



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 4th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ROA-KOURI (Cuba)

CONTENTS

UN LIBRARY

NOV 10 1982

UN/ES COLLECTION

ELECTION OF THE RAPPORTEUR

AGENDA ITEM 98: 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 (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 99: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS

Hearing of a petitioner

* 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 A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), 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.4/37/SR.4
21 October 1982

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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

ELECTION OF THE RAPPORTEUR

1. Mr. ADDABASHI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) nominated Mr. Garcia (Philippines) for the office of Rapporteur.
2. Mr. Garcia (Philippines) was elected Rapporteur by acclamation.

AGENDA ITEM 98: 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 (continued) (A/37/23 (Part III) and (Part III)/Add.1, A/37/333, 405; A/AC.109/690, 701, 702, 703; A/37/23 (Part II) and (Part II)/Add.1; A/AC.109/696, 698 and 704)

3. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic), Rapporteur of the Special Committee of 24, drew the attention of the Fourth Committee to the decisions of the Special Committee on an item entitled "Military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration which might be impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples", as set out in chapter IV of the Special Committee's report contained in documents A/37/23 (Part II) and addendum 1 thereto. He pointed out that the decision adopted by the Special Committee at its 1226th meeting was reproduced in paragraph 11 of chapter IV. A reformulation of the decision, which he had been requested to prepare as a draft decision of the General Assembly for submission to the Fourth Committee for its consideration, appeared in paragraph 13 of that chapter. He was bringing it to the attention of the Committee in view of the close correlation between that draft decision and agenda item 98.
4. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) said that the international community needed to adopt a new strategy in order to impede the activities of the transnational corporations which were exploiting and usurping the natural and human resources of southern Africa, Palestine and all the Territories still under the colonialist and imperialist yoke. Adequate means had to be found to stop the transfer of profits to the home countries of those corporations, especially in view of the very slow progress that was being made on the code of conduct for the activities of transnational corporations.
5. He expressed praise for the report prepared by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations (A/37/405) because of the valuable data it provided on the profits of transnational corporations. On the other hand, he deplored the fact that most of those corporations were refusing to co-operate with the Centre.
6. His country, which had had experience in the struggle against colonialism and against the exploitation and usurpation of its resources by foreign companies, was seriously concerned that the many General Assembly resolutions denouncing the

(Mr. Mahmoud, Iraq)

activities of foreign economic and other interests in Territories under colonial domination, and especially in Namibia, had remained a dead letter. Indeed, such activities had actually increased. He therefore called for the implementation of all the relevant resolutions, including those calling for the imposition of sanctions. Not only did the refusal of certain Western countries to impose sanctions on South Africa impede the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, but their continued participation in the illegal activities of transnational corporations in Territories under colonial domination ran counter to the measures taken by the international community.

7. Zionism and apartheid, like all other theories based on racial superiority, were violations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Charter of the United Nations. Likewise, many peoples were being prevented from achieving freedom, independence and self-determination because of the failure to implement the objectives of the Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and to apply the provisions of the various international instruments designed to combat racial discrimination.

8. The data provided by the Centre on Transnational Corporations showed just how close relations were between the Western monopolies and the racists in southern Africa. Foreign investment and profit-taking there had reached record levels. It was in order to safeguard those vested interests that certain Western countries were giving military, economic and other assistance to the racist régime. The need to continue exploiting the mineral wealth of Namibia, especially uranium, was the explanation for the refusal of the Government of South Africa to recognize the rights of the people of that Territory.

9. His country was especially fearful of the close relationship which had developed between the Tel Aviv Zionist régime and the Pretoria racist régime in the exploitation and supply of uranium, and in nuclear research. That close co-operation was based on their desire to colonize the Arab and African peoples. The imposition of an economic and military embargo against those régimes was imperative if they were to be forced to comply with United Nations resolutions and to respect the will of the international community. The right of peoples to benefit from their own natural resources must be recognized, and Governments must take all necessary measures to forestall the activities of foreign and other economic interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories. Finally, his delegation called for a halt to all military activities in Namibia and in all other occupied territories.

10. Mr. SCHRÖTER (German Democratic Republic) observed that the pillage by transnational corporations of Territories under colonial domination in South Africa and elsewhere was continuing unabated, and the legal rights of millions of people were still being trampled underfoot.

11. The plunder was most extreme in South Africa and Namibia, where the monopolistic exploiters were reaping maximum profits and doing everything possible to keep the system of colonial and racist subjugation intact. Their complicity

(Mr. Schröter, German Democratic Republic)

with the apartheid régime was one of the main reasons why United Nations efforts to ensure the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and to eradicate racism in South Africa had had no success.

12. The responsibility for the shameful practices of transnational corporations fell also on those States whose policies permitted or even encouraged such activities by corporations under their jurisdiction. Such States had hypocritically declared that under the law of their countries the Government could not intervene in corporate operations. Yet whenever it was a question of achieving their own political ends or of interfering in the internal affairs of other States, the Governments did find the necessary power to regiment corporate business activities and even arrogate to themselves the right to impose their wills on enterprises in other States. So-called norms of conduct and the "social mission" of multinational corporations had been extolled with much fanfare; yet the facts proved that neither in South Africa nor in Namibia had the lot of the African workers changed at all.

13. Intensified investment, new technologies, expanded trade, and supply of the most advanced weaponry were maintaining the viability of the inhuman apartheid régime. The activities of transnational corporations in southern Africa not only prevented the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples but also bolstered the South African policy of threatening international peace and security. There were daily reports of new acts of aggression by the racists against sovereign African States. South Africa's nuclear arms build-up, assisted by corporations of the NATO countries, particularly the United States, vastly increased the danger to Africa and the world at large. It was imperative that all military, economic and political support to the racists stop immediately.

14. The German Democratic Republic was committed to isolating the apartheid régime by a total boycott and effective sanctions. The General Assembly, on the proposal of his delegation, had adopted resolution 36/51 which called for the preparation of a register indicating the profits which transnational corporations derived from their activities in colonial Territories. The useful work already begun on such a register by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations should be continued at a faster pace and the Committee should pass a resolution to that effect.

15. His Government was staunch in its solidarity with the just struggle of the Namibian and South African people and their national liberation movements.

16. Mr. SEIFU (Ethiopia) said that, despite the fact that the General Assembly, year after year, had adopted resolutions naming States which maintained close economic ties with the Pretoria racist régime, those States, in order to protect their vested interests, continued to intensify their co-operation with that régime and to strengthen their military ties with it, in disregard for the fate of the black population of southern Africa and the will of the international community. Such conduct on the part of certain Western States had called into question the effectiveness and credibility of the Organization.

(Mr. Seifu, Ethiopia)

17. The oft-repeated claim that the transnational corporations were improving the lot of the African workers was totally beside the point. Apartheid, colonialism and racism could not be reformed; they had to be eradicated. Through direct investment, credit and the transfer of technology, the Western monopolies were contributing to the political and economic oppression of the black population, whose low wages and unsafe working conditions were deplorable, especially when compared with the limitless profits of the transnational corporations. Yet friends of the racists continued to echo the South African claim that the standard of living of the oppressed masses in that country was comparatively higher than that in independent African States. Such a comparison was outrageous. What the peoples of Namibia and South Africa needed was human dignity and a just reward for their labour, not crumbs from the rich man's table as the foreign economic interests continued to strip present and future generations of their valuable mineral resources.

18. If the Western imperialists had put morality above profit and had called a halt to their activities in southern Africa, colonialism and racism would have disappeared. Unfortunately, attempts to exert pressure by means of mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter had so far been to no avail; yet, certain States which claimed that sanctions were ineffective and detrimental to the interests of the oppressed peoples, hypocritically resorted to economic sanctions when it suited their interests. Surprisingly, far from being an embarrassment, their support for and collaboration with the racists had been so overt and amiable that they had emboldened Pretoria to apply for a credit of SDR 1 billion from the International Monetary Fund.

19. It was therefore all the more important that the international community should persevere in its demand for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. The Fourth Committee should spare no effort to achieve that end.

20. Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) said that since Namibia was the only country in the African continent which had not yet achieved independence, and the question of Namibia was the most prominent issue in the global struggle for decolonization and also an important international question about which the peoples of the world felt greatly concerned, he wished to focus on the activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia.

21. It had been pointed out in many General Assembly resolutions that the natural resources of Namibia were the assets of the Namibian people and belonged to them. The activities of foreign economic interests - supported by the South African authorities which were illegally occupying Namibia - as well as their plunder of the natural resources of Namibia, were violations of the United Nations Charter and the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. They were therefore unlawful. Moreover, those activities in fact supported South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. The resolutions in question strongly condemned the activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia, demanding that the transnational corporations which engaged in such activities should comply with the

(Mr. Liang Yufan, China)

relevant resolutions of the United Nations forthwith and should cease their investment and other activities in Namibia.

22. Over the years, the Council for Namibia had done much to protect the natural resources of Namibia. It had drawn up Decree No. 1 for the protection of the natural resources of Namibia. Also, it had given extensive publicity to the relevant United Nations resolutions and urged the countries concerned and the transnational corporations that operated in Namibia to implement those resolutions and Decree No. 1. The Arusha Declaration and Programme of Action adopted by the Council in May 1982 had once again stressed the importance of speedy and effective implementation of Decree No. 1.

23. Regrettably, however, some large companies of South Africa and certain transnational corporations from the West had turned a deaf ear to the relevant United Nations resolutions and the pressing demands of the international community. They were continuing their operations in Namibia and were plundering at will its natural resources. They were brutally exploiting the Namibian people. Moreover all those activities benefitted from the support and connivance of certain Western countries. According to data collected by the Council for Namibia, there were 88 transnational corporations investing in Namibia and realizing super profits, and the rich mineral resources of Namibia had become an important target for plunder.

24. In order to make huge profits, the transnational corporations were pursuing a barbarous policy of racial discrimination and ruthlessly exploiting the cheap labour of the indigenous black people. The gap between the wages of white and black workers was astounding.

25. According to some estimates, 65 per cent of the gross domestic product of Namibia was in the hands of transnational corporations - 50 per cent being pocketed as profits, and 15 per cent being handed over to the illegal authorities as tax payments. Another 25 per cent was in the hands of the white minority of Namibia, which made up only 8 per cent of the total population. The black majority of 92 per cent received only 10 per cent of the gross domestic product.

26. Such data amply proved that the allegation by the transnational corporations that their operations were helpful to the economic development of the area was untenable. Furthermore, their activities strongly bolstered the illegal occupation of the South African authorities and obstructed the early achievement of independence for Namibia.

27. His delegation believed that the international community should adopt comprehensive and effective sanctions against the South African authorities so as to force them to comply with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and help the Namibian people achieve early independence. At the same time, the General Assembly at its current session should once again condemn the activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia and mobilize international public opinion on an even larger scale, urging the countries concerned and the

(Mr. Liang Yufan, China)

transnational corporations to comply with the relevant United Nations resolutions and Decree No. 1 and desist forthwith from their operations in Namibia. Furthermore, support must be given to the efforts in that regard being made by the Council for Namibia.

28. Mr. MOLTENI (Argentina) said that the report of the Centre on Transnational Corporations (A/37/405), although limited in scope because of the lack of co-operation on the part of the principal administering Powers and the transnational corporations, did provide objective economic data which substantiated the repeated affirmation by the General Assembly that the unjust exploitation of renewable and non-renewable natural resources and the continued accumulation and repatriation of enormous profits by transnational corporations with investments in colonial Territories were, with the support of the Governments of the administering Powers, impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

29. The activities of foreign interests in southern Africa were hindering the elimination of colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in that region. South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia enabled it to maintain an economic and social system of exploitation and injustice that was detrimental to the Namibian people but beneficial to the white minority and the interests of the transnational corporations. That situation would end only when the people of Namibia were able to exercise their right to self-determination and their right to national independence, with full territorial integrity and with an authentically representative Government, in strict compliance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

30. The report of the Centre on Transnational Corporations provided information - which was, however, extremely limited because of lack of co-operation on the part of British companies and the United Kingdom Government - on the four affiliates of transnational corporations which operated in the Malvinas. The sectoral distribution of those companies revealed the oligarchic structure of the islands' economy but gave no indication of the profits being earned. It was clear, however, that the inhabitants of the islands had never benefited from the activities of those companies.

31. The economy of the islands was closely dependent on a monopolistic enterprise, the Falkland Islands Company, which had been taken over, in 1977, by the Coalite Group based in the United Kingdom. The Falkland Islands Company, unlike other British companies, was not registered and did not have any statute; it operated merely under a royal charter granted in the nineteenth century.

32. The Falkland Islands Company monopolized the economy of the islands; it owned 43 per cent of the land and half the sheep herds, and controlled 90 per cent of all business. One of the members of the Company's board had until recently been an official of an affiliate of the Samuel Hill banking organization based in South Africa.

(Mr. Molteni, Argentina)

33. The Economic Survey of the Falkland Islands, known as the Shackleton Report and prepared at the request of the United Kingdom Government in September 1982, showed that the Falkland Islands Company provided and/or operated foreign and domestic shipping services in the territory and all basic banking services and played a major part in the marketing of wool, which continued to be the main economic activity of the islands.

34. Some 57 per cent of the agricultural production in the islands not controlled by the Falkland Islands Company was distributed among only 13 companies whose shareholders for the most part did not live in the islands. Those companies appointed administrators to run the farms, and their directors visited the properties periodically. Moreover, of the relatively few companies registered in the islands, some had shareholders who did not live in the territory and were governed by policies very similar to those of the companies registered abroad. The Shackleton Report, also clearly revealed a tendency to restrict investment to what was needed to maintain existing assets. The result was that over the years there had been an uninterrupted flow of funds to the United Kingdom, a situation that had led to stagnation of the island's economy.

35. That unjust situation explained the steady decline in population and showed that the economic interests and colonial aspirations of the British Government were what had made it impossible to carry out the decolonization process in the islands and resolve the issue of sovereignty between Argentina and the United Kingdom in a just and peaceful manner. Moreover, the arguments put forward by the United Kingdom regarding the right to self-determination of the islanders represented nothing more than a manoeuvre to conceal from the international community the aims of the political and economic interests which wished to maintain the illegal and unjust colonial situation in the Malvinas.

36. The recent history of the Falkland Islands Company and the rapid succession of changes in its ownership revealed it to be simply a vehicle for carrying out policies dictated by the British Foreign Office and by the colonial interests headquartered in South Africa, Latin America and Asia. That state of affairs had been recently confirmed by Sir John Denman Barlow, the Chairman of the Falkland Islands Committee set up as a lobby for the economic interests with the United Kingdom Government, who had formerly been the largest shareholder in the Falkland Islands Company. It was he who had indicated that the objective of the United Kingdom Government and British economic interests was to maintain the current status of dozens of small strategically important Territories throughout the world which, like the Malvinas, enabled the United Kingdom to maintain imperialist control over raw materials and major world communication routes and thus to increase the military presence and threats of the great Powers against developing and non-aligned countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

37. It was his delegation's belief that the situation in the Malvinas could only be resolved through implementation of the principles and rights inherent in the decolonization process as provided in General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV), 2625 (XXV) and 35/114.

38. Mr. MACLAY (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he would not provide a point-by-point response to the statement made by the representative of Argentina; it would be clear to the Committee that much of what that representative had said departed widely from the truth and did not need a detailed reply.
39. He was delighted to note the attention accorded by the Argentine delegation to the Shackleton Report. He could assure that delegation and the Committee that the United Kingdom Government was closely studying the recommendations of that report with a view to promoting the wishes, interests and welfare of the Falkland Islanders.
40. As to the reference made to the principle of self-determination, which had been invoked by the United Kingdom Government with reference to the events of the past few months in the Falkland Islands, he could not accept the allegation by the representative of Argentina that the United Kingdom Government had invoked that principle as a manoeuvre to conceal the real situation and deceive the international community. His Government had gone to great lengths to protect the right to self-determination of the people of the Falkland Islands, and the events earlier in the year had been tragic for the United Kingdom, for the Falkland Islanders and indeed for the international community. However, his Government had to abide by the principle of self-determination enshrined in Article 1 of the Charter and also, and more especially, in Article 73, which governed the work of the Committee. Thus, it had not been with the intention of deceiving the international community that his Government had gone to such great lengths to protect the rights of the islanders; its intention had been to live up to its obligations in accordance with Article 73 of the Charter. It was regrettable that the representative of Argentina had offered an interpretation of the principle of self-determination which was so drastically at variance with the facts.
41. Mr. MOLTENI (Argentina), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he considered it inexcusable for the United Kingdom to fail to comment on the information which he had presented to the Committee and which had, moreover, been provided by the Government of the United Kingdom itself. That was further evidence of the fact that when the United Kingdom said its goal was to defend the right to self-determination of the inhabitants of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) it really meant the rights of the Falkland Islands Company.
42. Mr. MACLAY (United Kingdom) observed that he had made the point earlier that the Shackleton Report, which had indeed been issued by Her Majesty's Stationery Office, was receiving his Government's urgent attention. His Government would adopt a position on it in due course, taking into full account the interests, welfare and wishes of the Falkland Islanders.

AGENDA ITEM 99: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (A/37/23 (Part III) and (Part III)/Add.1)

Hearing of a petitioner (A/C.4/37/5)

43. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Morrell (Center for International Policy) took a place at the petitioners' table.

44. Mr. MORRELL (Center for International Policy) said that a great tragedy was about to occur: the International Monetary Fund was about to give South Africa the largest loan in that country's history, in defiance of repeated United Nations resolutions. The South Africans had cleverly made their request for the loan after the conclusion of the annual meeting of IMF and the World Bank, and IMF had now scheduled the massive \$1.1 billion loan for "routine" approval on 3 November, namely, in two weeks.

45. The loan South Africa was about to receive roughly equalled the increase in South Africa's military expenditure from 1980 to 1982. South Africa had received \$464 million from IMF in 1976, and in that same year had increased its defence expenditure by \$450 million. Recipient Governments could, of course, use IMF money for any purpose. It took a simple majority to approve or block a loan by IMF: third-world nations collectively had 30 per cent of the votes, and the major Western European countries had another 30 per cent; a combination of the two could thus block the loan.

46. The loan was in two parts: \$689 million on easy terms from the Compensatory Financing Facility - the largest ever made from that Facility to any country - and \$394 million for a stand-by arrangement.

47. It had been claimed before the General Assembly in the past that IMF operated according to purely economic and technical criteria and that the General Assembly, by trying to make it stop supporting South Africa, was asking it to violate its non-political charter. Perhaps the industrialized countries actually believed that IMF and other such institutions were non-political, but the reality was more complex. The fact was that the dominant IMF stockholder, the United States, had successfully pressured IMF and the other international financial institutions to favour countries it favoured and to cut loans to left-leaning countries, IMF rules notwithstanding.

48. In July 1981, for example, a \$36 million Compensatory Financing Facility loan to El Salvador, which had failed to qualify under the Facility's rules and had accordingly been opposed by the directors representing most of the major Western European nations, had been approved under pressure from the United States. The transcripts of that IMF Executive Board meeting made it indisputably clear that IMF had broken its own rules at United States insistence. Those transcripts were available to the Fourth Committee, and the delegations of the industrialized countries were particularly invited to study them.

49. At the same time, the United States had consistently opposed loans to countries with which it had political differences, using "technical grounds" as a pretext. That had been the case when Grenada had applied to IMF for an Extended

(Mr. Morrell)

Fund Facility loan early in 1981, and IMF, that purely "non-political" organization, had complied with the United States demand. Similarly, the United States had opposed loans to Nicaragua and the Indo-China countries, again on "technical" grounds. For a full year the United States had, for avowedly political reasons, been blocking a badly needed loan for fisheries to Nicaragua from the Inter-American Development Bank, another supposedly non-political institution.

50. Thus, the recent assertion by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States that his country would use only technical, economic criteria in assessing a loan to South Africa was grossly misleading. The United States followed such criteria when politically expedient and ignored them at other times. What was more, IMF and the other international financial institutions had allowed themselves to be taken advantage of.

51. At United States prodding, the World Bank had decided to eliminate three sectors of lending to Nicaragua and to reduce the other three, the reason given being differences of opinion over Nicaragua's treatment of its private sector. That punitive policy, along with the threat to cut off lending to Nicaragua entirely, was spelled out in a confidential World Bank policy paper which was available to the members of the Fourth Committee.

52. Recently, in blocking a request by Viet Nam for IMF balance-of-payment assistance, the United States had argued, validly, that Viet Nam's war in Cambodia constituted a massive diversion of economic resources and had asked why the international community ought to pay for that war. The United States could not, however, be expected to raise that same argument in connection with South Africa's illegal wars in Namibia and Angola. In that case, of course, it would revert to the old refrain of IMF being a purely technical, unswayable institution, even at a time when the United States was successfully lobbying to keep Poland out of IMF as a protest against the imposition of martial law.

53. The international financial institutions were already politicized. The United States Congress had recognized that situation as long ago as 1976 when it had passed a law requiring the United States to vote against or abstain on development bank loans to gross and consistent violators of human rights, unless the loans benefited the needy. Under that law, the United States had voted 128 times to disapprove of loans to 16 countries. The multilateral development banks had, however, easily survived that action, thus demonstrating the absurdity of the charge that non-ideological concern for basic human rights was in some respect "political".

54. He therefore appealed to Committee members to reject the mindless charge that the United Nations was attempting to politicize IMF by insisting that it should not support the inhuman system of apartheid. He also renewed an appeal he had first made before the Committee in 1978 that it should examine the status of IMF as a specialized agency of the United Nations, for IMF had repeatedly flouted the resolutions of the Committee and had undermined the authority of the United Nations. The Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that the status of

(Mr. Morrell)

IMF as a member of the United Nations family should be suspended until it agreed to respect the resolutions of the General Assembly.

55. He further appealed to the members of the Committee that they should make sure that their Governments lived up to statements made in the Committee and that they should oppose the loan to South Africa within IMF. If all the directors on the IMF Executive Board from third-world countries received unambiguous instructions before 3 November to protest the loan to South Africa, surely the directors from the more enlightened Western European countries would support them and bring the count close to a majority. The time, however, was short: the South African authorities had intended it to be so. Governments had only two weeks in which to transmit instructions to their representatives in IMF.

56. If the members of the Committee succeeded, all future South African attacks against Namibia and Angola would be paid for strictly out of internal taxes. The authority of the United Nations would be reaffirmed, and the world would know that the consistent and gross violation of human rights had a cost. If they failed, their Governments would be paying for South Africa's war.

57. Mr. Morrell withdrew.

58. Mr. ZEGERS (International Monetary Fund) said, to avoid any misunderstanding, that it would be inappropriate for him to offer any comments on the request by the Government of South Africa for IMF assistance while the matter was still being considered by the Executive Board of IMF, the principal intergovernmental organ dealing with such questions.

59. The CHAIRMAN expressed the hope that, the Department of Public Information would, in accordance with the relevant General Assembly resolutions and in view of the importance of the issue, give the widest possible publicity to the morning's discussion in the Committee, including the statement by the petitioner.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.