



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 5th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GBEHO (Ghana)

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

CONTENTS

ELECTION OF THE RAPporteur

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, 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.

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

ELECTION OF THE RAPPORTEUR

1. Mr. BARILLARO (Italy) nominated Mr. Akyol (Turkey) for the office of Rapporteur.

2. Mr. Akyol (Turkey) was elected Rapporteur by acclamation.

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 (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, 865; A/CONF.138/4-A/AC.131/179/Add.1, A/CONF.138/7-A/AC.131/203; E/C.10/1986/9)

3. Mr. BARTKEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that during the General Assembly debate, many delegations, echoing the Declaration on decolonization, had emphasized the need to make every effort to put an end to apartheid and the illegal occupation of Namibia. At their meeting in Harare (Zimbabwe), the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries had contributed significantly to the implementation of the Declaration by reaffirming their conviction that the colonial system would not end as long as colonialism continued to exist in Namibia, New Caledonia, Puerto Rico, the Malvinas Islands, Micronesia and other Territories. Mainly through the efforts of the Special Committee on Decolonization, 59 colonial territories, representing 80 million people, had attained independence over the past 25 years.

4. The major obstacle to decolonization was the very nature of imperialism, which was politically, economically and strategically motivated. According to the as yet very incomplete information furnished by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations, transnational corporations had more than 2,000 subsidiaries in the colonial and dependent Territories, among them approximately 900 American corporations and 600 British corporations. It was incumbent upon the United Nations to denounce the plunder by those corporations, whose activities served to aggravate the current threat to international peace and security.

5. The United Nations had substantial information showing that the activities of foreign economic interests were the source of unemployment, hunger, social problems, and the impoverishment and economic and political subservience of the indigenous peoples. In order to retard the decolonization process, the administering Powers were doing their utmost to impose and legitimize new forms of colonial and semi-colonial dependence, which they called "integration", "commonwealth", "association", and so on. Those manoeuvres had been condemned in many international forums.

(Mr. Bartkevich, USSR)

6. The case of southern Africa was particularly distressing. The inhuman system of apartheid, the illegal occupation of Namibia and Pretoria's acts of aggression against neighbouring African States were made possible only by the material basis provided by the imperialist monopolies and transnational corporations operating in South Africa and Namibia. Despite the many United Nations resolutions, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 1971 and Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia, 335 foreign corporations, (among them 197 South African corporations, 73 British corporations and 33 American corporations), continued to plunder the natural resources of Namibia. That was why the Namibian economy was typically colonial: imbalanced, precarious and dependent upon imports. As much as 60 per cent of Namibia's GDP was repatriated abroad by foreign companies as profits before taxes, and of the remaining 40 per cent, a large part was used as operating expenses of the foreign economic interests. White per capita income in 1980 had been approximately R 3,000 while the corresponding figure for all Blacks had been about R 125. Foreign banks provided the funds enabling Pretoria to maintain its army of occupation in Namibia. In particular, Barclays Bank had purchased South African Defence Bonds and served on the South African Defence Advisory Board.

7. With a view to solving the Namibian question, the Soviet Union had turned to the principles of peace, détente and defence of the legitimate rights of peoples. Its policy was also consistent with its recent proposal concerning the creation of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. In that connection, Mr. Shevardnadze, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, had recently recalled that the time had long since come to enable the United Nations to exercise all its rights and powers effectively, above all with regard to the fate of the Namibian people and the Trust Territory of Micronesia. In Mr. Shevardnadze's view, both of those problems were as old as the United Nations. The Soviet Union therefore strongly condemned the activities of foreign interests in Namibia and other colonial and dependent Territories. It supported the African peoples who demanded an immediate withdrawal of foreign capital from Namibia and the cessation of any form of economic co-operation with the racist South African régime.

8. The Seminar on International Assistance and Support to Peoples and Movements Struggling against Colonialism, Racism, Racial Discrimination and Apartheid had urged all States to adopt legislation with punitive measures against individuals and institutions dealing with South Africa and Namibia, and had appealed to States, especially those that exercised jurisdiction over the transnational corporations acting in South Africa and Namibia, to accede to the relevant regional and international instruments.

9. The Soviet Union saw the adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions by the Security Council as the most effective means to permit the implementation of the decolonization Declaration in Namibia. With the international community as a whole, it called on the United States and certain of its allies to end their policy of "constructive engagement" in South Africa. In conclusion, it endorsed the recommendations submitted by the Special Committee of 24 in document A/AC.109/881.

10. Mrs. King-Rousseau (Trinidad and Tobago) took the Chair.

11. Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia) said that, despite the bold achievements of the United Nations in the sphere of decolonization, some peoples had yet to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

12. Safeguarding their economic and other interests prompted colonial Powers and transnational corporations to perpetuate an unacceptable situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Eighth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries held at Harare had condemned the exploitation, including the military exploitation, of the natural and human resources of those Territories, which not only seriously impeded the decolonization process but also threatened the security of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and of neighbouring States. His delegation rejected totally the argument that the activities of those foreign interests enhanced the living conditions of indigenous populations, for in its view they represented the gravest form of exploitation of colonial countries and peoples and transformed them into theatre of confrontation between super-Powers.

13. Namibia was a case in point, for its tremendous wealth was being exploited for the benefit of foreign corporations and the white minority in South Africa, despite the decision taken by the General Assembly in 1966 to terminate South Africa's mandate over the Territory, the 1971 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, Decree No. 1 on the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia and Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

14. The non-aligned countries had condemned the activities of foreign economic interests which impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and were incompatible with the relevant United Nations resolutions. There was abundant proof that foreign investments in South Africa and Namibia enabled the apartheid régime to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia and to use the Territory for acts of State terrorism, aggression and destabilization against independent States, particularly Angola.

15. At all the conferences held in 1986 on the subject of South Africa and Namibia, including the special session of the General Assembly held in New York in September, the international community had unanimously and resolutely demanded the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa as the only means of weakening the apartheid régime and compelling it to comply with the requests of the international community. Other Non-Self-Governing Territories which did not have Namibia's wealth but were strategically important were being maintained in a situation of dependence by the great Powers, which established military bases and installations there. Like the other non-aligned countries, Yugoslavia demanded strict adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, so that the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories might achieve freedom and independence.

16. Mr. JASSNOWSKI (German Democratic Republic) observed that the United Nations had undertaken, on the basis of the Charter and especially since the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, to help oppressed peoples to shake off the yoke of colonialism and to exercise

(Mr. Jassnowski, German Democratic Republic)

their right of self-determination and independence. Some Non-Self-Governing Territories remained, however, and all obstacles on the road to their independence, namely the activities of foreign economic and other interests, must be removed. No argument about the alleged weakness of those Territories and the need to protect them could justify the plunder of their resources, which was designed solely to enrich the colonial Powers and was the basis for maintaining the Non-Self-Governing Territories in a situation of dependence and subjection. The right of self-determination was the first fundamental right of peoples on which all other political, economic, social and cultural rights were based.

17. In Namibia, the largest remaining colony, the exploitation was all the more harsh because it used racist methods. As long as the question of Namibia remained unresolved, regional and international peace and security would be threatened. The Western States, through their transnational corporations, were collaborating with the apartheid régime and hindering the progress of peace and justice in South Africa. Neither their verbal condemnations of apartheid nor the cosmetic measures they took could conceal that reality. The imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against Pretoria called for at the special session of the General Assembly on Namibia represented the only way to solve the problems of the region peacefully.

18. His country, like the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, strongly condemned any collaboration with the racist régime; supported all steps by the United Nations to demonstrate the responsibility of those States which had jurisdiction over transnational corporations operating in South Africa and Namibia; and hoped that the committee responsible for drafting a code of conduct for transnational corporations would complete its work soon. Such a code would make it possible to control the activities of those corporations in all colonial Territories.

19. Mr. GAIKWAD (India) said that he wished to call particular attention to the situation in Namibia, which was a direct and brutal consequence of the colonialist and interventionist policies pursued by the Pretoria régime with the tacit support of Governments and foreign economic interests. United Nations resolutions and the genuine aspirations of the Namibian people notwithstanding, the Pretoria régime was using Namibia to launch acts of aggression against Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe, in order to cripple and even destroy the economic structures so carefully crafted by those free States.

20. Military service was now compulsory in Namibia and the South African armed forces were trying to recruit and train willing Namibians. Mercenaries and soldiers of fortune, seeking a fleeting moment of glory, were pursuing ambitions that they did not understand. The human resources of the Territory were being depleted as Namibians were forced to seek refuge and honour in the front-line States, which were barely able to assume such a burden.

21. Since the previous session of the General Assembly, the Security Council had met on more than one occasion to consider South Africa's tactics of terror and turmoil. However, clinging to the straw of an indulgent veto, South Africa's régime had been spared the retribution of the international community.

(Mr. Gaikwad, India)

22. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, for its part, was not indifferent to the situation and at the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government, held at Harare the previous month, had set up a Africa Fund with the following objectives: to strengthen the economic and financial capability of the front-line States to fight the Pretoria apartheid régime, to support the liberation movements in South Africa and Namibia in their unrelenting struggle against racist and colonialist oppression, and to assist the front-line States in enforcing sanctions against South Africa and in coping with any retaliatory economic action by the racist régime.

23. Concerted action was needed, but no one could deny the fact that the provisions of the arms embargo against South Africa imposed nine years previously by Security Council resolution 418 (1977) had been circumvented by domestic legislations that were riddled with loopholes. It was high time that the United Nations imposed a plan of security for southern Africa comprising the following provisions: improved implementation of the provisions of Security Council resolutions 418 (1977) and 558 (1984) including the elimination of all loopholes; conversion of resolution 558 (1984) into a mandatory embargo on arms imports from South Africa; concerted international support for the front-line States; revocation of all agreements concluded with South Africa in the military sphere and all licences granted in that connection; adoption of internal legislation by United Nations Member States to ensure compliance with the embargo; termination of transfers of military and paramilitary technology to South Africa; and precise evaluation of the success and impact of the embargo, leading to its reinforcement where necessary.

24. The Indian Parliament had for its part unanimously adopted in August 1986 resolutions condemning Governments which gave moral and material support to the racist régime of South Africa. The two Houses had jointly urged all Governments to impose comprehensive, effective and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. That was an urgent appeal by the elected representatives of a population of 780 million people, whose history had acquainted them with the horrors of colonialism and racist oppression. It was also a reflection of a collective conviction that the situation could still be saved if the international community could at last summon up the courage to act.

25. Mr. BRAVO (Angola) said that the Fourth Committee once more had before it the item on the activities of foreign economic, military and other interests which were impeding the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in Namibia and in other colonial Territories, particularly the island Territories of the Pacific, the Indian Ocean and the Atlantic. Consideration of that item was especially important during the current International Year of Peace.

26. Twenty years had elapsed since the United Nations had terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, and eight since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the only acceptable basis for a just settlement of the question of Namibia. Unfortunately, the Pretoria régime, with the connivance of its NATO allies, continued to turn the southern region of Africa into a theatre of

/...

(Mr. Bravo, Angola)

war by maintaining its illegal occupation of Namibia, whose territory it was using as a base for murderous acts of aggression against the front-line States, particularly Angola.

27. There was no doubt that the spectre of violence and insecurity in southern Africa was a direct consequence of the economic, military and other activities of those who, in violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia and Security Council resolution 418 (1976), were helping the anachronistic apartheid régime to exploit the natural and human resources of Namibia. Thus the countries of origin of the transnational corporations operating in South Africa and Namibia were aiding and abetting the policy of State terrorism practised by South Africa inside and outside its frontiers.

28. His delegation wished to stress again that the absurd concept of "linkage" made no sense. In its resolution 539 (1983), the Security Council had rejected all attempts to link the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist forces, whose presence in Angola was in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations and was a question which fell exclusively within the sovereign authority of that country. In fact, as the Angolan Minister for Foreign Affairs had stated at the special session devoted to Namibia, the issue was not the linkage between the independence of Namibia and the presence of Cuban forces in Angola, but the illegal occupation of Namibia and the war of aggression against Angola by virtue of the criminal activities of South Africa.

29. It was obvious, given that tragic situation, that it was impossible to continue fighting apartheid with mere condemnations combined with the adoption of a plethora of resolutions. His delegation hoped that all the States Members of the United Nations would prove equal to the task expected of them and would make every effort to eliminate the odious apartheid régime, the principal source of all evils in the southern part of the African continent. The adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, was necessary, and would be in accordance with the appeal made by OAU and the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa.

30. His delegation vigorously condemned all the economic, military and other activities of the colonial and neo-colonial Powers in Namibia, Micronesia, Bermuda and other colonial Territories. Those selfish activities were impeding the realization of one of the most elementary rights of the human person, the right to self-determination and independence, and were undermining the authority and prestige of the United Nations. The United States and the United Kingdom, through the voices of Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, had in 1941 adopted the Atlantic Charter, to which South Africa, among others, had acceded. The way in which the South African racist troops occupied Angola and the two States behind the Atlantic Charter were supporting the policies and practices of Pretoria showed the extent of their commitment to the principles they had proclaimed.

31. Mr. NAVARRO RIVAS (Nicaragua) said he was taking part in the discussion on foreign economic and other interests because, just like the peoples still under colonial and neo-colonial domination, the Latin American people had been the victim of one of the most brutal exploitations to benefit foreign interests that history had ever known.

32. To give an overview of the situation, 25 years after the United Nations had adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and 20 years after the General Assembly had terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, one might say that many countries had freed themselves from colonialism and imperialism and had recovered what belonged to them: sovereignty, dignity, natural resources and the right to determine their own destiny, but that there were still peoples that had been denied the most elementary rights and countries in which discrimination between inhabitants on the basis of the colour of their skin was institutionalized. Southern Africa's ordeal was a daily reminder to the human conscience that as long as apartheid existed, no human being could say that he lived in a civilized world.

33. If the South African racist régime maintained its illegal occupation of Namibia it was because of the collaboration of its powerful allies, which drew enormous economic advantages from the system and ruthlessly exploited natural resources which legally belonged to the Namibian people. In July 1986, the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia had adopted a Programme of Action urging all States to recognize the validity of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia and to ensure its observance by prosecuting the companies which violated it. Similarly, the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, who had met at Harare, Zimbabwe, had reaffirmed that the activities of foreign interests were incompatible with the Declaration, United Nations resolutions and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 1971.

34. South Africa, to maintain its hold over Namibia and its natural resources, employed more than 100,000 soldiers and used the Territory of Namibia as a base for aggression against the fraternal front-line countries, and particularly the People's Republic of Angola. That attitude was encouraged by Governments which, while joining the universal clamour for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against Pretoria, nevertheless continued to support South Africa and to oppose sanctions, abusing their power of veto in the Security Council. In that connection, his delegation strongly supported paragraph 11 of the Programme of Action concerning Namibia adopted in July 1986, which appealed to the United States and the United Kingdom, both permanent members of the Security Council to reconsider their position in the light of the serious situation in southern Africa.

35. As for foreign military activities, the Latin American region was witnessing an alarming militarization of the Territories under foreign occupation, which, far from promoting a climate of security and stability, was aggravating tensions and the critical situation in the region. The use of Non-Self-Governing Territories under foreign domination or pressure as a springboard for aggression against other countries, and the maintenance of military bases and installations to intimidate the populations of the countries in question and neighbouring peoples were intolerable factors which threatened international peace and security.

(Mr. Navarro Rivas, Nicaragua)

36. It was a well known fact that the United States Government was planning to use the territory of Puerto Rico to train mercenaries in the service of the CIA, who would be sent to kill Nicaraguans. Nicaragua denounced those plans to use one Latin American territory in acts of aggression against another. It recalled that Puerto Rico had also served as a springboard for the invasion of Grenada. That was why his delegation fully supported paragraph 226 of the Harare Declaration reaffirming the need to eliminate all forms and manifestations of colonialism and confirming support for the inalienable right of the Puerto Rican people to self-determination and to independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on decolonization on 14 August 1985. Similarly, Nicaragua itself held the view that the massive military and naval presence of the United Kingdom in the Malvinas Islands, in South Georgia and in the South Sandwich Islands, and the maintenance of a strategic airport in the region, caused great concern to the countries of Latin America and greatly affected stability in the region.

37. Nicaragua was an obvious illustration of the fact that the process of liberation was painful, sometimes slow, but inevitable. Nicaragua was therefore sending a message to the peoples of the world still struggling for their independence to tell them that nothing could hold back the course of history; victory would be theirs and justice would prevail.

38. Mr. McLEAN (Canada) said that he need scarcely remind the Committee that Canada, a country with a fortunate past in terms of its evolution from colony to nation State, fully supported the process of decolonization and looked forward to its successful conclusion. Decolonization had been one of the main success stories of the United Nations, and the road ahead was much shorter than that already travelled. Canada had always strongly supported Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and had provided significant development assistance to the Namibian people and other colonial peoples. His country firmly believed that such assistance promoted economic viability and accelerated the process of self-determination.

39. As far as Namibia was concerned, the major stumbling-block impeding progress towards the independence of that unfortunate hold-over from the colonial era was the Government of South Africa. As many were aware, Canada and other States represented in the Fourth Committee had increased pressure on that Government. Indeed, in the past few days, Canada had introduced additional measures, in particular a ban on the importation of agricultural products, uranium, coal, iron and steel from South Africa, pursuant to the agreement reached with its Commonwealth partners to bring about not only the end of apartheid, but the freedom of Namibia.

40. There should therefore be no doubt about Canada's position on the question. Nevertheless, his delegation continued to be disappointed that the debates in the Committee were sterile and repetitive. In addition, it could not readily accept the blanket condemnation of foreign economic interests in colonial Territories, the demand for the immediate withdrawal of colonial Powers from all their military bases and installations, or explicit or implicit support for armed struggle in the

(Mr. McLean, Canada)

process of self-determination. His delegation was very concerned over the danger of the Fourth Committee becoming a caricature of the hopes expressed in 1945. The United Nations should be seeking ways to make its deliberations as objective and pertinent as possible, but at the present time, instead of decisions being taken, they were being avoided, and when there was a crisis, the debates were endless. It was most important to rationalize the Committee's work and to harmonize it with that of the Special Political Committee.

41. His delegation could not accept the hypothesis that all foreign economic activities, notably those of Western countries with colonial Territories and those of transnational corporations, were inherently evil. That did not square with the facts. Indeed, Canada believed that transnational corporations could have a beneficial impact in terms of development and the transfer of technology. As many developing countries were aware, it was in the Canadian transnational corporations, private and public, that much of the Canadian expertise that was being made available to developing countries in such areas as transportation and communications was to be found. Fundamentally, his delegation believed that it was time for the Fourth Committee to get back to basics. If the members of the Committee might not find more common ground, the Committee might in fact hinder rather than help the process of decolonization.

42. Canada had other reservations about the approach taken in some of the documents before the Committee. For example, with respect to overseas economic activities, consideration appeared to be given to only one group of countries, Western countries, some of which were actually named - a practice to which Canada had objections in principle. But, several delegations had cited, and FAO had well documented, the plunder of fishery resources off Namibia's shores by a country which was not, and was unlikely to become, a member of the Western Group. It should be pointed out that, to a large extent, it was the Western countries that were looked upon to assist the developing countries, not least those which remained in a colonial situation. Canada itself - and it was not unique among Western countries - was devoting particular energy to promoting economic recovery in Africa. The achievements, even the sacrifices, of Western countries were worthy of considerably more attention than had been given to them in the documents before the Committee. Canada would therefore like future documents and resolutions to give a more rational and realistic appreciation of what was being done to alleviate the economic difficulties of the developing world, including countries still under colonial administration, whereas all too often such documents were excessively ideological and unbalanced. His delegation was convinced that the item was an important one which needed and deserved better treatment.

43. Mr. HELLER (Mexico) said he regretted that in the past year no progress had been recorded in the struggle against colonialism and neo-colonialism, even though, in the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, particular attention had been paid to the need to renew efforts in that area. The problems that continued to be caused by foreign economic and other activities and interests impeding the implementation of the Declaration demonstrated irrefutably the long road that still lay ahead. Those activities had the inevitable consequence of

(Mr. Heller, Mexico)

strengthening the bonds of dependence and subordination. That was clearly proved by the case of Namibia, whose natural resources were overexploited for the sole purpose of satisfying the needs of the metropolitan country, not in order to promote the economic development of the Territory, as was the clear duty of any administering Power. Yet the struggle for independence made genuine sense only in the context of a minimum of economic independence.

44. Attention should also be paid to a question which gave no less cause for concern: the military activities of the administering Powers in Non-Self-Governing Territories, which they were using as test-sites for all sorts of weapons (in particular nuclear weapons, the harmful effects of which were well known), or even as springboards for attacks on other countries. His delegation wished to state once again that it vigorously condemned the acts of aggression which the Pretoria régime was persistently perpetrating against the front-line States from the Territory of Namibia. They were a flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, endangering peace and security in the region. Moreover, the racist South African régime, with the direct or indirect support it was receiving, was persisting in its illegal occupation of Namibia.

45. His Government wished to reiterate the need to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the South African Government on the basis of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on the question. That was the only way to bring to an end South Africa's policy of apartheid and to guarantee Namibia's accession to independence.

46. Mr. HYDAR (Malaysia) said that with the benefit of hindsight, the multidimensional significance of the concept of independence had been recognized. In addition to the transfer of political power, it involved an important economic aspect. Political independence should be accompanied by equitable and fair international economic relations. Therefore, it was appropriate for the Non-Self-Governing Territories to insist, in their pursuit of independence, that their strategic economic interests should be taken into account.

47. In that respect, the situation in Namibia was of particular concern to his Government, which wished to express its whole-hearted support for the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 11 August 1986. Malaysia abhorred all the activities of transnational corporations and foreign economic interests that resulted in the further impoverishment of the Namibian people, depriving them of their fundamental right to justice, equality and freedom.

48. The continued occupation of Namibia by South African military forces constituted a serious violation of human rights, the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the internationally-recognized basis for a settlement of the question of Namibia. South Africa was unjustifiably persisting in linking the implementation of that resolution to a withdrawal of the Cuban troops stationed in Angola. It was therefore justifiable for the non-aligned countries to have strongly condemned the recent establishment of the provisional government and the massive militarization of the Territory of Namibia, which South Africa was using as a springboard for acts of aggression in the region.

/...

(Mr. Hydar, Malaysia)

49. His country continued its firm support for the Namibian people in its struggle for independence under the leadership of SWAPO, and was sure that resolution 435 (1978) was still the only possible basis for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. His country called upon the members of the Contact Group to increase their efforts to that end, and he affirmed its unwavering support for the adoption of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

50. A similar situation existed in South-East Asia, where Viet Nam, flouting international opinion, continued its military occupation of Kampuchea, thereby preventing the people of that country from regaining their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

51. It was essential to resist those who, while claiming to respect the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, were in fact trampling underfoot the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. Malaysia urged all the countries and peoples of the world to unite in their efforts to eradicate the last traces of colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid.

52. Mr. AL-FANAH (Oman) said that the racist régime of South Africa was continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia and its shameless exploitation of the Territory's natural and human resources, in violation of all the United Nations resolutions on the subject, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

53. Oman denounced any intervention in the internal affairs of Namibia, and did not recognize the Government resulting from the anti-constitutional elections which had taken place there. His country supported the efforts of the international community - particularly the United Nations Council for Namibia - to eradicate apartheid and achieve swift independence for Namibia, and it approved the declarations by the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, held in Paris in June 1986, and the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held in Vienna in July of that year.

54. All obstacles preventing the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples should be removed and, in particular, there should be no attempt to establish a "linkage" between the cessation of the occupation of Namibia and completely extraneous issues. It was time for the Namibian people to exercise its right to self-determination and independence; it was time that its sovereignty over its own territory and resources was respected. The policy of the racist régime of Pretoria - to accumulate weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, in order to carry out acts of aggression against neighbouring States - could only serve to increase the troubles and tension in the region, thereby jeopardizing international peace and security.

55. As a non-aligned developing country, Oman had many links of friendship and co-operation with African States, and insisted that the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and the rule of international law should be respected.

56. Mr. KULAWIEC (Czechoslovakia) said that monopolies played a steadily increasing role in the strategy pursued by the imperialists against dependent territories; that was the case not only in the economic sphere but also in political, ideological and military spheres. They could rightly be called the strike force of modern colonialism. Sixty per cent of the GDP of Namibia was taken out of the country by foreign companies; it was estimated that, because of such looting, the Namibian diamond mines, which were the largest in the world, would be exhausted in 20 years' time. A clear illustration of the typically colonial character of the Namibian economy was to be found in the agricultural sector, where blacks, who formed more than 95 per cent of agricultural workers, were confined to a subsistence economy; their share of commercial agricultural production did not exceed 2.5 per cent. The ratio between the salaries of whites and those of blacks was 12 to 1; in northern regions, it was 25 to 1.

57. The States which opposed sanctions were the very ones which had jurisdiction over the economic circles exploiting Namibia. In order to justify their actions, they claimed to be the real defenders of the victims of discrimination and refused to acknowledge that the sanctions were intended solely to improve conditions for the Namibians.

58. The activities of transnational corporations had similar negative effects in Puerto Rico, Micronesia, the Cayman Islands, the Turks and Caicos Islands, Monserrat and the Virgin Islands.

59. As well as looting the dependent territories, foreign monopolies also impeded their social development. The reports of the United Nations Council for Namibia showed that most Namibians were not protected by labour legislation and had access, at best, only to second-rate medical services. Often, colonial Powers did not even acknowledge the right to work, and unemployment rates in the dependent territories were high.

60. Foreign economic interests continued to operate in newly-independent States. A declaration of political independence did not necessarily mean the eradication of colonialism, which continued to impede the development of some independent countries. Asian, African and Latin American countries were completely justified in demanding that those responsible for their difficulties should help to bring about a more equitable distribution of the world's wealth. However, the forces of imperialism opposed the process of decolonization and economic reconstruction by exerting ever-increasing pressure on developing countries; they wished to prevent them from implementing progressive social and economic reforms so that private capital would remain free to act. Moreover, the imperialist States tried to create a gulf between developing countries by playing one off against the other.

61. It was clear that the colonial Powers were acting in contravention of Article 73 of the Charter of the United Nations. Czechoslovakia supported all initiatives to eradicate the negative influence of transnational capital, both in Non-Self-Governing Territories and in developing countries. It insisted that the decolonization process should be extended to the economic sphere, in conformity with the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order. To that end, Czechoslovakia had joined those who, during the session of the Special

(Mr. Kulawiec, Czechoslovakia)

Committee on decolonization, had proposed the establishment of a working group to analyse the entire problem and make proposals which would guide economic decolonization in the desired direction. The activities of the working group would be more effective if representatives of administering Powers were to participate in them in a constructive manner. In that connection, his country regretted that the United Kingdom had decided not to participate in the work of the Special Committee in the current year.

62. His delegation would support any draft resolution which revealed the true nature of the activities of foreign economic interests in the colonies and which demanded the adoption of measures against the activities of colonialist and neo-colonialist forces seeking to perpetuate the exploitation of colonies in the modern world.

63. Mr. AL-SUDANI (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the Zionist entity had made racist accusations against the Arabs in his statement to the Fourth Committee. That was not at all surprising since the Zionist entity was racist by its very nature, having come into being by depriving the Palestinian people of all its rights. All the public opinion polls carried out there reflected the Zionists' hatred for the Arab population.

64. The Zionist entity was pretending to condemn apartheid merely to encourage the African countries to restore their diplomatic relations with it. Yet, Africa was fully aware of the extensive co-operation going on between the Zionist entity and the apartheid régime - which were ideological partners - in economic, military, nuclear and other matters, because such co-operation had been amply exposed. Indeed, the representative of the Zionist entity had not denied the existence of ties between the two régimes. He had simply pointed out that the volume of trade between them was smaller than that between South Africa and certain other countries.

65. The representative of the Zionist entity had accused Iraq of exporting oil to South Africa. He (Mr. Al-Sudani) challenged him to substantiate that statement. Iraq, whose oil production had been reduced to half its former level because of the war, had no difficulty in marketing its oil at OPEC prices throughout the world; and neither did it need nor did it intend to sell any to the Zionist régime or the racist régime of South Africa. The accusations made by the representative of the Zionist entity were based upon information that could be summed up as follows: on two different occasions in November 1978, an oil tanker loaded in an Iraqi port had sailed to Singapore where it had delivered its cargo in December 1978 and in January 1979 respectively. Those facts were established by the customs manifests of the Port of Singapore, which were in the possession of the Iraqi Government.

66. Lastly, as had already been the case at the previous General Assembly, the representative of the Zionist entity had accused Iraq of buying arms from South Africa, an allegation that the Iraqi delegation once again refuted categorically. At a loss for new fabrications, the Zionist entity had found nothing better to do than to go on repeating the same old story.

67. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, pointed out to the representative of the Soviet Union that it was not the United Kingdom which was denying the population of the Falkland Islands the right to self-determination and independence as embodied in resolution 1514 (XV), but the General Assembly itself; indeed, unlike the other resolutions on the dependent territories, the resolution concerning the Falklands contained no reference to that right. However, it was not too late to rectify the situation and ensure that the inalienable right of the population of the Falkland Islands to self-determination and independence was at long last recognized in the resolution to be adopted on the matter that year.

68. Mr. CHACON (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, emphasized that the sanctions imposed on South Africa by his country were stronger than those applied by any other country, including the front-line States. Furthermore, he wished to stress the fact that a liberation movement such as the one in Angola would be unable to survive without the support of the local population. The United States earnestly hoped that the civil wars in Angola and Nicaragua would be brought to an end through national reconciliation and dialogue accompanied by a withdrawal of all the foreign troops and military personnel stationed in Angola and Nicaragua, most of whom were from the Soviet bloc.

69. Turning to the question of Puerto Rico, he said that that Territory had been withdrawn from the list of dependent territories pursuant to decision 748 (VIII) as adopted by the General Assembly in 1953, and was therefore not on the Committee's agenda for consideration. Any attempt to address that question would constitute interference in the internal affairs of the United States, in violation of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter.

70. Mr. IBÁÑEZ ECHEVERRÍA (Argentina) reserved the right to exercise his right of reply in due course.

71. Mr. NAVARRO RIVAS (Nicaragua), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, pointed out to the representative of the United States that there was no civil war in his country and that it was mercenaries paid by the United States who were responsible for the strife in Nicaragua. As a result of the interventionist policy pursued by the United States, his country was being forced to exercise its legitimate right of self-defence to ensure its survival. It was not a civil war which had caused the death of 30,000 people in Nicaragua (which, as a proportion of the population, would correspond to a death-toll of 2 million people in the United States), but rather the United States policy of aggression and militarization. Only by putting an end to its interventionist policy in Nicaragua and by supporting the solutions put forward by the Contadora Group would the United States contribute to the promotion of peace and demilitarization in the region.

REQUESTS FOR HEARING

72. The CHAIRMAN said that two communications containing requests for hearing on the question of Namibia had been submitted to the Committee in Documents A/C.4/41/4/Add.1 and 2. In the absence of any objection, she would take it that the Committee agreed to accede to those requests.

73. It was so decided.

74. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that she had received two communications containing requests for hearing on the question of Namibia. In accordance with established practice, she suggested that the communications in question be circulated as Committee documents for consideration at a later meeting. In the absence of any objection, she would take it that the Committee agreed to that suggestion.

75. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.