialism in the South Atlantic. Similarly, the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands were undergoing increasing and massive militarization on a scale out of all proportion to their alleged defence requirements. Indeed, a third of the British Navy was concentrated in the South Atlantic; missile installations and very advanced radar systems had been set up and thousands of troops - outnumbering the population by far - had been stationed. The United Kingdom had allegedly spent more than \$3 billion to fortify the territories which it occupied in the South Atlantic, whereas it had allocated only £31 million to the five-year development plan for 1983-1988. That state of affairs was certainly not likely to promote the future stability of those territories, especially in view of the virtual economic monopoly enjoyed by the Falkland Island Company over the economy of the Malvinas. However, it should be borne in mind that the economic backwardness of those islands was, of course, primarily attributable to their lack of contact with the American continent, although it was much closer than the United Kingdom. That, in turn, was the result of the lack of progress in the settlement of the dispute concerning sovereignty over the islands. In that connection, Argentina wished to emphasize that the dispute could be settled only through the resumption of negotiations between Argentina and the United Kingdom, which was, moreover, being advocated by a growing number of representative spokesmen in the United Kingdom.

26. Mrs. SHI YANHUA (China) deplored the fact that most of the United Nations resolutions condemning the activities of foreign economic, military and other interests had remained a dead letter. In that connection, she mentioned the example of Namibia, which was being subjected to illegal military occupation by South Africa and to the plundering of its resources, in disregard of the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations and of Decree No. 1. Not only did that situation prevent the Namibian people from exercising its inalienable right to self-determination and independence, but it also jeopardized Namibia's future prosperity and integrity as an independent State. China, which had suffered from colonial exploitation itself, was convinced that the effective protection of Namibia's natural resources could be ensured only through its accession to independence. Strong measures had to be taken to that end, and China therefore urged the international community to redouble its efforts to ensure Namibia's speedy accession to independence. The eighth meeting of Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries, the special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia and various other gatherings had prompted a growing number of countries to rally round the cause of Namibian independence and had made it possible to secure broader and broader support. Never before had the South African régime been so isolated and, in that connection, China wished to pay tribute to the United States Congress for the sanctions which it had recently adopted against South Africa. China, for its part, had always lent, and would continue to lend, its unwavering support to the peoples of the dependent Territories in their struggle for self-determination, independence and the elimination of all forms of colonialism.

27. Mr. TAEB (Afghanistan) expressed the deep concern of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan about the activities of foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the implementation of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)].

28. The colonial Powers and certain other States, including in particular the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, attracted by the prospect of profit and unconcerned about the genuine interest of the local population, were exploiting for their own benefit the natural and human resources of those Territories in violation of the Charter and relevant resolutions of the United Nations. Namibia provided the most obvious example of such practices since 60 per cent of its gross domestic product was repatriated in the form of profits by capitalist monopolies, especially by American, British and West German transnational corporations. Nine hundred and twelve of the 1,068 transnational corporations operating in South Africa had their headquarters in the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany. The racist régime of South Africa and the Western economic interests operating in Namibia neglected sectors other than mining to the point where Namibia had become highly dependent upon imports for its most basic needs, including food. In addition, Namibia was still under illegal occupation by the racist régime of South Africa. The non-participation of the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany in the World Conference on Sanctions against South Africa was clear proof of the direct support provided to the apartheid system by imperialist forces. Once again, imperialism had shown that it was concerned only about its own

(Mr. Taeb, Afghanistan)

profits and that it totally disregarded the genuine interests of the peoples suffering from the colonialist, capitalist system.

29. Afghanistan thus reaffirmed its unfailing support of SWAPO, as the sole legitimate and authentic representative of the Namibian people. It refused to recognize the so-called interim government of puppets installed in Windhoek and strongly condemned the policy of "constructive engagement" pursued by the American Government. Afghanistan fervently desired the urgent implementation of the various resolutions adopted at the many gatherings held during the year as part of the international effort to achieve Namibian independence and the eradication of apartheid.

30. The other colonial Territories were also victims of exploitation by foreign interests and transnational corporations; their economic dependence was increasing rather than decreasing, and they had huge foreign trade deficits: \$US 366 million for Bermuda in 1984 and \$US 571.5 million for Guam in 1983. No comment was required on those figures. In conclusion, his delegation supported the recommendations 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 contained in document A/41/23 (part III).

31. Mr. STROMHOLM (Sweden) said that, in certain instances, issues brought into the debate had been alien to the question under consideration, which was of undeniable importance, but at times more complex than had been stated. The situation called for a more subtle analysis that would distinguish between detrimental and beneficial foreign economic interests. The colonial peoples had often played a significant role in the decolonization process as a result of constructive co-operation with the administering Power.

32. Sweden, which attached paramount importance to the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination and independence, had always lent its active and concrete support to the decolonization process. Considering the important responsibilities the United Nations had in that connection, it must act with great wisdom at all times, never losing sight of its fundamental task to promote the well being of colonial peoples and safeguard their rights. The size and natural resources of a Territory should certainly not be used as an argument against the right of peoples to choose their own constitutional system or development model, but the fact was that some of the remaining colonial Territories were at a disadvantage in that respect. It was the obligation of the international community to render assistance to them in support of the decolonization process.

33. Sweden had consistently condemned the activities of foreign economic interests which brought no benefit to the people of the Territory, or which made the Territory almost exclusively dependent upon one country, or even one company. At the same time, those same activities could also be beneficial to a Territory, or to an independent country - for example, by promoting industrial development or creating jobs.

(Mr. Stromholm, Sweden)

34. The fact that the Namibian question remained unresolved was a human tragedy and an international disgrace. Namibia was essentially a colonial remnant, a case in which the right to self-determination was denied. Moreover, the people were under the yoke of apartheid and South Africa was not only illegally occupying Namibia but also using it as a springboard for terrorist and military action against neighbouring States. Consequently, the issue was a unique one, not least of all because of the foreign economic interests operating in a Territory under military occupation. There was an overwhelming amount of more or less accurate information on the exploitation of natural resources in Namibia and the depletion of its considerable marine wealth. The so-called International Commission of the South-East Atlantic Fisheries (ICSEAF) continued to display a lack of responsibility in its activities, despite numerous appeals by various bodies and even by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

35. It was imperative that the international community should respect the rights and interests of the Namibian people. The exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia, including its marine wealth, by foreign economic interests must be halted. Sweden had already taken measures to that effect: no Swedish companies were involved in the exploitation of Namibian resources, new investments in Namibia were prohibited by law and Namibian uranium could not be imported to Sweden as long as that Territory was occupied by South Africa. In general, the provisions of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia had to be enforced. Everywhere in the world, imports of Namibian uranium should be banned. The recent proposal by the Indian delegation - to request the International Court of Justice to determine the extent to which foreign economic interests in Namibia were illegal - was also interesting. As soon as possible, a 200-mile exclusive economic zone for Namibia would have to be established. In the mean time, Sweden urgently appealed to those foreign economic interests and States exploiting the natural resources of Namibia to ensure that those resources were not depleted and to respect the interests of the people of Namibia.

36. The primary objective should be Namibia's accession to independence, in accordance with the United Nations plan. The Swedish Government was deeply concerned over South Africa's persistent refusal to implement the relevant resolutions, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which constituted the only internationally acceptable basis for a peaceful and lasting solution. In its resolution 566 (1985), the Security Council had strongly warned South Africa that its failure to co-operate would compel the Council to meet forthwith to consider the adoption of appropriate measures, including those provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. In the light of the South African Government's continued refusal to implement the plan, as demonstrated in its most recent letter to the Secretary-General, it was only logical for the Security Council to take such measures. The Security Council's failure to do so earlier was a matter of grave concern. The Security Council must live up to its role as the primary organ of the United Nations responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. Indeed, its credibility was at stake. The permanent members should seize upon that historic opportunity.

37. Mr. KOZKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, despite the crumbling of the age-old colonial system, the decolonization process was not yet over and that dangerous source of tension continued to poison the international climate. If there was still talk of the need to eliminate that system in southern Africa and in many island Territories throughout the world it was essentially because of the economic and military activities of the colonial Powers and the racist régime in Pretoria, and their transnational corporations. Imperialist monopolies, closely bound by their common interest in exploiting colonial possessions, persisted in impeding those territories from attaining independence, which, in the words of resolution 1514 (XV), was contrary to the Charter of the United Nations.

38. The inalienable right of colonial peoples to self-determination and to independence and the use of their natural resources in their own interests had been reaffirmed time and time again, particularly at the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa and at the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly. Economic, financial and other Western circles, however, refused to abide by the decisions of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. They made demagogic speeches on the positive role of monopolies in the colonial and non self-governing Territories, doing all they could to force the status quo or a neo colonialist future upon them.

39. The example of Namibia, occupied by the racist South African régime and shamelessly exploited and plundered by the colonialists, was typical. The magnitude of that exploitation was illustrated by the fact that 60 per cent of Namibia's GDP was repatriated abroad as company profits before taxes, while the remaining 40 per cent was used as operating expenses (A/AC.131/203, para. 7). Western and South African transnational corporations continued to exploit the work-force and mineral resources of Namibia, in violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. Most black workers were not protected by any labour code; on farms owned by whites, the system was practically feudal.

40. According to United Nations statistics, more than 350 transnational corporations, among them the most powerful corporations of South Africa, Western Europe and North America, were exploiting the resources of Namibia, without reinvesting any portion of their sizeable profits in the economy of the Territory. For that reason, the Namibian economy was typically colonial: unbalanced, unstable and dependent upon imports. Those corporations were the mainstay of the South African militarist clique, which was attempting to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia and spread its war of aggression against the peoples of the Territory and the front-line States. Its 1985-1986 military budget had been increased by 30 per cent over the previous fiscal year.

41. The illegal occupation of Namibia was particularly distressing if account were taken of the aggressiveness, nuclear ambitions and audacity of the racist régime. With a view to protecting the interests of imperialism in southern Africa, the racists had constantly undertaken new political manoeuvres and adventures, and were repressing the indigenous peoples of Namibia and South Africa. The proof was the

(Mr. Kozko, Byelorussian SSR)

so-called "interim government" established in Namibia in violation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), in an attempt to prevent SWAPO's accession to power.

42. South Africa would not dare to defy world public opinion openly without the backing of its Western protectors, primarily the Government of the United States. However, the international community did not accept the policy of "constructive engagement" with the racists as practised by the United States, considering quite rightly that it was designed merely to maintain the colonial status of Namibia and make it easier for the Territory to be used as a springboard for attacks against independent African States.

43. The question of Namibia could and must, however, be resolved by political means. The Namibian people must exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and independence as soon as possible, having regard for the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, and the South African Government must withdraw its troops from Namibia immediately and unconditionally. The Byelorussian SSR, which supported the struggle waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, was one of the sponsors of the socialist countries' proposal concerning the introduction of a comprehensive system of international security providing for unconditional respect for the right of each people to choose its mode of development, the equitable political settlement of international and regional disputes and the elimination of genocide, apartheid and discrimination. That was the basic position of the Byelorussian SSR on the question under consideration.

44. The Byelorussian delegation supported the appeal addressed to the Security Council by the African countries and the non-aligned States, as well as the decisions of the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia and the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly. The Security Council must impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, so as to compel Pretoria to apply the relevant United Nations resolutions.

45. The activities of foreign transnational corporations also impeded the decolonization process in small colonial Territories placed under the administration of certain imperialist States. Despite United Nations decisions, the inalienable rights of the populations of such Territories were violated and the Territories were turned into colonial dependencies of the administering Powers and into military bases for acts of aggression against independent States. Foreign monopolies, on which the local economy was in fact dependent, prevented the development of national awareness and the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In the 40 years that the United States had been administering Micronesia, it had not established any infrastructure there. The administering Power was deliberately holding back the economic and social development of Micronesia, whose economy was utterly dependent

(Mr. Kozko, Byelorussian SSR)

on the United States, which as a result was able to force upon it a political status equivalent to that of a colony of the United States.

46. Whether in Namibia, in South Africa, in the colonies or in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, the activities of Western economic circles continued to impede the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the efforts made to eliminate apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa; such activities must be brought to an end. The United Nations should act responsibly and determinedly and the Byelorussian SSR would support any effective measure of that kind.

47. Mr. KORGA (Togo) said that, 26 years after the adoption by the General Assembly of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the persistence of colonialism and racism in Africa and in other regions of the world was still a cause of deep concern to the Togolese Government, because of the anachronistic and inhuman nature of that situation, which was particularly fraught with danger since the control exercised over those regions was part of a strategy applied on a world-wide scale by the colonial Powers.

48. The events in southern Africa had turned that part of the continent into a veritable powder-keg. In defiance of all United Nations resolutions and decisions, foreign interests, in collusion with the racist régime of South Africa, were frantically plundering Namibia's natural resources, at the risk of exhausting most of its mineral resources within the next 20 years, banking companies were investing in Namibia and repatriating all their profits, oil companies were providing the South African régime with oil for its civilian and military requirements alike and the Namibian people were subjected to a new form of slavery.

49. Using the military power supplied by its allies, the racist régime continued with impunity its bloody repression of the Namibian and South African peoples, and even had the effrontery to attack neighbouring States in an attempt to destabilize them. The attitude of its allies was the major obstacle to the dismantling of apartheid and to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The policy of "linkage" enabled the racist régime to resort to all kinds of dilatory manoeuvres to keep Namibia under its domination and continue to plunder its natural resources.

50. South Africa and Namibia resembled concentration camps in which massacres were a daily occurrence. Drawing on the lessons of the Second World War, the international community should take all possible steps to dismantle apartheid. Togo appealed to all Governments respectful of human rights to apply the sanctions against South Africa laid down by the two international conferences and by the General Assembly at its special session which had been held in 1986, so as to induce the Pretoria régime to introduce radical changes in South Africa and in Namibia.

51. In certain islands of the Atlantic, the Pacific and the Indian Ocean, foreign economic interests were still active, impeding the implementation of the

(Mr. Korqa, Togo)

Declaration. Togo considered that it was the duty of the international community to grant freedom to all peoples, both in southern Africa and in the other Territories under colonial domination. The responsibility of the international community was clear in regard to those who imposed their will through force and iniquity and those who were robbed of their own lands. It was in the interest of all to prevent the explosive situation prevailing in southern Africa from degenerating into widespread conflict.

52. Miss KHALIPA (Bahrain), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the allegation of the representative of Israel to the effect that Bahrain was exporting oil to South Africa was totally groundless.

53. Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the false allegations made on 17 September by the representative of Israel against the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and other sister countries were intended merely to distract the Committee's attention from the extensive economic collaboration of the Zionist régime with the apartheid régime, its ideological partner. The Zionist representative, far from denying such collaboration, had even stated at the previous session that Israel was the seventeenth largest trading partner of South Africa. The volume of bilateral trade had reached some 280 million rands in 1984, discounting the sales of oil, arms, gold and diamonds which were conducted indirectly. Because of the secret nature of certain transactions and the condemnation of that partnership by the international community, Israel and South Africa had always concealed the extent of their collaboration, which was steadily growing, particularly in the nuclear and military fields.

54. For its part, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was scrupulously observing the embargo on trade with South Africa which the United Nations had adopted, particularly in respect of oil. It was equally strict in its observance of resolution 25/5 of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries dated 6 May 1981, which imposed a total oil embargo on South Africa. It required every purchaser of Saudi oil to produce a certificate of delivery to the place of destination and a guarantee that the oil would not be resold, in the form of crude oil or of oil products, to internationally banned countries, such as racist South Africa. Whenever it heard from a credible source that a purchaser was infringing those rules, the Saudi Government imposed penalties.

55. The slanderous allegations of the Zionist representative could not divert the Committee's attention from the inhuman conditions in which the Palestinian people, struggling against colonial domination, were kept in the occupied territories, nor from the intensive co-operation in all areas between the Zionist régime and the apartheid régime. He referred in that connection to document A/39/22/Add.1.

56. Mr. AL-FANAH (Oman), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Israel had as usual implicated his country and sought to introduce topics alien to the Committee's work into the discussions. Reaffirming the peace-loving character of the people of Oman, he pointed out that the foreign policy of Oman, which condemned all racist régimes and particularly apartheid, excluded all forms of collaboration with South Africa.

57. Mr. BILAL (Qatar), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, rejected the allegations made by the representative of the Zionist entity concerning his country and reaffirmed that Qatar, on the basis of the precepts of Islam and the civilization to which it belonged, strongly condemned all forms of racism and rigorously applied the resolutions adopted by the Arab States, the Islamic countries and the non-aligned countries which imposed an embargo on trade with South Africa. If it learned that oil from Qatar had been supplied to the racist régime of South Africa by third parties, the Government of Qatar would take the necessary measures.

58. Mr. JOFFE (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the Soviet Union had joined the clique of countries which persisted in accusing Israel of having links with South Africa. He felt obliged to make some reference to the profitable relationship between the USSR and South Africa in the diamond, gold and platinum trade.

59. The two countries, which controlled more than 80 per cent of the gold, diamonds and platinum sold on Western markets, had a vital interest in ensuring that prices remained as high as possible. In 1956, they had signed a secret agreement which allowed South Africa to market Soviet diamonds in the West. The tribute exacted by the USSR was becoming increasingly heavy; it currently amounted to \$600 to \$700 million per year. Secret meetings on the subject frequently took place between Soviet and South African officials. The collusion between the two régimes also extended to the gold and platinum trade. Between them, they produced 80 per cent of the world's gold, which they marketed through a group of Swiss banks in Zürich. The contacts between the two countries on all aspects of gold prospecting, production and marketing took place in that city. For obvious political reasons, the USSR insisted that South Africa should keep silent about all those activities. In the same way, any disclosure about gold production was a capital offence in the USSR. Contacts also took place concerning platinum, of which the USSR and South Africa were again the main world producers. Although the USSR was aware that, by disassociating itself from South Africa, it could cause considerable damage to the latter's economy, it had not shown the slightest intention of changing its profitable relations with the apartheid régime in any way.

60. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the reference by the representative of Argentina to the alleged militarization of the Falkland Islands and Ascension Island, had extended the debate to cover territories which were not on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories for the excellent reason that they harboured nothing but turtles and migratory birds.

61. It was true that the United Kingdom had military installations on the Falkland Islands, but they were of a truly defensive and deterrent nature and were only there to ensure that the events of 1982 were not repeated.

62. He would make a statement about fishing in the waters around the Falkland Islands at a later meeting. He was, however, surprised and disappointed that Argentina had responded to the lure of a multilateral approach by signing bilateral

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

fishing agreements with the USSR and Bulgaria the provisions of which were to be extended to the neighbouring islands. Argentina's action had reopened the sovereignty dispute between the United Kingdom and Argentina.

63. It was surprising that the representative of Argentina had referred to the activities of the Falkland Islands Company, which he called a "foreign company", as an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It would seem that Argentina wanted to prevent the Falkland Islands from achieving independence unless, of course, that indicated a complete change in Argentina's position, which his country could only welcome.

64. Mr. FENDRICK (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he would respond at the appropriate time to the allegations made by certain delegations which were inopposite at the current stage of the debate. In respect of the question of Namibia and South Africa, his country had declared a unilateral embargo on arms deliveries to South Africa 15 years before the embargo declared by the Security Council. It was one of the unexpected and regrettable consequences of the embargo that South Africa was now an arms exporter, and it was necessary to prevent those exports as well.

65. It was ironic that the representative of Afghanistan, a country whose territory was occupied by 100,000 of its northern neighbour's soldiers, should cite the United States of America as the leading exponent of imperialism. The representative of Afghanistan saw the non-participation of the United States in the Conference as proof of its support for apartheid. In that case, how did he interpret the sanctions imposed by Congress? The representative of Afghanistan also considered that President Reagan was against sanctions because the profits of United States companies would suffer, rather than because the blacks would suffer; in fact, only 2 per cent of United States foreign investments were in South Africa.

66. Mrs. AL-MULLA (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, drew the Committee's attention to the missing link in the annual report of the Shipping Research Bureau on oil deliveries to South Africa. The oil trade involved a supplier and a purchaser, but the role of the carrier should not be forgotten. It was essential to establish who purchase and transported the oil before it reached its final destination in South Africa. Perhaps the representative of Israel could give the Committee some further information on that point.

67. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the repetition of the arguments on both sides in the debate between the United Kingdom and Argentina on the Malvinas issue emphasized the fact that no progress was being made. The Argentine Government, which had offered many opportunities for finding a peaceful solution, was certainly not responsible for that situation. There was a marked contrast between the attitudes of the two Governments: The United Kingdom had responded with intransigence to the flexible and imaginative policy of Argentina, and, four years after the end of the war, a country which had contributed so largely to the progress of humanity was still incapable of discussing the matter with Argentina.

/...

68. Mr. BARTKEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he wished to state officially that there had never been co operation of any kind between the Soviet authorities and South Africa in respect of gold, platinum or diamonds. The lucubrations of the representative of Israel were out-and-out lies and bore no relation to reality; they only served to further the policies of their inventor.

69. Mr. JOFFE (Israel), speaking on a point of order, said that all the information he had given had been taken from Africa Confidential and that the delegation should, therefore, challenge that publication.

70. The CHAIRMAN said that the speaker's remarks were out of order.

71. Mr. BARTKEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) emphasized that the USSR abided strictly by United Nations resolutions and maintained no relations of any kind with the racists of Pretoria. Soviet trade organizations had no direct or indirect links with South Africa. It would be better if the representative of Israel were to speak of his own country's military relations with the Pretoria régime. It was those relations which enabled South Africa to oppress the black population, occupy Namibia and launch acts of aggression against neighbouring States.

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

72. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee had before it two communications before containing requests for hearings on the question of Namibia (A/C.4/41/4/Add.3 and 4). If she heard no objection, she would take it that the Committee wished to grant those requests.

73. It was so decided.

74. The CHAIRMAN informed the members of the Committee that she had received five communications containing requests for hearings, three of them on the question of Western Sahara, one on the question of Namibia and one on the specialized agencies. In accordance with established practice, she suggested that the communications should be distributed as documents of the Committee and considered at a subsequent meeting.

75. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.