

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



**FORTY-SECOND SESSION**

**Official Records\***

**FOURTH COMMITTEE**  
8th meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 6 October 1987  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 8th MEETING**

**Chairman:** Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus)

**CONTENTS**

**AGENDA ITEM 109: 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, 7 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

**Distr. GENERAL**  
**A/C.4/42/SR.8**  
**9 October 1987**

**ORIGINAL: ENGLISH**

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 109: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/42/23 (Part III); A/AC.109/897, 900-902, 905, 908, 909, 912, 914 and 916; A/AC.131/241 and 243)

1. Mr. ONONAIYE (Nigeria) said that most, if not all, the activities of foreign economic and other interests in dependent and Non-Self-Governing Territories violated one of the fundamental principles of international law which had been confirmed by the Charter, namely, the inalienable rights of all peoples to self-determination and independence. Since the foundation of the United Nations in 1945, the number of people under colonial bondage had decreased from some 750 million to an estimated 3 million. No one should be subjected to external domination. The world was still witnessing the collusion between the administering or colonial Powers and transnational corporations from certain Western countries in the economic impoverishment, political manipulation and cultural alienation of the peoples in the dependent Territories. All manner of subtle and overt efforts had been employed to incorporate dependent Territories into the administering or colonial Powers or to perpetuate the status quo, in flagrant violation of the genuine wishes of the vast majority of the inhabitants. General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and Articles 73 and 76 of the Charter clearly stated that in all matters pertaining to the peoples of dependent and Non-Self-Governing Territories, the interests and wishes of the people must be paramount.

2. His delegation was gravely concerned at the increasing militarization of dependent and Non-Self-Governing Territories by administering Powers, especially in the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian Oceans, and at the importance of the profit motive which regulated the behaviour and activities of the transnational corporations in those dependent Territories.

3. In no other Territory had the activities of foreign economic and other interests impeded the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) more than in Namibia, which was being flagrantly occupied by apartheid South Africa in defiance of numerous United Nations resolutions. Namibia's resources were being plundered by transnational corporations from certain Western countries in active collaboration with the racist South African régime. While those transnational corporations which had implemented genuine disinvestment in Namibia and South Africa were to be applauded, they should be certain that they had not simply changed from direct foreign investment to foreign portfolio investment. The only peaceful way to tackle the South African crisis was to invoke comprehensive, universal and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) still constituted the only internationally accepted basis for facilitating Namibia's independence.

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

4. The exploitation of Namibia's uranium and other natural resources by the transnational corporations continued unabated, in violation of the relevant General Assembly resolutions and Decree No. 1 of the Council for Namibia. South Africa's nuclear capability and military arsenal had all been developed and strengthened by those corporations in violation of Security Council resolution 418 (1977), while Namibian territory was being used as a launching-pad for invading the front-line and other neighbouring independent African countries. Well over a hundred thousand troops of the so-called "South African Defence Force" were stationed in Namibia.

5. Mr. KOUNKOU (Congo) said that the 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/42/23 (Part III)) showed the aggressive practices of foreign economic interests, especially in Namibia in collaboration with Governments allied to the Pretoria régime. The presence of the transnational corporations in the Non-Self-Governing Territories was one of the main obstacles to the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

6. In the nineteenth century, the prosperity and industrial development of the colonial Powers had been based on exploitation of the human and natural resources of the colonies. That exploitation was no longer carried out by States but by transnational monopolies, and the legitimate aspirations of the indigenous inhabitants of dependent Territories were still not fulfilled. The many resolutions and decisions adopted by the United Nations, and the Special Committee on decolonization in particular, confirmed the inalienable right of all peoples to attain self-determination and independence and to exploit for their own use the natural resources of their countries.

7. Namibia was a glaring example of exploitation by foreign interests. The transnational corporations operating in that Territory or out of South Africa were helping to perpetuate and strengthen the odious system of apartheid.

8. The innumerable resolutions of the General Assembly and the Organization of African Unity, the United Nations plan set forth in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and Decree No. 1 of the Council for Namibia had not prevented the South African Government, hundreds of South African firms and other powerful foreign interests from continuing to pillage Namibia. The pillaging of the Territory's non-replaceable resources and the shameful exploitation of its workers helped to strengthen the illegal occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria régime.

9. The disinvestment in South Africa carried out by certain Western Governments and interests in response to anti-apartheid campaigns throughout the world should be welcomed. On the other hand, some firms left behind them a system which guaranteed their economic interests.

10. New and even stronger international campaigns against the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the dependent Territories were essential,

(Mr. Koukou, Congo)

and in that non-governmental organizations could complement the efforts of Governments and international organisations. Africa had committed itself to the mobilization of new energies by establishing for the benefit of the oppressed peoples of southern Africa and the front-line States the Africa Fund, which was supported by the Non-Aligned Movement. His country had joined other States in helping to finance that Fund and looked forward to seeing a democratic, multiracial South Africa and an independent, prosperous Namibia.

11. Mr. WASNIK (India) said that the issue under discussion concerned not colonialism in the sense of subjugation alone but the establishment of footholds in areas which could provide markets and resources to sustain self-interest.

12. His delegation reiterated its call to the United Nations to seek the guidance of the International Court of Justice on the nature and extent of the illegality of the activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia. The United Nations Council for Namibia had begun to implement its decision to initiate legal proceedings in the domestic courts of States which were believed to violate its Decree No. 1. The United Nations must also ensure that that Decree was codified as a tenet of international law, particularly so that the future Government of an independent Namibia could claim compensation for losses incurred during its period of colonial captivity.

13. As an erstwhile colony, India recognized that the economic patterns of colonial Territories were inevitably oriented to the needs of the administering Power. Colonialism still persisted in several parts of the world, and countries were denying to other peoples the democracy they themselves prized so highly.

14. The principles set forth in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples could be vitalized only if peoples were given the freedom and opportunity to define for themselves their rights, the scope of their domestic jurisdiction and the integrity of their territory.

15. The Committee should encourage the participation of other United Nations bodies and specialized agencies with first-hand information on the situation and should encourage vigorous debate so that practical measures could be suggested to the General Assembly. Specific measures should include integration and co-ordination of the work relating to activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia and South Africa that was being discussed in a variety of multilateral forums, in order that remedial measures could be implemented. The illegal nature of foreign economic interests wherever determined should be challenged in the International Court of Justice and its opinion sought.

16. Mr. BRAVO (Angola) said that the deterioration of the tragic situation in southern Africa was a direct consequence of the activities of foreign interests and a clear proof of complicity by the home countries of the transnational corporations operating in South Africa and Namibia.

(Mr. Bravo, Angola)

17. That illegally occupied Territory was used as a base for aggression and practices of destabilization against neighbouring States, especially Angola, where, as Henry Kissinger had said in 1970, the main United States interests in black Africa were concentrated. The occupation of the southern part of the country by the racist South African troops and the policy of linking withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola with withdrawal of the South Africans from Namibia was a vivid example of the theory of vital interests, which was incompatible with the principles of the Charter and other norms of international law. His delegation stressed the absurdity of the concept of "linkage", condemned in Security Council resolution 539 (1983). The presence in Angola of Cuban forces was in conformity with Article 51 of the Charter and was a purely domestic matter. On the other hand, as pointed out in General Assembly resolution 41/35 A, the occupation of southern Angola by the racist régime had been in large part facilitated by the policies pursued by the United States, especially those of "constructive engagement" and "linkage".

18. With a view to finding a negotiated political solution in southern Africa, the Angolan Government had submitted on 4 August 1987 a proposal for a global agreement, demonstrating its flexibility by agreeing that the timetable for the withdrawal of Cuban forces from the southern part of Angola should be reduced from 36 to 24 months. In the same spirit of conciliation, the Angolan Government had recently carried out an exchange of prisoners at Maputo, including Captain Du Troit of the South African armed forces.

19. The Angolan Government strongly condemned economic, military and other activities carried out by the colonial and neo-colonial Powers in southern Africa and elsewhere and expressed its solidarity with the peoples of Namibia and South Africa in their heroic struggle against the forces of repression and exploitation.

20. His delegation welcomed the decision to hold a special meeting of the Council for Namibia at the ministerial level and strongly hoped that its final communiqué would help to improve the situation in that Territory.

21. Mr. AL-ROUMI (Kuwait) said that his country had a clear and unequivocal policy of supporting peoples struggling to gain independence and freedom, and to counter racial discrimination. That policy was guided by the teachings of the Islamic religion, which called for the repudiation of apartheid and for equality among all mankind irrespective of colour, race or creed. Kuwait's policy was steadfast in its support of the legitimate and brave struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). Also, it was no longer permissible or just to make the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) contingent on extraneous elements. Kuwait reaffirmed its concern for the legitimate rights of the Namibian people and its complete support for the United Nations Council for Namibia in its capacity as the legitimate authority to administer the Territory of Namibia until it gained independence.

22. World public opinion had been anguished by the injustice of the white minority. The same injustice was found in the practices of Israel against the

(Mr. Al-Roumi, Kuwait)

Palestinian people, who had the primary right to their territory and their homeland. The Fifth Islamic Summit Conference, which had been held in Kuwait in early 1987, had called for a redoubling of efforts to eliminate racial discrimination and zionism. In addition, the Conference had strongly condemned the minority régime in Pretoria for its pursuance of the policy of apartheid, its occupation of Namibia, its repeated attacks on the front-line States and its repression of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia. Likewise, it had called upon its member States to impose effective and comprehensive sanctions on the South African régime, while requesting the Security Council to impose comprehensive and mandatory economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

23. Kuwait called upon countries engaged in economic activities in Namibia and other colonial regions to refrain from any activity that led to economic depletion.

24. The representative of Israel, in his statement at the previous meeting, had chosen to disregard the foreign economic and other interests which impeded the implementation of the Declaration. He had said that for the past three years the Israeli delegation had been calling the General Assembly's attention to statistics and specific studies published by the Shipping Research Bureau. However, according to the Bureau, it appeared that the Israeli list contained a large number of distortions and errors. The representative of Israel had been hypocritical in his expression of concern over the supply and shipping of oil to South Africa because, in fact, according to the Bureau, Israel had not shown any support for the oil embargo against South Africa and had voted against General Assembly resolution 41/35 F, which had called for a mandatory oil embargo and the establishment of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa.

25. On 16 September 1986 Israel had adopted a number of measures against South Africa in order to comply with Western sanctions and also in order to mollify United States public opinion. That decision had been taken at a time when many Western States had been thinking of applying measures. Thus, contrary to its claim, Israel was, in fact, lagging behind the Western democracies in that regard.

26. Mr. OUNSENG (Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that the reports before the Committee demonstrated clearly that colonialism persisted not only in its traditional form but also in new patterns such as the granting of conditional economic assistance and the growing exploitation of the natural riches of dependent Territories by transnational corporations and other foreign interests.

27. The repression of the peoples struggling for their freedom was becoming increasingly bloody. In South Africa and Namibia in particular, there had been large-scale repression and aggression by South Africa, with the encouragement of its Western allies. The imperialists' new policy was to pass off the struggle for decolonization as an ideological conflict or as terrorism. The South Africans and their protectors were hoping that with the passage of time they could succeed in imposing a solution fostering their economic and strategic interests in the region.

(Mr. Ounseng, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

28. The continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa was the most striking example of a decolonization failure. Arrogantly disregarding the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on Namibia, the Pretoria régime was holding its people in bondage by force of arms. It was, moreover, attacking the front-line States from Namibian territory in an attempt to destabilize them and compel them to cut off their assistance to the Namibian freedom-fighters.

29. His delegation reaffirmed its support for the heroic struggle for self-determination and national independence of the South African people under the direction of the African National Congress (ANC) and of the Namibian people under the direction of SWAPO. It condemned the policies of constructive engagement and linkage. Namibia would only be able to attain its independence under the terms of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It also decried the stepped-up activities of foreign economic and other interests and condemned the use of the veto by certain Western States to prevent mandatory sanctions from being imposed on South Africa.

30. It was also regrettable that the objectives of the Declaration on decolonization had not yet been achieved in some other small Territories in the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian Oceans and in the Caribbean. Their continued colonial exploitation by imperialist monopolies and their use as military bases were keeping them from self-determination and independence. The Territories' lack of political and cultural maturity or their economic and social underdevelopment could not serve as a pretext for keeping them as colonies, and it should be the aim of all administering Powers to create the conditions for independence.

31. Mr. MUTSVANGWA (Zimbabwe) observed that the Fourth Committee had an enviable history of achievement: the decolonization process had almost reached its term. In the remaining colonial Territories, however, processes had been set in motion to reverse the movement towards decolonization in order to favour outside strategic and economic interests. Nowhere were such machinations more apparent than in southern Africa, where Namibia was under military occupation by the apartheid army and was being plundered by the transnational corporations of certain Western countries, even though, since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), all elements had been in place for Namibia's independence.

32. There had been recent attempts to cloak with legitimacy the issue that was being used to stall Namibian independence by describing the outrageous linkage of Namibian independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a matter of "international realities". Despite the constant denials by the United States of a tacit common purpose with Pretoria in Namibia, their collusion was a matter of public record and represented nothing less than a joint enterprise to achieve geostrategic aims by taking Namibia hostage and interfering in Angola's internal affairs.

33. Angola's predicament as a country at war since its independence was a proverbial instance of the curse of wealth. Angola was the only southern African

(Mr. Muts'rangwa, Zimbabwe)

majority-ruled country whose natural wealth would, but for the designs of South Africa and the United States Administration, enable it potentially to have a self-sufficient economy outside the South African orbit.

34. Within Namibia, the politics were carried on by an amalgam of white puppets and black sycophants in the pay of Pretoria. The charade had been presented as a multi-party conference entrusted with writing a constitution for Namibia that was outside the United Nations framework for the Territory. Legal expertise for the task was being provided by another Western Power which itself had in the past attempted genocide in Namibia. At great cost, the Namibian people and SWAPO were resisting those machinations.

35. The grim picture had another unsavoury dimension in the plunder of Namibian wealth by transnational corporations, which had maintained Namibian workers in conditions of poverty, used violence to break strikes and set up their own security police as outposts of the occupier's illegal State machinery.

36. The situation in Namibia in its stark cruelty was a microcosm of the hell that was apartheid South Africa. A recent conference in Zimbabwe on the brutalities of the South African régime against black children provided heart-rending evidence of the torture and mistreatment of children who should normally be in school but were in prisons.

37. The situation in New Caledonia was also a cause for concern. There, the colonial Power, which elsewhere had a proud record of successful decolonization, had resorted to time-worn subterfuge in order to thwart a process of complete self-determination. The recent one-sided referendum must be seen for what it was, and France must employ the established structures of the United Nations to discharge its responsibilities in a manner acceptable to all New Caledonians and to the international community.

38. Zimbabwe also called upon Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO to co-operate with the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations in allowing the Saharan people self-determination. The administering Powers in Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and other dependent Territories should also similarly discharge their responsibilities so that the decolonization chapter could be effectively closed.

39. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines) observed that decolonization had many dimensions. Those countries which had undergone the difficult colonial experience recognized that the enjoyment of economic independence was as crucial as the exercise of political sovereignty. The Philippines supported the struggle of all Non-Self-Governing Territories against every aspect of colonialism.

40. The Namibian people were being denied their right to self-determination and independence and were being oppressed by South Africa's unlawful occupation of the country and its continued exploitation of its natural resources, in connivance with foreign economic interests, without heed to the rights of the current and future



(Mr. Valderrama, Philippines)

generations of Namibians. The Philippines supported Namibia in its legitimate struggle for freedom under the leadership of SWAPO. Its independence could be attained only on the basis of the United Nations plan as set forth in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

41. The partial embargoes and boycotts voluntarily imposed by States in the past had proved insufficient to compel South Africa to withdraw from Namibia. Sanctions must be extended to other fields, including investments, loans, transport and trade, and the industrialized countries were urged to heed the call of the international community for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. It was the only peaceful means available for change. The alternative to peaceful change in Namibia was dreadful to contemplate, and time was running out on South Africa.

42. Mr. MOTANA ALI (Democratic Yemen) said that Namibia was living proof of the resolve of those colonial nations to maintain their domination over the Namibian people by armed force. The racist Government of South Africa pursued a terrorist policy of repressing the national will of the Namibian people and impeding their inalienable right to independence and self-determination. He reaffirmed his country's stand against colonial policy in all its forms. Democratic Yemen offered support to all people struggling for their rights to freedom and self-determination. He also saluted the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. He endorsed the decision of the Special Committee to condemn both the investment of foreign capital in the production of uranium and the collaboration of several Western countries and the Zionist régime with the racist minority régime in South Africa in the nuclear field. South Africa had now become a nuclear State and constituted a threat to international peace and security. Democratic Yemen also condemned the policies of South Africa and some Western States aimed at systematically depleting and exploiting the region's human and natural resources through transnational corporations.

43. He expressed his country's concern over the establishment of military bases in the Indian and Pacific Oceans and in Territories under colonial administration with the aim of maintaining military power for the interests of international monopolies. His delegation supported United Nations efforts to end foreign military presence in the territory of others. He had great trust in the national will and aspirations of the peoples to build a peaceful and independent life in Central America, South Africa, Namibia, Palestine and the Western Sahara. That national will could not be repressed, whatever the might and means of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

44. Mr. COMO (Albania) said that, despite all the General Assembly resolutions condemning colonial domination and exploitation, the imperialist Powers were continuing in various ways to strengthen their hold on other peoples.

45. An extreme case was the racist South African régime's policy of oppression and apartheid within its own country and in Namibia and its armed aggression against

(Mr. Como, Albania)

neighbouring African countries. In its barbarous treatment of the black populations, South Africa enjoyed the political, economic and military support first and foremost of the United States but also of the other imperialist Powers and Israel. Together they continued ruthlessly to plunder the African continent which, despite its vast natural resources was in a critical economic situation. The same States that cynically defended human rights in every part of the globe were giving unreserved support to the Pretoria régime, which had made racism into a brutal system.

46. Albania believed that the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the colonial Territories were part and parcel of an overall imperialist strategy extending also to developing countries that had struggled to gain political independence. The imperialist Powers, the two super-Powers above all, were seeking both to exploit and to enslave them by economic means.

47. Such economic activities had unavoidable political consequences and culminated not infrequently in direct military interventions by the United States and the Soviet imperialist Powers to defend their neo-colonialist interests and redivide the world into spheres of influence. Under the guise of altruism, they were creating new evils and inciting conflicts and even wars in order to divide the peoples of the developing world who should, instead, stand united. Albania's own constitutional prohibition of any activity within its territory by foreign economic interests had assured its people economic and political independence.

48. Mr. TAEB (Afghanistan) said that any administering or occupying Power that deprived a colonial people of its legitimate right to dispose of the natural resources on its territory violated its obligations under the Charter. The summit of the non-aligned movement in Harare had condemned the increasing exploitation of the natural and human resources of the Territories by the colonial Powers and transnational corporations as well as the use of some of them for the stockpiling or deployment of nuclear weapons.

49. The administering Powers had continued to subjugate the economies of the colonial Territories to world imperialism, in violation of the United Nations Declaration on decolonization. Some Western States, in particular the United States and the United Kingdom, were trying to cover up their real interests by proclaiming that their economic activities contributed to the development of the colonial Territories. In Namibia, however, mineral resources as well as agricultural and fishery products were exploited by South Africa and other foreign countries, particularly certain Western nations. Over 1,000 transnational corporations, most of them based in the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, were operating in South Africa. They were repatriating over 60 per cent of Namibia's gross domestic product. The food sector had been so neglected that Namibia had become highly dependent on imports for its most basic requirements.

50. Owing to the negative attitude of some of its permanent members and their followers, the Security Council had been unable to give a universal character to the sanctions imposed on South Africa, which were observed by the majority of the

(Mr. Taeb, Afghanistan)

United Nations Members. The racist régime would be unable to withstand the pressure of world-wide condemnation without the political, moral and economic backing of certain Western States, in particular the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany.

51. In violation of Article 73 of the Charter, the colonial Powers were pursuing economic policies which subjugated their Territories. Economic reforms would not enable the remaining Territories to obtain genuine independence. The one-way free-trade policy of transnational corporations continued to dominate the economies of the colonial Territories. His delegation condemned the failure of the colonial Powers concerned to comply with the General Assembly's repeated request that they should withdraw their military bases from colonial Territories.

52. The racist Pretoria régime continued its illegal occupation of Namibia, using it as a springboard for aggression and destabilization in the region. Certain Western States and Israel continued their co-operation with Pretoria in its nuclear programme. Relying on the support of world imperialism, South Africa had refused to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

53. The presence of the military bases of the colonial Powers and their allies in Guam, Bermuda, the United States Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands seriously impeded genuine independence. His delegation expressed its grave concern with regard to the nuclear weapons emplaced in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and Guam. According to the United States, the military bases served the security interests of those territories. A United States general, however, had stated that the United States Air Force base in Guam would play an increasing role in the United States Pacific strategy in the coming years.

54. Mr. ROY (Nepal) said that the racist régime of South Africa, heedless of United Nations resolutions calling for its withdrawal from Namibia, had strengthened its presence there, systematically plundering Namibia's vast resources. It had also stepped up repression in South Africa by imposing a state of emergency and had committed acts of aggression against neighbouring front-line States.

55. The implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which had been agreed to by all parties concerned, was the only way to settle the problem of Namibian independence. Linking extraneous issues to the granting of independence was unacceptable.

56. It had become increasingly clear that voluntary sanctions and even an oil and arms embargo would be ineffective. Hence, the only course left to the United Nations was to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions on the Pretoria régime.

57. Mr. SATHIAH (Malaysia) said that the independence of a number of colonial and Trust Territories had been hampered by continued foreign economic domination, which, over the years, had created an economic dependency syndrome that impeded the

(Mr. Sathiah, Malaysia)

development of nationalism, a fundamental condition for independence. That, together with political domination by foreign and colonial Powers, perpetuated the subjugation of the peoples concerned. Such was the case of Namibia, where racism had compounded the problems of decolonization.

58. South Africa's decision to instal an "interim government" was clearly in defiance of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). His Government rejected the linking of that occupation to any extraneous issues. His delegation supported the Namibian people's struggle for independence under the leadership of SWAPO. It fully endorsed the resolution contained in document A/AC.109/927 adopted by the Special Committee on decolonization on 12 August 1987, which it hoped would be adopted by consensus in the General Assembly.

59. South Africa's economic domination of Namibia was buttressed by the numerous transnational corporations of certain industrial countries through interlocking equity arrangements. The major industries were dominated by South Africa in collusion with certain Western nations. The foreign economic interests involved in exploiting Namibia's resources included some of the world's largest corporations and financial institutions based in South Africa, Western Europe and North America.

60. The link between economic domination and military presence was reinforced through South Africa's policy of developing a large military-industrial complex in its pursuance of self-sufficiency in armaments. The ability to manufacture sophisticated military equipment had been made possible through the assistance of certain Western and other countries. Collaboration in the production of armaments with a large number of subsidiaries of transnational corporations operating in South Africa and Namibia (A/AC.131/241) negated international efforts, which those same countries claimed to support, towards the goal of a self-governing and independent Namibia. International banks also supported the illegal South African administration in Namibia by providing facilities for its army of occupation (A/AC.131/243). The importance of the military-industrial complex had increased over the years with the establishment of military bases accommodating some 100,000 South African troops.

61. The United Nations had been unable to prevent the domination and occupation of Namibia by South Africa, because of the actions of a few Member States which had continued to share the spoils of that exploitation. The link between industry and military presence, which impeded Namibia's becoming independent, could be cut by weakening Namibia's economic domination by South Africa and other foreign economic interests. His delegation therefore urged the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978), which sought mandatory economic sanctions against the South African régime.

62. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) said that, for many delegations, the activities of all foreign economic interests by definition impeded self-determination and were detrimental to the needs of dependent peoples. Many speakers had applied conclusions drawn from the particular circumstances of Namibia to other Territories, disregarding the unique situation in each case.

(Mr. Smith, United Kingdom)

63. Whereas much had been said about the exploitation of dependent Territories, no mention had been made of the enormous contribution foreign businesses often made to their development. The theory of economic imperialism quite simply did not fit the situation in the various British dependent Territories.

64. For example, the Secretariat working paper on the Cayman Islands (A/AC.109/911) correctly stated that tourism and international finance not only contributed significantly to the development of the Territory by providing a substantial amount of capital and foreign exchange for trade and investment, but were also an important source of employment and constituted a major growth factor for other sectors of the economy.

65. Another Secretariat working paper (A/AC.109/912) quoted a local representative as saying that the economy of the Cayman Islands had been transformed through foreign investment into one of the most envied in the Caribbean. Its people were prosperous, social welfare and health services were highly developed, and education was free and compulsory for all children from 5 to 16. He found it hard to see any meaning in talk about exploitation.

66. Similarly, the Secretariat working paper on Bermuda (A/AC.109/895) pointed out that the important tourist industry had provided considerable employment and that Bermuda's rapidly growing international-finance industry was of increasing importance. Yet another Secretariat working paper (A/AC.109/901) made clear that in Montserrat, the local government's policy was to stimulate foreign investments with the aim of creating employment.

67. Those and other examples showed that foreign investment, far from being an impediment to the economic and social advancement of the people, was essential to their well-being. Without an adequate economic base, the dependent peoples could not realistically aspire to independence if that was what they desired.

68. The United Kingdom had repeatedly condemned South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and called for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without delay or preconditions. His delegation wished to draw attention again to the plunder of Namibia's off-shore fishery by the fishing fleets of many countries from outside the region. Although the latest report of the Council for Namibia on the activities of foreign economic interests operating in Namibia had given lengthy treatment to the depletion of the in-shore fishery, primarily by South African concerns, it had provided an inadequate account of what was going on in the Namibian off-shore fishery. According to a recent report by a Polish off-shore fishery specialist, no less than 44 per cent of the total catch in the South-East Atlantic, which included the waters off Namibia, was taken by fleets from the Soviet Union, Romania, Poland, the German Democratic Republic, Bulgaria and Cuba. He wondered whether the Council for Namibia had taken the matter up with the countries concerned in order to halt that grave depletion of Namibia's natural resources, and he inquired why those countries themselves were not exercising restraint.

(Mr. Smith, United Kingdom)

69. He deplored the fact that the Council had neither discussed the content of, nor circulated, a joint FAO-UNDP report on the Namibian fisheries, which highlighted the exploitation of one of the Territory's most valuable resources. Bulgaria, Cuba and Poland figured prominently among those involved, although the Soviet Union accounted for by far the largest catch.

70. The Committee's approach to the question of foreign economic interests was too selective. It ignored the fact that off-shore fishing by foreign fleets contributed neither to the Namibian economy nor to employment in the Territory.

71. The issue was a source of serious embarrassment to those who denounced most loudly the activities of foreign interests in Namibia, embarrassment which they sought to conceal by concentrating on the activities of Western concerns. Any discussion of foreign economic interest that ignored the fisheries issue would be one-sided. He suggested that the debate should be conducted on a more realistic basis. His delegation firmly rejected the underlying assumption that the activities of foreign economic interests necessarily impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

72. Mr. ABDUL WAHAB (Saudi Arabia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that at the previous meeting, the Israeli representative had, as usual, resorted to attack as the best means of defence. The Zionist régime was known by all to co-operate with the racist South African régime in violation of international law, particularly with regard to the exploitation of raw materials. Saudi Arabia observed an all-out embargo on trade and economic co-operation with South Africa and strictly condemned those who exported oil to that country illegally.

73. Mr. ABUHAJAR (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Israeli representative's remarks on the relationship between the Arab and African nations were an expression of hatred. It was common knowledge that those nations were united in the struggle against the Zionist and racist régimes, and it was, in any case, surprising that a war criminal, who had participated in the massacre of Arabs and in the usurpation of their territory, should be discussing the rights of Arabs and Africans.

74. Both those racist, illegal régimes were supported by the imperialist Powers in their daily acts of aggression and oppression, a situation described in United Nations documents and reflected in the resolutions of the Organization.

75. Mr. IDRIES (Sudan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, referred to certain allegations made by the Israeli representative with regard to the Sudan. A country with close links with South Africa was hardly in a position to make such allegations. The Sudanese were aware that their democratic system was being attacked by those serving the interests of Israel, but their Constitution and laws upheld the rights of all Sudanese and prohibited oppression. Co-operation was being promoted between the tribes, and all claims of injustice were investigated. Israel's own record, particularly with regard to the violation of the rights of the Palestinian Arabs, was well known.

76. Mr. HASSAN (Bahrain), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Israeli representative had accused his country of exporting oil to South Africa. That allegation was groundless since Bahraini law specifically prohibited such exports. In making that accusation, the Israeli representative had merely been seeking to camouflage his own country's co-operation with the racist régime.

77. Mr. MUKHTAR (Oman), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Israeli representative's accusations with regard to Oman were unfounded. His country was committed to a complete embargo on all co-operation with South Africa, including the exporting of oil. Israel itself co-operated widely with the racist régime, and its representative's remarks were deliberately misleading.

78. Mr. JUMA (United Arab Emirates), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his country had no relations whatsoever with South Africa and that the Israeli representative's accusations with regard to oil exports were, therefore, unfounded. That representative had merely been seeking to distract attention from his own country's special relations with South Africa.

79. Mr. PJCZACKI (United States), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, rejected the allegations made by the representative of Zimbabwe with regard to United States policy in southern Africa. The insulting charge that the United States was colluding with South Africa over Namibia indicated either a lamentable lack of understanding of United States policy or a deliberate attempt to misrepresent it.

80. Mr. BASTELICA (France), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, referred to the Zimbabwean representative's comments concerning New Caledonia. He wished to point out that, in the recent referendum, the New Caledonians had both rejected independence and opted to retain their association with France.

81. Mr. HERNANDEZ (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, referred to comments by the United Kingdom representative with regard to off-shore fishing activities. Cuba had always adhered to international regulations governing such activities and had clearly explained its position on previous occasions. The United Kingdom's dissatisfaction with the decisions of the Council for Namibia in that respect and its request that the issue should receive further attention clearly reflected that country's desire to distract attention from the internationally recognized exploitation of natural and human resources in Namibia. Everyone knew who was responsible for the colonial status of that country and who was exploiting its resources.

82. Mr. CHERNY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the statement by the United Kingdom representative had had two objectives, firstly, to paint an invidious picture of the Soviet policy in southern Africa and, secondly, to divert attention from the main issues. Fishing in the South Atlantic did not impede implementation of the Declaration, and all activities by Soviet travelers in the area were conducted in conformity with international conventions, rules and procedures.

83. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he had raised the question of the off-shore fishery again because no action had been taken to redress the situation.

84 The Afghan representative had made explicit allegations with regard to United Kingdom policy in southern Africa. The United Kingdom's position on Namibia was clear. Apartheid was abhorrent and should be eliminated as quickly as possible, but not through measures such as comprehensive and mandatory sanctions. Economic isolation would serve only to exacerbate the situation.

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (A/C.4/42/4/Add.4-6, A/C.4/42/6/Add.7-9)

85. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received six communications containing requests for hearings, three relating to New Caledonia, under agenda item 18, and three to Namibia, under agenda item 36. He suggested that, in accordance with the usual practice, the communications should be circulated as Committee documents for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

86. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.