



UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



Distr.  
GENERAL

A/6868  
3 November 1967

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Twenty-second session  
Agenda item 24

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 SOUTHERN  
RHODESIA, SOUTH WEST AFRICA AND TERRITORIES UNDER PORTUGUESE  
DOMINATION AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL  
DOMINATION

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

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1 - 5	2
II. CONSIDERATION BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE REPORT OF SUB-COMMITTEE I . . . . .	6 - 93	4
III. ACTION TAKEN BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE REPORT OF SUB-COMMITTEE I . . . . .	94 - 95	29
ANNEX: REPORT OF SUB-COMMITTEE I		[see A/6868/Add.1]

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. During 1964, the Special Committee, in accordance with operative paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 1899 (XVIII), considered the implications of the activities of the mining industry and other international companies having interests in South West Africa, in order to assess their economic and political influence and their mode of operation, and submitted a report thereon to the General Assembly at its nineteenth session.<sup>1/</sup> Further, during 1965 and 1966 the Special Committee, pursuant to a decision taken by it in 1964, undertook a study of the 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 the Territories under Portuguese administration and submitted reports thereon to the General Assembly at its twentieth and twenty-first sessions.<sup>2/</sup> Moreover, during 1966 the Special Committee, pursuant to a decision taken by it the previous year, studied the activities of foreign economic and other interests in Southern Rhodesia and their mode of operation in order to assess their economic and political influence, and submitted a report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-first session.<sup>3/</sup>
2. In the chapters of its report to the General Assembly at its twenty-first session concerning the two last-named items, the Special Committee recommended that the General Assembly should inscribe on its agenda for that session, as a matter of urgency, an item entitled:

"The activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa, the Territories under Portuguese administration and other colonial territories".

3. On 12 December 1966, following its consideration of the report of the Special Committee, the General Assembly by resolution 2189 (XXI) decided, inter alia, to include in the provisional agenda of the twenty-second session an item

---

<sup>1/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Annexes. (A/5840).

<sup>2/</sup> Ibid., Twentieth Session, addendum to agenda item 23 (A/6000/Rev.1), chapter V, section D; A/6300/Add.3 (Part II).

<sup>3/</sup> A/6300/Add.1 (part II).

entitled "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 Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination".

4. At its 488th meeting on 20 February 1967, the Special Committee decided to request Sub-Committee I to undertake a study of this question.

5. Sub-Committee I first considered this question in May 1967 and again during August and September 1967. At the Sub-Committee's request, the Secretariat prepared for its consideration working papers on economic conditions in South West Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Territories under Portuguese administration, Fiji, Mauritius, Papua and New Guinea and the Bahamas, as well as one paper containing excerpts of statements by petitioners. The working papers on the Territories in southern Africa were supplementary to the studies the Sub-Committee had previously considered in 1964, 1965 and 1966.<sup>4/</sup> On 27 September 1967 Sub-Committee I adopted its report on this item which is annexed hereto.

---

<sup>4/</sup> See A/6868/Add.1, Annex, paragraph 1.

II. CONSIDERATION BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE REPORT  
OF SUB-COMMITTEE I

6. The Special Committee considered the report of Sub-Committee I at its 565th to 568th meetings from 6 to 18 October 1967.
7. At the 565th meeting of the Special Committee, Mr. Rafic Jouejati (Syria), Rapporteur of Sub-Committee I, introduced the report of the Sub-Committee on this question (see A/6868/Add.1, Annex).
8. The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said that his delegation had received the report, which provided a considerable amount of factual material, only a few days earlier and had not yet been able to obtain instructions from his Government. He noted that almost half the report consisted of conclusions and recommendations, which were purportedly based on a large volume of statistical and factual material. Some members of the Sub-Committee had thought that the evidence presented had not been sufficiently convincing and other members had said that they had not had sufficient time to consider the material. Some of the Territories had been studied by the Sub-Committee since 1961, namely South West Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese administration, but it was only in 1967 that the Sub-Committee had concerned itself with the other four Territories. The assertion that all the necessary information had been available for years would thus seem to mean that the Sub-Committee's conclusions and recommendations concerning southern Africa could readily be applied to other parts of the world. His delegation could not accept that contention.
9. The Sub-Committee's conclusions and recommendations included so many unsubstantiated generalizations that his delegation could not possibly accept the report. Both the language and the substance of the conclusions and recommendations showed that they were inspired by a set of assumptions which were themselves based on an abstract theory that pre-selected or ignored facts. The report could not be made acceptable to his delegation by amendment, for its whole approach was contrary to his Government's views. The activities of foreign economic interests might, in certain circumstances, affect the decolonization process but, they were only one of the many factors influencing that process. It was unrealistic and misleading to suppose that valid conclusions

of universal application regarding the reasons why some Territories had not yet become independent could be drawn from a study restricted to the activities of foreign economic interests. Political factors and the inexorable facts of geography, size and natural resources must also be taken into account.

10. His Government's policy regarding decolonization was clearly demonstrated by the succession of former United Kingdom colonial Territories which had become independent States Members of the United Nations during the past ten years. In his view there was no evidence to support the theory that the presence of foreign economic interests impeded the colonial peoples' progress towards independence. On the contrary, the determining factor in the decolonization process was the people's political will to attain independence and the administering Power's political will to grant it. For example, the fact that foreign interests had exploited important mineral resources in most of the thirteen former United Kingdom colonial Territories in Africa had not prevented those Territories from becoming independent.

11. The report contended (para. 132) that the profits of foreign economic interests were used in ways detrimental to the interests of the indigenous people. The fact was, however, that without the foreign capital, which in most cases could only be provided on the required scale by private interests, the natural resources of many former and actual colonial Territories could never have been developed. In that connexion it was significant that foreign enterprises often remained in private hands after independence and that the Governments of newly independent States continued to make every effort to attract further private foreign investment.

12. In general, the report was superficial and ignored many important factors such as government policies on company taxation, minimum wages, legislative guarantees against racial discrimination and freedom of association. Consequently, his delegation could not endorse its conclusions and recommendations, and would vote against the adoption of the report.

13. The representative of the United States of America said that after examining the report of Sub-Committee I his delegation could not but express shock and dismay at its tendentious and doctrinaire terminology as well as its substance. His delegation could only wonder how the Sub-Committee had arrived at its

sweeping generalizations on the economic activities of foreign companies in all dependent Territories, when it had studied only eight Territories in a relatively short period and in a relatively cursory manner. The United States delegation was forced to conclude that the report's conclusions and recommendations were based on preconceived and unsubstantiated concepts.

14. The Sub-Committee had refused to take into account the fact that conditions in each of the Territories considered were widely different and that it was difficult to make strict comparisons. Such a comparison had been made, however, and conditions in the Pacific Territories, for example, had been equated with those in the Territories in southern Africa. Political, economic and social differences had been ignored, with the clear implication that they did not exist. The failure to recognize such differences often led to a distorted and biased analysis of the actual economic impact of foreign investments on those Territories and of the role that such investments played in the process of decolonization.

15. It was interesting to note that at least two members of the Sub-Committee had suggested that economic experts might be called in to assist the Special Committee in its difficult task. Others had mentioned the need for more factual and statistical data concerning wage trends, cost-of-living indices and so forth on which to base conclusions. Nowhere in the report, however, was it indicated that the Sub-Committee had called on the services of such experts or that the suggested type of statistical data had been furnished. The use of such sources could have provided for a more comprehensive analysis of the facts, which would have enabled the Sub-Committee to produce conclusions and recommendations more in conformity with the facts. No attempt had been made to examine fully all the policies guiding the activities of the companies. Nor had any attempt been made to examine the policies pursued by administering Powers with regard to economic activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories or to determine the extent to which the people of the Territories concerned would or would not suffer from the presence or absence of foreign companies.

16. Much of the statistical material in question had been compiled a number of years earlier, and the data had not been interpreted by qualified experts. That, in the view of his delegation, was one of the main shortcomings of the

report and it was the reason why his delegation would not comment specifically on any part except that relating to Territories under United States administration.

17. In paragraph 116, the Sub-Committee had seen fit to mention the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in connexion with its discussion of the question of "alienation of land to European settlers and non-indigenous interests". It was indeed strange that that Territory should have been singled out, particularly when it was not among those concerning which separate data had been presented to the Sub-Committee. The United States delegation rejected the intimation that 58 per cent of the land in the Trust Territory had been alienated. If the Sub-Committee had examined more carefully the table on page 283 of the Official Report on the United States Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for 1966, which was shown as the source of the figure given in the Sub-Committee's report, it would have concluded that not 58 per cent but about 1 per cent of the land in the Territory was land which might be called "under alien control". As could be seen from the table, the figure of 58 per cent was the figure for land held by the Trust Territory Government. Only 5 per cent of that figure reflected land used by the Administering Authority; the balance, about 53 per cent, was shown as being in the public domain. There was no need to point out that land "in the public domain" was hardly under "alien control". That was an example of the tendency in the report to reach sweeping conclusions which were not warranted by full and careful examination of facts.

18. There were many other discrepancies in the report and allegations with which his delegation did not agree. For all those reasons, his delegation opposed the adoption of the report and requested that a vote should be taken on it.

19. The representative of Australia said that his delegation had received the report only a few days earlier and had not had time to study it carefully. His delegation had been struck by the contrast between the method of presentation of the report under consideration and those of Sub-Committees II and III. The language used in the report of Sub-Committee I was immoderate and inappropriate for an economic study.

20. As a member of Sub-Committee II, he had had occasion to mention the problems which the Territory of Papua and New Guinea faced in attracting the capital

investment needed to promote economic development. He found it odd, therefore, that the present report implied that any form of foreign capital investment was wrong. He wondered whether the problems to which some members had referred did not arise in independent countries themselves. The fact of the matter was that the necessary sources of capital did not exist in the Territories under Australian administration and had to come from outside those Territories. The report misrepresented and distorted the facts in several instances. For example, paragraph 104 stated that profits in Papua and New Guinea in recent years were estimated to have amounted to \$A6 and \$A10 million a year. It was interesting to note that no exact figure was given. That was all the more significant since the Australian Government was planning to invest a considerable amount of money in the Territories during the current year. The report was not a balanced and objective economic analysis but a polemical tract.

21. The Sub-Committee had clearly failed to allow itself sufficient time for thorough study of the broad and complex question under consideration, which covered a wide geographical area. Furthermore, it had employed methods which did not satisfy the normal criteria of economic analysis and economic-historical research. For example, the experience of independent countries whose economic problems resembled those of dependent Territories was not touched upon. The experience and documentation available in the Secretariat had not been drawn upon and many aspects of the question had been ignored. No mention was made of two important problems: that of obtaining investment capital for the economic development of dependent Territories and that of protecting the indigenous people's interests against the power of foreign investors. No reference had been made to his Government's efforts to solve those problems in the Territories for which it was responsible, which had often been explained in various United Nations bodies. No attempt had been made to distinguish between foreign interests which might legitimately be called detrimental to the interests of the indigenous inhabitants and those which on balance were obviously beneficial. The Sub-Committee had not even tried to establish criteria for drawing such a distinction. In fact, the report seemed to imply that all foreign investment was somehow wrong.



22. The reasoning used in the report was lax. Moreover it had been presented in such a way that the terms of debate were artificially restricted. Conclusions drawn from the circumstances prevailing in one Territory were applied almost without qualification to different situations in Territories in other parts of the world. Frequently no distinction was made between the activities of foreign investors and the policies of the administering Power. It had been suggested that it was for the colonial Powers to disprove the conclusions reached in the report but it seemed to him that it was for the authors of the report to prove that their conclusions were correct. He had noticed that in some instances the sources of the data presented were indicated but in others they were not. When dealing with such material the source should always be identified.

23. The report gave a seriously inaccurate picture of the situation in the Territories administered by Australia. It was generally unsatisfactory and his delegation would therefore vote against it.

24. The representative of Tunisia recalled that his delegation had been one of the first to say that the question would require specialized knowledge and that the Secretariat should be asked to assist in preparing the report. It had continued to consider that the work required a certain degree of specialization and expert assistance, particularly with regard to the presentation of facts and models. It had felt, however, that the need for such assistance should not prevent the Sub-Committee from beginning its examination of the data available. He noted that much of the material in the report had been available since the previous year and had been circulated to members. The representatives who had spoken in the Special Committee had accused the members of Sub-Committee I of not having been objective in their examination of the question. If those representatives wished to make a constructive contribution to the debate, they should take up the Sub-Committee's report point by point, offer criticism and, if necessary, submit amendments. His delegation recognized the right of each delegation to have time to study the documents.

25. He recalled that in the Sub-Committee, his delegation had formally proposed the creation of a group of experts, to make a general synthesis of the documentation submitted to the Sub-Committee. Information concerning the Territories in question could thus be brought to the knowledge of the public at large and given wide

publicity. He would like to know the views of the members of the Special Committee regarding that proposal.

26. With regard to the Australian representative's remarks concerning conditions in independent countries, he would point out that the Sub-Committee had been requested to study conditions in dependent Territories, not independent ones.

27. The representative of Syria noted that, although some representatives had said that they had not had time to study the report, they had commented on that document at length. He would ask those delegations to concentrate their attention on three aspects of the matter: whether the indigenous population was being prepared to assume the task of independence; whether the income of the indigenous peoples was such as to enable them to build up their country and promote its economic and technical development; and whether the economic policy of the administering Powers was designed to ensure the welfare of the indigenous inhabitants or was centred on the exclusive needs of the mother country or on making the maximum profit. The Sub-Committee had been of the firm opinion that the welfare of the indigenous inhabitants should be the primary consideration. The vast concessions given to foreign capitalist monopolies for the exploitation of the natural resources of the Territories did not benefit the large masses of the population, who were being subjected to a system not unlike forced labour. Economic theories borrowed from Western textbooks which applied to highly industrialized and independent countries should not blind anyone to the true situation in African and Asian Territories still under colonial rule.

28. With regard to the Territories under Australian administration, the information concerning those Territories had been taken from the 1965 Annual Report on Papua and New Guinea and from the International Bank's 1965 report on the economic development of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea.

29. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that for the past three years the Sub-Committee had been studying the activities of foreign economic and other interests in southern Africa. With regard to the complaints of the representatives of Western Powers that they had received the report only a few days previously, he would point out that most of the information in the report had been available as early as 1964. The material that had not been circulated in 1966 amounted to only fifty or sixty pages and related to small Territories. The

/...

Committee could not accept their contention that the report provided important new material with which they had not had an opportunity to acquaint themselves.

30. Being unable to refute the conclusions reached by the Sub-Committee concerning the role of the foreign monopolies in the colonial Territories, they were evading the main issue and quibbling over minor points in an attempt to make it appear that the report was not based on fact. The Australian representative's remarks about paragraph 104 were an example and the answer to the question he had asked was simple: the limited data on which the Sub-Committee, faced with the colonial Powers' refusal to reveal profit figures, had been able to draw showed that profits of private enterprises in Papua and New Guinea varied between \$A6 and \$A10 million a year. The best the United States representative had been able to do in his effort to undermine the credibility of the report was to question the statement in paragraph 116 that 58 per cent of the land in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands had been alienated. Yet that figure had been derived from the United States report for 1966, which showed that indigenous persons held only 40 per cent of the land. In short, the colonial Powers had been unable to advance a single convincing argument to discredit the Sub-Committee's conclusions.

31. Despite the attempts of certain delegations to show that the report contained too many generalizations and ought to deal with Territories individually, he considered that the Sub-Committee had been justified in reaching the conclusion that the activities of foreign economic and other interests in colonial Territories had certain common features. As the Special Committee's earlier study had established, the same international monopolies were operating in the various dependent Territories in southern Africa, where they intended to preserve the last vestiges of colonialism in order to obtain maximum profits. It was clear that the investments of those monopolies yielded higher profits in such Territories than in domestic markets: for example, United States companies earned 20 per cent annually in colonial Territories and 25 to 27 per cent in southern Africa, as against 8 to 9 per cent in domestic markets. In March 1964, The Observer had reported that foreign companies operating in southern Africa were able to recoup their entire capital investments in a mere four or five years, so that profits amounted to two or three times the total capital invested. Those profits were obtained through the merciless exploitation of cheap labour and the utilization of cheap raw materials.

32. No one had disputed the first thesis of the Sub-Committee's report that low wage rates and bestial exploitation characterized the activities of foreign monopolies in colonial Territories and were a principal factor in the maximization of profits. Colonial exploitation of labour took the form of wage differentials between white and local workers in the same enterprise: the wages of white workers in the Republic of South Africa were ten times higher than those of the indigenous workers and the ratio was equally high in Portuguese and other colonial Territories. In the Middle East, local workers in the oil industry received up to six times less than white workers, yet United States companies earned \$1,200 million, and United Kingdom companies \$250 million, every year from Arab oil.

33. Another characteristic of the operation of international monopolies was that the profits obtained were not used to the advantage of the indigenous population. A part of such profits was reinvested in economic sectors controlled by those same monopolies and by the white minority, but most of them were sent abroad and not used to improve the people's living standards or to further economic development. The Sub-Committee's conclusion that the economy of colonial Territories was divided into two sectors, that of the foreign investors and white settlers on the one hand, and that of the local population on the other, was irrefutable. As a result of complete segregation in the local sector, the indigenous inhabitants suffered from complete economic degradation and were deprived of the land. In colonial Territories in southern Africa, the best and most fertile land was given to European settlers and firms, including mining companies. In South West Africa, half the total land area was given over to foreign monopolies for exploitation, while in Southern Rhodesia monopolies owned 45 per cent of the agricultural land, yielding 93 per cent of agricultural produce by value, although only 5 per cent of the population was European. A similar situation prevailed in the Portuguese colonies.

34. It was clear that foreign monopolies invested capital only where they could maximize profits and did not allow the development of a properly balanced industrialized economy. By concentrating on the production of profitable exports rather than meeting the needs of the people, they kept the economy at a primitive level and maintained the difference in living standards between the European and the local populations. Moreover, their activities had an adverse effect on the

political, economic and social conditions of the indigenous population. In order to preserve their position, the foreign monopolies condemned the peoples of colonial Territories to political injustice, depriving them of electoral rights, trade union rights and the right to education and public health. They sustained racial discrimination in all spheres and even maintained their own armed forces. In the Portuguese Territories, for example, companies that received oil-refining concessions were legally bound to help Portugal maintain law and order. As was pointed out in document A/6300/Add.3 (Part II) the Angolan Diamond Company had paid more than 16 million escudos in 1962 for military activities in Angola and about 40 million escudos between 1961 and 1963 for the protection of private property. Oil monopolies in southern Africa and the Persian Gulf maintained private armies to support the colonial authorities in their efforts to suppress national liberation movements. The decision of the Security Council to impose sanctions against the racist minority in Southern Rhodesia was being undermined by monopolies which supplied the Smith régime with oil and helped Southern Rhodesia to export its products.

35. For every inhabitant of Mozambique employed in the South African Republic, the Salazar régime received the sum of \$6 and a further \$6 for the first three months of employment - a source of income which was used to help suppress national liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique and Bissau Guinea. Thus every dollar, pound or escudo received by the Portuguese colonialists from foreign monopolies bore the sweat and blood of African inhabitants. The entire machinery of colonial exploitation was supported not only by the State structure but also by the military forces maintained in colonial Territories, which the imperialists did not hesitate to use in order to suppress national liberation movements.

36. None of the delegations of the administering Powers had had the courage to counter the conclusions and data in the report with specific facts. It was generally known that the capital exported by the countries which had investments in colonial Territories was much smaller than the profits they derived from the Territories in question; for instance, in 1962 a United States Senator, Mr. Morton, had stated that between 1950 and 1960 North American monopolies had invested \$8,000 million abroad, which had yielded them profits of \$25,000 million.

37. The conclusion that the activities of foreign monopolies in colonial Territories were the main obstacle on the path to the implementation of the Declaration on the

Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was therefore fully justified. Those activities must be firmly condemned and the Committee should make recommendations in accordance with the interests of the indigenous inhabitants of the Territories concerned, in order to further their advancement towards self-determination and independence. The Soviet Union delegation fully supported the conclusions and recommendations of Sub-Committee I.

38. The representative of Yugoslavia observed that the critics of the report had attacked it in general terms but had been unable to raise any serious objections to its actual contents. It was true that during the Sub-Committee's discussions some delegations, including his own, had deplored the inadequacy of the information available but that did not mean that the Sub-Committee had lacked sufficient data to enable it to reach conclusions. Moreover, its inability to obtain all the data it had sought was due to the determination of the colonialist Powers to withhold that information, particularly in the case of certain Territories in southern Africa. His delegation would, of course, be ready to discuss the report with an open mind but the delegations which were criticizing it should be constructive in their approach.

39. The representative of Australia had said that it was not for his delegation to provide data and information to show that the conclusions of the Sub-Committee were incorrect; it rather behooved the Sub-Committee to prove that its conclusions were indeed true. This was strange logic, for, as a rule, anyone who challenged the validity of certain documents and the information contained therein was duty bound to provide the information in refutation. The Sub-Committee had studied very carefully the material placed before it, and on that basis had formulated the conclusions in the report. They were supported by concrete evidence and illustration. Thus, the Yugoslavian delegation did not consider it to be the Sub-Committee's task to provide information in support of its view but rather that it was the task of those delegations who questioned the report. The fact that the latter had only expressed criticism of a general nature without adducing concrete evidence was additional proof that the Sub-Committee truly reflected the negative impact of the activities of foreign monopolies in colonial Territories.

40. The representative of Bulgaria said that he thought Sub-Committee I had done useful work - work which was a continuation of the efforts that had been made by

the Special Committee since 1964 under General Assembly resolution 1899 (XVIII). Hence it was no new problem that was being considered, though it was easy to understand why the administering Powers and certain other Powers would prefer not to see it on the Assembly's agenda. Some members of the Special Committee would have liked to find more new information in the report. That would certainly have been desirable, but, as everyone knew, the administering Powers and the foreign monopolies never published any figures for their profits. The information contained in the report was, however, convincing enough to enable the Committee to express its views on the conclusions and recommendations of Sub-Committee I. Since time was short, the Committee should adopt the report as soon as possible, and delegations which had misgivings should try to make constructive suggestions instead of getting entangled in generalizations.

41. The representative of Madagascar said that, with reference to paragraph 19, the Sub-Committee might have gone further in its inquiry into the labour codes in force in the countries concerned. It might also usefully have made a detailed survey of the legislation relating to investment. He could not express any views on the adoption of the report until he had received instructions on the subject from his Government. He agreed that in preparing its report the Sub-Committee should have avoided systematic generalizations and gone into much more detail on some points. He also endorsed the suggestion that a group of experts should be established to study the complex question under consideration more thoroughly.

42. The representative of Ethiopia expressed astonishment at certain accusations that had been levied against the members of Sub-Committee I and its report. What was "shocking and deplorable" was not the report itself, but the facts set forth in it; the Sub-Committee's intention had been to bring those facts to the notice of the Special Committee, so that it could try to eliminate their causes. The facts had not been invented by the members of the Sub-Committee, as some would have it believed, but had been taken from publications.

43. The report did not condemn all foreign investments, as the representative of Australia had implied. In fact, foreign investments, as such, were encouraged by the developing countries. What was intolerable was the use of certain methods, as for example when enterprises financed by foreign capital helped to perpetuate a political climate which was contrary to the legitimate aspirations of the population, or when, under the guise of foreign investment, certain Territories

were exploited without the population's deriving any appreciable benefit from the activities of the investors concerned.

44. If the foreign investments were to the mutual benefit of the investor and the population of the Territories in question, it was incumbent on the administering Powers to prove it, as it was incumbent on them to prove that the necessary legislative and administrative measures had been taken to safeguard and preserve the material and human resources used. The Sub-Committee and the Special Committee could only present the facts as they knew them: it was for those who objected to them to belie them by producing other facts.

45. The representative of Poland said that the facts and data contained in the report of the Sub-Committee were well known to the members of the Special Committee. The plundering of the national wealth of Non-Self-Governing Territories, the merciless exploitation of indigenous labour, the granting by the colonial administration of long-term concessions to foreign monopolies, the direct or indirect support given by those monopolies and other foreign interests to the suppression of national liberation movements - all those phenomena had often been studied by the Special Committee and other organs of the United Nations, which had already condemned such activities, notably in General Assembly resolutions 2074 (XX), 2107 (XX), 2189 (XXI) and 2151 (XXI) of the General Assembly.

46. The General Assembly had adopted in particular resolution 2151 (XXI), in which it had reaffirmed the inalienable right of all countries to exercise permanent sovereignty over their national resources in the interest of their national development in conformity with the spirit and principles of the Charter. Since it was the Special Committee's task to assist the colonial peoples in their struggle for liberation, it was also the Committee's duty to defend and secure the interests of those peoples; for, unlike the peoples of independent countries, the peoples of South West Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese domination were not consulted on the subject of foreign capital investments.

47. The conclusions and recommendations of Sub-Committee I accurately reflected the situation in the Territories concerned, and the Polish delegation was prepared to support them.

48. The representative of Venezuela said he was convinced that, in certain territories, foreign economic and other interests were a real obstacle to the full



application of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Although, however, the report dealt only with the activities of foreign interests in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa, the Territories under Portuguese domination and, generally speaking, all Territories under colonial domination, it contained generalizations likely to distort certain facts and weaken the force of certain conclusions.

49. The report dealt with matters to which his delegation attached the greatest importance; it was therefore essential that every aspect should be viewed in the proper focus. While in many cases foreign economic interests in colonial countries were impeding the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), a more thorough analysis of the subject was needed; in view of the importance of the item, it should be studied at a higher level - for example, in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly. Although his delegation considered that the wording, and in some cases the actual substance, of some parts of the report could be improved, it would nevertheless support the report.

50. The representative of Mali said that the newly independent countries were familiar, from their own experience, with the problems discussed in the report, which, he felt, dealt with them objectively. He doubted whether the representatives of the colonial Powers would in any way change their position with regard to the report if they were given more time to study it.

51. In reply to the Australian representative's remarks about the need for capital investment to promote development, he wished to point out that in all the newly independent countries investment was subject to legislation which safeguarded the interests of the public; that had not been the case before their accession to independence.

52. His delegation, which was a member of Sub-Committee I, was disappointed that the report under study was not gaining the unanimous approval of the Special Committee. The Secretariat had collected information of inestimable value from authorized sources and it was hard to understand how the United Kingdom delegation could have said of the report, that "both the language and the substance of the conclusions and recommendations showed that they were inspired by a set of assumptions which were themselves based on an abstract theory that pre-selected or ignored facts".

53. The mere title of the report of Sub-Committee I explained the contents of the report and made the comments of certain delegations all the more surprising. However, it was scarcely to be expected that delegations which did not even approve of the title of the report would approve of its contents - although, instead of criticizing it in general terms, they might have disputed the data set out in it and supported their arguments with facts and figures. Whatever might be said by those whose criticisms, as also their vote on General Assembly resolution 1899 (XVIII) and other relevant General Assembly resolutions, were linked to their interests in the Territories in question, it was a fact that in certain colonies foreign capital was hampering the progress of the people towards freedom and independence, and consequently impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

54. The representative of Iran said that, while his delegation approved of the report of Sub-Committee I on the whole, it had misgivings with regard to the excessive simplification and generalization in the recommendations and conclusions. It shared the view expressed by the Tunisian representative that the question should be studied further by a group of experts to provide a firmer basis for conclusions and recommendations.

55. The representative of Chile said that the report of Sub-Committee I represented the first attempt made to synthesize the study of the activities in question under a single heading. In view of the complicated nature of the subject it was readily understandable that, despite the great amount of work done, there were still gaps; there were also judgements which his delegation found it difficult to accept as conclusive. His delegation considered that the situation would have been reflected more accurately if the report had dealt with each Territory separately. It shared the Finnish delegation's view that experts should be consulted before final judgements were reached. In view of the tragic situation in southern Africa, his delegation would support the report but it had explicit reservations regarding the points about which it had expressed doubts.

56. The representative of Finland said that his delegation maintained its reservations regarding the conclusions and recommendations of the report and would therefore abstain in the vote on the report.

57. The representative of the Ivory Coast said that the Sub-Committee's report provided further evidence of the interest that the members of the Special Committee took in the liberation of the peoples that were still suffering oppression. The report dealt with a most important question, but at this stage he would confine himself to a few brief comments of a general nature. The negative effects of foreign interests in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and the Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination were perfectly obvious and the administering Powers had often made use of those interests to subjugate the indigenous inhabitants still further. It was deplorable to see from the report that in some Territories the indigenous inhabitants were forced to let their land to foreigners and that, owing to the almost complete lack of social laws, the workers generally had no protection.

58. The Ivory Coast, too, had been exploited by a foreign country, but since its attainment of independence it had concluded agreements, under certain conditions, with companies that had already been operating in the Territory for a long time; hence the activities of foreign interests did not necessarily prevent progress towards independence. While, therefore, he had no formal objection to make to the report, he felt that it would have been better to avoid systematic generalizations and to go into a great many more details on some points.

59. The representative of Italy said that his delegation had many reservations about the report. Sub-Committee I had been asked to study a most complex question and it had tackled it in all earnestness, but, as the Tunisian representative had pointed out, it should have had the assistance of experts.

60. He noted that, although the report was based on that of the previous year, in which the Sub-Committee had shown some discretion, it included many conclusions and generalizations that were not supported by specific facts. It would have seemed natural to distinguish between the interests that might impair the development of the countries in question and those which, on the contrary, promoted their development, for, as the representative of the Ivory Coast had pointed out, the activities of foreign interests were not necessarily an obstacle to the attainment of independence. The developing countries that were trying to

become industrialized and to adapt themselves to the systems established in Europe and the United States would have much to gain from contacts with foreign companies; his delegation hoped that those systems and their variants would enrich the developing countries and help them to struggle against under-development and to become economically independent.

61. His delegation had reservations regarding the report because of the vague and sometimes contradictory form of the conclusions and recommendations. In paragraph 82, for example, it was stated that the study showed that the main aim of the international monopolies in the colonial Territories was to make the largest possible profits - as if that was not the objective of economic interests, private or public, in any Territory. That was not a very enlightening conclusion. The real problem was to determine why the people of the colonial Territories did not receive their share of the profits, and the paragraph should have been formulated accordingly. Moreover, the three causes of colonial exploitation mentioned in the paragraph were treated in a vague and equivocal manner. Basically, they were all included in the last, namely, the discriminatory laws enacted by the colonial Powers. In the succeeding paragraphs there was confusion between the role of foreign interests and that of the colonial Powers. That confusion was particularly noticeable in paragraph 91, where it was stated that "all the major sectors of production are controlled by foreign capital, including that of the colonial Power".

62. About half the paragraphs comprising the conclusions were devoid of any indication of the information on which the statements in them were based. That was hardly surprising, since the members of the Sub-Committee themselves had said that information was lacking. The impression was unavoidable that the purpose had not been to specify foreign interests and to demonstrate, on the basis of fact the obstacles they created in the way of the independence of colonial peoples, but rather to put together a few selected observations designed to lay the blame attaching to a few colonial Powers on the greatest possible number of foreign countries. He shared the Tunisian representative's view that the report under consideration, as indeed all the Special Committee's reports, would gain in effectiveness if they were more succinct and drafted in a more orderly fashion.

63. Summing up his delegation's reservations, he said that the effort to apply generalizations about the effects of the activities of a few colonial interests and foreign interests to the largest possible number of countries was self-defeating and could only serve the purposes of those interested in maintaining the status quo in South Africa, who might use it to show that the decolonization policy of the United Nations was in fact inspired by certain Powers against the Western Powers. The over-generalized and over-systematic conclusions of the report were of no use to the policy pursued by the Special Committee.

64. Secondly, the report was based on some abstract principles which were a by-product of a certain ideology. His delegation was convinced that the reintroduction of European ideological quarrels into the field of decolonization in Africa could only harm the decolonization process itself and was therefore at variance with the purpose of the Special Committee.

65. Thirdly, his delegation considered that the report should have concentrated on Territories on which adequate data were available. It should have specified the interests which really represented obstacles to decolonization by distinguishing them from those which might under certain conditions help the colonial populations to become aware of their own interests. The report could have addressed recommendations to international organizations dealing mainly with labour problems with a view to enlisting the co-operation of workers' organizations.

66. Lastly, the report seemed to seek to prove that the colonial problem was essentially economic. In his delegation's view, that was not the case and such an approach might even cause the true purpose of the Special Committee to be overlooked. As the Finnish representative had pointed out, the colonial problem was above all a political problem.

67. For the reasons he had outlined, his delegation could not support the report,

68. The representative of India said he would consider the report of Sub-Committee I in detail when it came before the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly. The Secretariat had done an excellent job of putting together information, and the Indian delegation accepted the conclusions of Sub-Committee I; it also supported the generalization that, despite certain marginal benefits which the population necessarily derived from them, foreign interests were an obstacle in the colonial countries to the progress of their peoples towards freedom and independence. It was indeed no secret to anyone that foreign economic and financial circles had

considerable influence with the administering Powers, and that when they exerted that influence it was only to promote their own selfish and petty interests, thereby impeding the application of resolution 1514 (XV) of the General Assembly.

69. He suggested that, to gain time, those members of the Special Committee who had reservations to make on the subject of the report of Sub-Committee I should say immediately that they were opposed to the recommendations in paragraphs 132 (g) and 133 (1). Those recommendations were the most important of all, for it was on them that the application of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples depended.

70. The representative of Uruguay said that he was not opposed to the condemnation and abolition of any system impeding the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which was a vital part of decolonization. However, economic factors were not the only impediments to the independence and advancement of colonial Territories; political, cultural, and even racial, factors were quite as important. Moreover, it was not only in colonial Territories that those factors formed an impediment to the well-being and freedom of the people; for there were also some independent countries where hunger, disease and poverty placed the inhabitants at the mercy of foreign interests.

71. Investment was not in itself something evil. Indeed, it was desirable, provided that it served the interests and aspirations of the peoples of the countries in which it was made. If, however, investment became a factor of exploitation and oppression which impeded independence for the peoples concerned, it should be categorically condemned.

72. He pointed out that comments, in the report, some of which had been critical, were not related in any way to the work of the Sub-Committee or of its members but but to the conclusions they had reached. The Sub-Committee's condemnation should have been restricted to specific facts proving that foreign investments were impeding independence. The end-product would then be more useful, more constructive and more within the bounds of the Sub-Committee's terms of reference. What was important was to rise above ideologies, because it was not the role of the Special Committee to decide whether a given system was good or bad for a country; each country must choose its own course.

73. Apparently, some delegations would have preferred that the item under discussion should not be included in the agenda of the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly. He did not agree; the question had to be studied, but it was very complex. It could be seen in free countries, where even independent Governments had difficulty in controlling the role and the influence of companies and monopolies. Time was therefore needed to make a careful and thorough study of the report, in order that an informed decision might then be taken on it. He for one was not opposed to the report despite some reservations.

74. His delegation would support the report of Sub-Committee I in so far as it was in line with General Assembly resolution 2189 (XXI), but could not accept any false generalizations which might lead to erroneous interpretations. It did not think that the mere presence of foreign activities could be condemned when they were likely to be of benefit to the people of the Territories. A clear distinction should be made between beneficial international economic co-operation and other types of activity by foreign capital which did in fact impede the development of peoples.

75. The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania said that he would confine himself to a few observations in reply to objections which had been raised regarding the report. The kind of interests which the Special Committee should condemn was not a subject that needed prolonged cogitation; the General Assembly had seen to that when it had adopted, for the report under consideration, a precise title which did not require any explanation. The Sub-Committee was not supposed to be dealing with foreign interests which might have beneficial effects for the peoples of colonial Territories; such interests did exist, but usually the activities of foreign interests were a definite impediment to the independence and advancement of colonial peoples.

76. So far as foreign monopolies were concerned, he was sure that no member of the Special Committee could assert that they had a beneficial influence in Southern Rhodesia; no member of the Committee could approve of the barbarous campaign carried on by Portugal, with the help of such monopolies, against the peoples of Angola and Mozambique; no member of the Committee could approve of the fact that a colony like the Bahamas was not only exploited by the United Kingdom Government but was also subject to the wishes and the control of another

Power, namely, the United States; no member of the Committee could approve of the exploitation to which New Guinea was subjected. No distinction could be made between the colonial Territories of southern Africa and others; for, while it was true that foreign interests were particularly harmful in Africa, they were equally so elsewhere.

77. The representatives of administering Powers still refused to accept the realities of the modern world and did not realize that the era of colonialism was over. If those Powers wished to promote investment by the companies of their countries, they should first liquidate colonialism. They would then have to negotiate the presence of their companies and of their interests in the countries in question with an independent opposite number. In condemning colonialism, one must also condemn the kind of exploitation which resulted from the activities of foreign interests in colonial Territories.

78. The Italian representative's criticism of the report was unfounded. Italy was no longer a colonial Power and it was astonishing that its representative should go to such lengths to defend the decadent system of colonial exploitation. That system, which had been condemned by the whole of the enlightened world, had reached such extremes in some Territories that even the colonial Powers could not defend it. The United Kingdom representative's contention that the investment of foreign capital in colonial Territories did not impede their attainment of independence was surprising, although, significantly, even that representative had been obliged to admit that Southern Rhodesia constituted an exception to his theory.

79. The Sub-Committee had considered other Territories besides those of southern Africa and had concluded that the investment of foreign capital always impeded the attainment of independence. For example, the economic exploitation of the Bahamas had been so shameful that the colonial Power itself had been forced to establish a Royal Commission to investigate it. The recent changes in the Territory supported the views of Sub-Committee I, since there was now to be an investigation into the criminal exploitation of the Territory, though no such investigation had ever taken place during the 200 years of direct or indirect United Kingdom domination. Although it was not the only form of exploitation, gambling was certainly one form of economic exploitation. The people of the



Bahamas had not been given a chance to elect their own representatives and so-called "representatives" had been imposed upon them. Certain ex-Ministers of the old Bahamas Government had subsequently admitted their participation in the foreign monopolies that were exploiting the Territory. Not a single economic move could be made in Nassau without the assent of a monopolistic company originating in the United States. Foreign economic interests were thus impeding the Bahamas' attainment of independence and even threatening its territorial integrity.

80. As regards the Australian Territories, it should be remembered that the economic exploitation of the Territories under Australian administration was so extreme that the General Assembly had adopted a resolution calling upon Australia to make reparations.

81. He would vote in favour of the report, for its conclusions and recommendations were entirely justified.

82. The representative of Iraq said that the criticisms of the report formulated by the representatives of the administering Powers were nothing more than delaying tactics. The Sub-Committee should be commended for having produced an excellent report despite the negative attitude adopted by those Powers. He would vote in favour of the report and hoped that it would be put to the vote forthwith.

83. The representative of Sierra Leone said that in considering the report of Sub-Committee I his delegation was naturally guided by its own recent experience and the recent colonial history of other Territories which were soon to become independent.

84. It had been claimed that the colonial countries had benefited from the exploitation of mining and other resources. Those benefits, however, were purely incidental. Wherever cheap labour was needed, the indigenous people had generally been given only the minimum education compatible with that need, and similar considerations had determined the level of living conditions in general. The pattern of trade, too, favoured the administering Power. The colonial peoples, earning low wages, had to pay extremely high prices for products manufactured from raw materials obtained cheaply in their Territories. As to investment in those Territories by companies other than those of the colonial Power, it was well known that tariff barriers, uniform agreements and the like resulted in

unfavourable terms for the indigenous inhabitants. The Sub-Committee deserved praise for its disclosures in that connexion.

85. While foreign capital was essential in any colonial or recently independent Territory, the question was how that investment was made and how its profits were shared. Through pressure exercised by lobbying and other means, laws were enacted and agreements were made which discriminated against the people of the Territories. As a result, agreements frequently had to be radically altered after independence. An example was the case of Nauru, where the Administering Authority and the people of Nauru had had to alter considerably the trade agreements made with phosphate companies before the request for independence.

86. The report rightly directed attention to the reluctance to educate the people of the Territory, to raise their level of living and to treat them as equals, and the deliberate efforts made to ensure that they remained third-rate citizens because of their lack of education.

87. The Governments concerned had asserted that they had no control over the financial organizations involved, but those same Governments had clearly been able to apply in other areas the kind of pressure they claimed they were unable to apply in the colonial Territories. They had applied embargoes in other cases; if they could not do so in the case of South Africa, then his delegation could only believe that they had no interest in seeing the people in southern Africa move towards independence and freedom. His delegation would support the report as it stood.

88. Speaking in exercise of the right of reply, the representative of the United Kingdom said that some members of the Sub-Committee had said that that body had not sought to condemn all forms of foreign investment out of hand but that the situation changed after independence in that adequate safeguards were applied to mitigate the effects of "exploitation". In that case it was difficult to understand why those representatives had supported generalizations which suggested that foreign economic interests exerted a wholly negative influence on the political, economic and social evolution of the colonial Territories. His delegation believed that the activities of those interests produced benefits for the colonial Territory which, although possibly not deliberate, were undeniable and clearly outweighed the disadvantages. In the case of United Kingdom

Territories, such activities had contributed either directly or indirectly to early political independence and to the economic viability on which true independence must be based. Their contribution to the public revenue had helped to improve social services, technical training and basic economic facilities. With the exception of Southern Rhodesia, the Territories which remained under United Kingdom administration were precisely those which had attracted the least foreign investment.

89. It was somewhat surprising that the representative of Sierra Leone should claim that decisions on foreign investment in colonial Territories were taken without any reference to the will of the people concerned. In fact, such decisions had often been taken by responsible local ministers elected on the basis of the "one man, one vote" principle and had been endorsed by local legislatures elected in the same way.

90. As regards the Bahamas, the Commission of Inquiry into Gambling - a sphere which might be regarded as exploitation of foreigners rather than exploitation by foreigners - had not been set up by the United Kingdom Government, nor was it a Royal Commission. The Commission had, in fact, been proposed by the former Government of the Bahamas and established by the present Government; since both those Governments were elected Bahamian Governments, it was obviously the local people who, through their elected leaders, had decided that an inquiry should be held.

91. The representative of Syria, speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that unlike the Italian representative he felt that the report's failure to differentiate between the interests of the colonial Power and foreign interests in general was an advantage, not a weakness. Sub-Committee I had felt that the colonial Power, too, was foreign to the Territories under its control and should liquidate its interests there as soon as possible. The Italian representative had stated that economic enterprises had the same goals in both colonial and non-colonial Territories, but it should be remembered that in independent nations their activities were regulated by labour, social and other types of legislation and that any infringement resulted in legal sanctions and trade union protests. That was not the case in the African colonies. Furthermore, he questioned the United Kingdom representative's assertion that in those

colonies investment decisions were taken by local ministers elected on the basis of the "one man, one vote" principle.

92. Replying to the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom, the representative of Sierra Leone said that the political will of the people was indeed the determining factor in the attainment of independence, but the crucial issue was the organization of that will. In southern Africa, the indigenous inhabitants in colonial Territories were not even allowed to organize themselves into a labour union, let alone into a political party which would lead them to independence. Education in colonial Territories was designed to prevent the organization of the people's will: in former United Kingdom Territories in West Africa, for example, the few Africans who had managed to obtain a university education had found it extremely difficult to enter commerce or government service. Sierra Leone was interested in outside capital from whatever source. The fault lay not in investment itself but in the manner of investment, including the tax laws governing investment, the agreements signed and the benefits, if any, derived by the people.

93. The United Kingdom representative had stated that major decisions on foreign investments had frequently been taken and endorsed by responsible men elected on the basis of one man, one vote. The record in West Africa, however, showed that in almost every case those agreements had been made before the introduction of the one man, one vote system. Even when the people had attained a slight measure of internal self-government, they had been advised by the same colonial administrators as before and final decisions had still been taken by the administering Power. Once the system of one man, one vote, had been introduced, those agreements had usually been changed.

III. ACTION TAKEN BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE  
REPORT OF SUB-COMMITTEE I

94. At its 568th meeting, on 18 October 1967, the Special Committee, at the request of the representative of the United States, voted on the report of Sub-Committee I. At the request of the representative of Iraq, the vote was taken by roll-call, and the Special Committee adopted the report by 19 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions. The voting was as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Chile, Ethiopia, India, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Mali, Poland, Sierra Leone, Syria, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Against: Australia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Finland, Italy.

95. In adopting the report, the Special Committee endorsed all the conclusions and recommendations contained in the Sub-Committee's report (annex, paras. 132 and 133). Accordingly, the Special Committee recommends to the General Assembly that it:

(a) Reaffirm the inalienable right of the peoples of the Territories over their natural resources and their right to enjoy the benefits thereof;

(b) Strongly condemn the policies of the colonial Powers which deprive the colonial peoples of these rights;

(c) Condemn the colonial Governments for their active support and promotion of foreign economic activities and other interests which exploit the natural and human resources of the Territories without regard to their need for balanced economic development without regard to the welfare of the indigenous peoples;

(d) Draw the attention of the colonial Powers to the fact that, so long as the people of the Territories are denied full political rights and participation in a government of their own choice, concessions to foreign economic and other interests in disregard of the interests of the people run counter to the recommendations of the General Assembly and are a violation of the provisions of the Charter, especially of Article 73 which affirms the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories are paramount;

(e) Call upon the colonial Powers to put a stop to all discriminatory measures affecting the use and enjoyment of the natural resources, including in particular land ownership and settlement, and to halt all measures aimed at granting concessions to foreign companies, establishing more European immigrants and foreign interests in the Territories which perpetuate colonial and economic domination;

(f) Strongly condemn the present activities and operating methods of foreign economic and other interests in the colonial Territories which aim solely at the amassing of large profits, resulting primarily from the exploitation of cheap labour, and impede the progress of their people towards freedom and independence;

(g) Express its grave concern that foreign economic and other interests are directly and indirectly assisting the colonial Powers by supplying them with financial, material and other support which enable them to continue their colonial domination;

(h) Appeal to the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Belgium, France, Federal Republic of Germany and other Powers to take legislative, administrative and other measures with respect to their nationals who own and operate enterprises in the colonial Territories, and particularly in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and the Territories under Portuguese administration, to put an end to their activities which are at present detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants of the Territories;

(i) Request the United Nations Council for South West Africa to urgently consider measures for ending the activities of foreign economic and other interests in South West Africa, and especially the illegal activities of South Africa;

(j) Appeal to all States to put a stop to all forms of assistance and the sales of arms and ammunitions through whatever channels which are intended for (i) the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia; (ii) the Government of South Africa, and (iii) the Government of Portugal, so long as they continue their present policy of colonial domination in Africa;

(k) Appeal to all the specialized agencies of the United Nations, and in particular to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and request them to withhold from

South Africa, Portugal and the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia any further financial, economic or technical assistance so long as they continue their policies of apartheid, colonialism and racial discrimination;

(l) Urge all Member States to co-operate fully with the United Nations in the rapid and effective implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, so as to ensure to the peoples their full enjoyment of fundamental human rights and freedoms and through self-determination the attainment of independence;

(m) Request the Secretary-General to give the widest possible publicity the information on the role of foreign economic and other interests in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa, the Territories under Portuguese administration and all other colonial Territories and the conclusions and recommendations adopted;

(n) Decide to retain on its agenda of the twenty-third session the item entitled:

"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 the Territories in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination".

-----