



UN/SA COLLECTION

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 7th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ROA KOURI (Cuba)

CONTENTS

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

* 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.

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

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 and 405; A/AC.109/690, 701, 702 and 703; A/37/23 (part II) and (part II)/Add.1; A/AC.109/696, 698 and 704)

1. Mr. ZOWAWI (Saudi Arabia), observing that the General Assembly had been discussing the item since its eighteenth session, pointed out that despite its efforts, the question of Namibia was still not settled. The situation in Namibia and South Africa had steadily deteriorated and the people of those countries had had to cope with an increasingly difficult situation. In that connection, it was striking to see the similarity between the lot of the peoples of southern Africa under South African domination and that of the Palestinian Arab people, which was also being subjected to arbitrariness, imperialism and terror. Both the South African and the Israeli régimes relied exclusively on force in defiance of the wishes of the international community and in violation of the provisions of the United Nations Charter. Not content with savage repression of the populations under their domination, which they accused of terrorism, they also were making attacks on neighbouring countries. It was high time for Namibia to be liberated from the colonialist yoke and become independent.

2. The General Assembly had decided to terminate South Africa's mandate over Namibia in 1966 but, unfortunately, South Africa had ignored the General Assembly resolution just as it had failed to comply with the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). As for apartheid, the General Assembly had condemned that odious practice as early as 1946 and in 1960, the Security Council had stated that the pursuit of that policy jeopardized international peace and security. The South African régime, in disregard of those resolutions, had continued to show the utmost contempt for the rights of the African majority, including its most elementary rights.

3. There was no disputing the fact that without the help of foreign interests, the South African régime would not have been able to pursue its policy of apartheid in its own territory and its imperialist policy in Namibia. It followed that the States collaborating with South Africa shared responsibility for the explosive situation in that country. It was the hope of the international community that all necessary steps would be taken to promote Namibian independence and to prevent South Africa from pursuing its racist policy in contravention of the most basic principles of law.

4. In the final analysis, South Africa's present policy was bound to lead to an upheaval which would imperil peace and security in the region and destabilize it, a result which was contrary to the objectives pursued by the States and foreign

(Mr. Zowawi, Saudi Arabia)

interests collaborating with South Africa. All possible measures should therefore be taken to enable the people of Namibia to become independent and to compel South Africa to abandon its policy of apartheid and racial discrimination.

5. Mr. CHORNY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that economic and other foreign imperialist interests were one of the main obstacles to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the major reason why the system of apartheid and racism prevailing in South Africa was being maintained. Many General Assembly resolutions and declarations and a number of documents of other international organizations had rightly condemned those activities of foreign interests in Namibia, but the Western Powers and their transnational corporations had scorned those condemnations and appeals from the international community. Still, the reports of the Special Committee on Decolonization, the Special Committee against Apartheid, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations indicated that the activities of foreign monopolies, which were a threat to decolonization, not only had not stopped but were being pursued more actively. By encouraging those activities, certain Western States, particularly those members of NATO, were giving the racist régime direct political and economic assistance in contravention of the principles of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and of numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

6. The obstinacy with which Western imperialist circles were attempting to maintain their hold in the region was due primarily to their strategic aims and to the fact that South Africa, like illegally occupied Namibia, was a vast reservoir of mineral resources and a plot of land highly favourable to investments. This was shown by the presence in those countries of hundreds of banks and Western financial organizations. In that connection, attention should be drawn to the indignation aroused in the international community by the announced intention of IMF to grant a loan of over a billion dollars to the Pretoria racists with the endorsement of the Western Powers, which claimed that it was merely of a technical nature, but actually were trying to maintain their hold over that part of the world. Not only did the South African régime guarantee the Western Powers economic and financial hegemony, but it also provided them with the services of a veritable private army on orders to eliminate national liberation movements and bring the independent African States to their knees.

7. The United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations had done a good job in establishing a register of the benefits accruing to transnational corporations from their activities in the colonial territories and it was to be hoped that the Centre would continue its work so as to be able to submit a comprehensive report to the General Assembly on the activity of foreign economic and other interests, particularly in Namibia where their disastrous effects were reflected in the huge gap between the average annual income of the non-white population, which came to \$325 per capita in 1977, and the white population, which amounted to \$5,000 a year at that time.

(Mr. Chorny, Ukrainian SSR)

8. World opinion was deeply disturbed by the military assistance furnished to the South African régime by the United States, the other members of NATO and Israel in violation of the embargo on arms to South Africa ordered by the Security Council. With that assistance from the Western States, given by circumventing the Council resolution, South Africa was now capable of satisfying from 70 to 90 per cent of its needs for armaments and, as stated in document A/AC.109/704, it was now the principal arms producer in southern Africa and ranked tenth in the world. The dynamism of South Africa's arms industry was demonstrated by the production of a 155 mm gun with a range 40 per cent higher than all other existing artillery systems. In addition, South Africa was continuing to develop its nuclear capability, particularly its capacity to manufacture nuclear weapons, with the help of the United States and Israel, which represented a constant serious threat to peace and security in Africa and throughout the world. For all those reasons, it was incumbent upon the General Assembly to adopt genuinely effective measures such as mandatory global sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

9. Unfortunately, colonialism was not confined to South Africa and Namibia, but remained deeply rooted in the small territories under colonial domination where the administering Powers, which controlled the natural resources, denied independence to the indigenous population and practised the system of "divide and rule" in order to swindle them more deftly, as, for example, in Micronesia. Moreover, the existence of military bases on Guam, Diego García and the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Consequently, the Ukrainian SSR supported United Nations efforts to take effective measures for its implementation.

10. Mr. GERMA (Togo) said that his delegation wished to associate itself with the many others which had repeatedly and persistently over the years condemned the action of certain States and interest groups with regard to the situation in the territories still under colonial domination. While there seemed to be general agreement that all peoples were entitled to liberty and the enjoyment of their natural resources, as shown by resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the facts unfortunately had to be faced and the realization accepted that nothing had come of it: the principles which should have been the surest guarantees of international security and general progress were constantly being flouted. In the Caribbean and Pacific regions, for example, certain States and foreign interests were continuing to deprive the indigenous populations of their most rudimentary rights, of their right to life and their rights over their natural resources.

11. It was in southern Africa, however, that the gravest and most flagrant violation of those rights was occurring: despite repeated condemnation by the international community, the South African Government maintained its illegal occupation of Namibia by force and continued to exploit its natural and human resources. The exploitation was carried out with the aid of capital supplied by foreign interests which, totally ignoring General Assembly resolutions, continued

(Mr. Germa, Togo)

to establish themselves in that country and to reinforce the apparatus for domination and exploitation. With the aid of that close collaboration, racist South Africa could augment its military strength and establish itself as a nuclear Power. The unconditional and continuing support afforded by those States and interest groups constituted the rock which supported the South African régime.

12. Ignoring numerous General Assembly resolutions, including resolution 35/118, the annex to which contained the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and Security Council resolutions 418 (1977) and 421 (1977), concerning the arms embargo against South Africa, as well as resolutions of other organizations, including that adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its thirty-seventh session, held at Nairobi in June 1981, the South African régime persisted in its policy of apartheid and turned a deaf ear to all those appeals. Furthermore, his delegation had been deeply disturbed to learn that a request for a loan had been submitted to the International Monetary Fund. It would be most appropriate if that request, which had been made with a view to strengthening the apparatus of repression of the peoples of southern Africa, were to be refused.

13. In the light of that situation, and because the transnational corporations and the States which continued to encourage the shameless exploitation of the resources of the colonial countries appeared to be so little concerned at the fate of the indigenous peoples, there was a strong tendency to become pessimistic. However, the freedom and well-being of entire peoples depended on the constant support which the international community could offer in order to defend and safeguard them; that was why Togo, which believed in such freedom, supported the struggle for the independence of peoples still under colonial domination and reaffirmed its support for the liberation movements in Namibia and other colonial Territories. While condemning the co-operation between certain countries and organizations on the one hand, and the South African racist régime and other colonial States on the other, his delegation appealed to their conscience in an effort to induce them to cease such collaboration, which would merely incite the peoples of those Territories to violence in order to win respect for their inalienable rights to freedom and well-being in the Territories which naturally belonged to them. In addition to the appeals to reason made by the United Nations, his delegation now appealed to the political will of all the States concerned in the hope that his appeal would be heard before it was too late.

14. Mr. MUSTAFFA (Malaysia) noted that, despite the adoption of innumerable resolutions and intense pressure directed against the South African racist régime, the problem of Namibia remained unresolved and United Nations efforts to eliminate racism and apartheid had not yet borne fruit.

15. Everyone knew what enormous profits the Western transnational corporations and the South African racist régime were deriving from the exploitation of Namibia's natural and human resources, at the expense of the Namibian people, thereby depriving them of the right to enjoy the riches of their own land. For example, the recent report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations had

(Mr. Mustaffa, Malaysia)

indicated that the operations of affiliates of those corporations in Namibia constituted a source of huge profits for their parent companies.

16. The activities of those corporations and their collaboration with South Africa clearly impeded the decolonization process in Namibia, strengthening the racist Pretoria régime and encouraging it to defy United Nations resolution. It was imperative to find a new approach to bring an end to such activities, and Malaysia fully subscribed to all United Nations efforts to that end. Malaysia's position was clear: it supported any foreign investment that benefited the colonial peoples and facilitated decolonization but it abhorred the plundering of Namibia's natural resources and the exploitation of its people, and could not condone any acts that denied the people their fundamental rights to self-determination, independence and enjoyment of what rightfully belonged to them.

17. His delegation was concerned to note from the report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations (A/37/405), that Malaysia had been listed among the countries that had affiliates of transnational corporations operating in Bermuda, the Cayman Islands and Brunei. His delegation offered its assistance to the Secretary-General and the Centre in order to shed light on the nature of those companies and their activities, but it was concerned about the tendency to label the operations of foreign corporations in colonial Territories, by their very nature, as impeding decolonization. Experience had shown that Malaysian companies were in fact making a positive contribution to the development of the countries and Territories in which they operated and, in most cases, were collaborating with local interests. His delegation therefore looked forward to a more detailed examination of that question by the Centre.

18. Mr. BOLD (Mongolia) said that item 98 was one of the most important items on the Committee's agenda. The transnational corporations were not only engaged in plunder in the colonial countries and Non-Self-Governing Territories but also tended increasingly to determine the foreign policy of the country in which they operated, with the support of the Governments which had jurisdiction over them.

19. That phenomenon was particularly evident in southern Africa, especially Namibia. In that region, which was very important for the supply of various minerals to certain Western countries, particularly the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, foreign economic interests were investing enormous sums and, in line with the strategic, political and economic interests of the imperialist Powers, were engaged in the criminal exploitation of the natural and human resources. Their operations and their co-operation with the Pretoria régime helped the latter to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia, in violation of General Assembly resolutions 3299 (XXIX) and 3398 (XXX), establish its nuclear capacity and build up its military strength, thereby enabling it to pursue its repression of non-white South Africans and its aggression against neighbouring countries.

20. The military activities of foreign interests, including the maintenance of military bases, constituted a major obstacle to the decolonization process. For

(Mr. Bold, Mongolia)

the establishment of those bases, the population had been evicted and their farmland confiscated.

21. Mongolia's position was dictated by its concern for peace and its desire to ensure the inalienable right of peoples to independence and self-determination. Mongolia supported the just struggle of peoples against colonialism, neo-colonialism and racial discrimination. Like the majority of countries and peoples of the world, it demanded the immediate and unconditional cessation of the activities of foreign economic and other interests in southern Africa and in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It firmly rejected the manoeuvres of the contact group for Namibia, which were aimed at foisting on the Namibian people a neo-colonialist puppet régime. It was essential to impose comprehensive sanctions against South Africa in order to force it to withdraw from Namibia and to accord the Namibian people their right to self-determination.

22. Mongolia also demanded that the administering Powers should take into account their obligations under the Charter in respect of the Territories under their supervision. It hoped that the General Assembly would take the necessary decisions in order to put an end to the military activities of the imperialist Powers in the colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories and to end all collaboration with the Pretoria régime in order to remove the obstacles to the elimination of the final vestiges of colonialism.

23. Miss AL-MULLA (Kuwait) said that, owing to the economic and military activities of certain Powers, the colonial countries and Non-Self-Governing Territories were affected by the worsening world situation. The administering Powers were not fulfilling their obligation under the Charter to promote the well-being of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and accordingly to protect them from economic exploitation and the foreign control of their resources.

24. A striking example was Namibia, whose economy was dominated and controlled by South African and other Western corporations, which caused concern not only about the current state of development but also about the future well-being of the indigenous population. Kuwait had joined in the international community's efforts to isolate the South African régime, through an arms embargo and an oil embargo for example, but certain circles, prompted by narrow self-interest had sought loopholes. It was imperative that those measures should be strictly enforced if the desired objectives were to be attained.

25. The only guarantee for the well-being of a Territory as a viable economy: not an economy dependent on a single source of income (for example, financial institutions in the case of the Cayman Islands) or on income derived because of their status as tourist centres or tax havens - which meant outside control and vulnerability to the fluctuations of world markets - but rather an economy based on strong links between the inhabitants and their resources, it being the responsibility of the administering Powers to strengthen those links.

(Miss Al-Mulla, Kuwait)

26. Foreign interests were already having a marked impact on the economies of Non-Self-Governing Territories and, what was more, because of their military and strategic activities there, they gravely jeopardized the political stability of such Territories and embroiled them in the manoeuvres of the overall balance of power. Whereas some countries claimed that foreign military bases served the economies of the Territories concerned by creating jobs for the local population, Kuwait was convinced that the negative effects outweighed the positive effects and that bases represented an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

27. Mr. ISINALIYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said it was common knowledge that the aim of imperialist monopolies was the maximization of profits. Karl Marx had written, in the nineteenth century, that there was no crime which capital would not commit if it stood to reap a large profit.

28. By exploiting indigenous populations and pillaging their natural resources, imperialism was creating the most propitious conditions for the maximization of profits. That was why the imperialist Powers opposed implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The many United Nations resolutions on the subject remained a dead letter because it served the economic, military and strategic interests of a number of Powers, especially the United States and some of the member countries of NATO, to maintain colonialism and racism in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Such was the case in southern Africa, a region of particular strategic importance, which the Western Powers considered a bastion in the struggle against independent Africa.

29. The links between those Powers and the apartheid régime were well known. The number of foreign companies based in the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany had increased by approximately 1,000 over the past three years and in 1981 there had been 3,035 such companies. At the beginning of 1979 foreign investment in South Africa totalled \$11 billion and in 1980 R 30 billion, 70 per cent of which came from the United Kingdom, the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany. According to the Centre against Apartheid, from 1979 to mid-1982 Pretoria had received loans amounting to \$2 billion. In the circumstances, the proposal of the International Monetary Fund to grant South Africa a loan of over \$1 billion was nothing short of scandalous.

30. All were aware that South Africa represented for the companies concerned one of the major sources of raw materials, especially non-ferrous metals, uranium and diamonds. Namibia had been pillaged in a particularly shameless way. Out of 88 transnational corporations active in the Territory, 53 were based in the countries making up what was called the "contact group". The profits derived there by such corporations were far greater than they would be anywhere else in the world.

31. Those who defended transnational corporations argued that the latter contributed to the economic development of the Territories in which they operated. However, the document prepared by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations clearly indicated that the only economy which such corporations

(Mr. Isinaliyev, USSR)

bolstered was that of South Africa. There was, unquestionably, an alliance between the racist régime and the more aggressive circles of the West, and that alliance was based on exploitation and the brutal repression of the African population.

32. Exploitation was just as evident in the small colonial Territories, which, because of their total dependence on the administering Powers, had no genuine national economy of their own. For example, the United Nations Mission which had visited the Turks and Caicos Islands in 1980 had pointed to the necessity of developing the agricultural and industrial infrastructure of the Islands. Yet, no action to that end had been taken in the Islands since the Mission. The situation was the same in Micronesia. At the most recent session of the Trusteeship Council, the representatives of Micronesia had unanimously denounced the lack of infrastructure in their Territory, where unemployment was rampant and there were almost no basic services.

33. The military activities of the administering Powers in the colonial Territories were also an impediment to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to those Territories. The presence of military bases in the islands of the Pacific, the Indian Ocean and the Atlantic was not conducive to peace or security in the world. Disregarding United Nations resolutions, the administering Powers were intensifying their military activities, as was evident in Micronesia, for example, where a military arsenal represented a serious danger to the independence of peoples. The United Kingdom intervention in the Malvinas to maintain the status quo had imperilled peace and security throughout the world. The use of Namibia by South Africa, with the complicity of the United States, as a bridgehead for launching destabilizing military operations against Angola was another example of the aggressive policy of the Western Powers.

34. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which during the current year would celebrate the sixtieth anniversary of its foundation, had always supported the peoples struggling for their national independence, which was considered the prerequisite for their development. As Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, he could testify to the spectacular industrial and agricultural development of that region since the Great October Revolution.

35. The Soviet Union condemned the activities of foreign economic interests in the colonial Territories. Every State Member of the United Nations should refrain from providing any assistance whatever to the racist South African régime and heed should be paid to the call of the African countries for the imposition by the Security Council of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. His delegation would support the draft resolutions on the subject that were submitted to the Fourth Committee.

36. Miss GORDON (Trinidad and Tobago) said it was generally recognized that the activities of foreign economic interests had hampered and in fact prevented the elimination of apartheid, racial discrimination and colonialism in southern Africa. It was curious that through an irony of fate the Territory of Namibia, a ward of the United Nations, was affected more than any other by the evils of colonialism.

(Miss Gordon, Trinidad and Tobago)

37. South African companies and other foreign interests, encouraged by the Pretoria régime, were plundering the rich natural resources of Namibia and extracting enormous profits, to the detriment of the local population, whom they were exploiting and treating like slaves. The South African apartheid system was aimed at creating and maintaining an oppressed class which had no rights and no protection, in order to furnish cheap migrant labour, thereby enabling foreign companies to make large profits. It was therefore not surprising that Governments which had the necessary influence and power had been reluctant to join in the efforts to convince the South African régime that it must change its inhuman and racist policy of exploitation.

38. No member of the Fourth Committee could doubt that if global sanctions had been imposed by the entire international community against South Africa, in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, the situation in Namibia and South Africa would have been changed long ago. Even those who claimed that the activities of their companies were beneficial to the local population could not be taken in by their own rhetoric.

39. Furthermore, her delegation deplored the fact that certain Governments were able to support South Africa's request for a large loan from IMF in spite of that country's terror and repression in southern Africa and the acts of aggression it was committing against its neighbours. Her delegation hoped that progressive Governments would unite their voting power to disallow that loan.

40. Lastly, her delegation welcomed the efforts of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations to prepare a register indicating the profits which transnational corporations were deriving from their activities in colonial territories.

41. Mr. CASAS SANTAMARIA (Colombia) said that his delegation would continue to support any initiative of the international community aimed at eliminating colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination.

42. Latin America had gained the necessary political maturity to be independent of the great Powers. The time had come for it to place itself at the vanguard of the international struggle against the new forms of domination which might appear in newly independent nations, whose economy was still weak. Since it rejected every form of colonialism, since it was pacifistic by tradition, since it supported the application of the norms and controls of international law and since it favoured non-intervention and believed that law must be complemented by justice, Latin America would be at the head of the movement to establish a new international order.

43. The Latin American countries would no longer be the same as they had been before the Malvinas conflict. Although long regarded as dependants of the great Powers, they were now free of such guardianship and had regained the dignity of sovereign nations. The wounds caused by the Malvinas conflict could not heal so long as colonialist practices continued at the southern tip of the continent.

(Mr. Casas Santamaria, Colombia)

44. His delegation felt concern at the progressive intensification of the activities of foreign interests which continued to exploit the natural and human resources of colonial territories, widening the gap between rich and poor and strengthening an unjust order which made it impossible to reduce privileges. It therefore welcomed the recommendations of the Special Committee of 24 and would support all its proposals.
45. Mr. MAHONEY (Gambia) said that although the great progress made in decolonization was demonstrated by the fact that many countries had gained independence since the General Assembly's adoption of resolution 1514 (XV) more than 22 years earlier, the case of Namibia showed that the work of decolonization was not without its setbacks. In 1966 the United Nations had expected the transition period leading to Namibia's independence to be short. The results had been different, since South Africa used that time to impose the odious apartheid régime on the local population and to militarize the Territory, whose wealth it had proceeded to plunder.
46. The occupation of Namibia, which the International Court of Justice had declared illegal in 1971 and which had been denounced by the entire international community, called into question the credibility of the United Nations. Unfortunately, the steps to compel South Africa to implement United Nations resolutions had not been taken, and the method of friendly persuasion proposed by certain elements had only intensified the intransigence of the Pretoria régime.
47. The grievous consequences of the activities of foreign interests in Namibia were undeniable. The co-operation of certain Western Powers with South Africa, particularly in the military field, where such collaboration constituted a violation of the arms embargo established against that country, was tantamount to ratifying the Pretoria régime's policies. South Africa's application for a loan of over \$1 billion must be considered in that light. If the International Monetary Fund granted the application, the consequences would be extremely grave. Such action would be equivalent to giving the loan the international community's seal of approval, thereby encouraging private banks to increase their investments in the Territory. The fact that the General Assembly, at its 40th plenary meeting, had adopted draft resolution A/35/L.5 was sufficient indication of the deep concern which that question caused in the mind of the international community.
48. Recalling the words spoken in 1972 by Mr. Vorster, then Prime Minister of South Africa, "Every new trade agreement, every new bank loan, every new investment is a new stone in the structure ensuring our continued existence", he said that the international community would do well to take those words literally.
49. Mr. FOURATI (Tunisia) said that the Fourth Committee had once again been called upon to discuss the activities of foreign interests in colonial Territories. That question had been so fully developed in the current report of the Special Committee of 24 (A/37/23, part III) that there was no need to spell out the dangers created by such a situation. The promulgation in 1974 of Decree No. 1 for the protection of the natural resources of Namibia had provided an

(Mr. Fourati, Tunisia)

international legal basis for the struggle against such anachronistic situations, and that basis must be taken into account in order to render justice to the Namibian people. The information contained in the Special Committee's report made clear who was responsible, and although the facts reported were well known, certain countries continued to co-operate with the Pretoria régime on a scale which could not but trouble consciences and give rise to the gravest concern.

50. His delegation was deeply troubled by the problems arising in southern Africa and wished to state its view on those questions, whose importance went beyond the strictly economic field. For example, South Africa, which had occupied Namibia illegally since 1966, was continuing to exploit the Territory's resources, had illegally extended its territorial sea and had proclaimed an economic zone along the Namibian coast. Those actions had, of course, brought a series of condemnations from the international community, but that had not made the Pretoria régime change its attitude. South Africa, supported materially, financially and militarily by certain States, was disregarding the resolutions and recommendations of the United Nations and, four and a half years after the adoption of the settlement plan which was to lead Namibia to independence, was trying by delay tactics to promote an internal settlement.

51. His delegation also appealed to the Contact Group promoting the settlement plan to redouble its efforts and exert more pressure on the Pretoria régime in order to make it comply with the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the only valid framework for finding a solution consistent with the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people.

52. In South Africa itself, apartheid must not be considered exclusively as a violation of human rights - a despicable aspect, indeed, but one which should not obscure the fact that the real context of apartheid was that of a colonial enclave founded on racism, the use of brute force, aggression, oppression and the exploitation of a majority of the people by a minority. The survival of the apartheid system was at the very core of the real crisis that had long plagued southern Africa.

53. The colonial situation had from the start been complicated by the formidable involvement of all kinds of foreign interests which, far more than the strictly political element, prevented the settlement of the question and constituted one of the most serious threats to international peace and security. Motivated solely by the desire for immediate profits, the foreign companies operating in southern Africa with encouragement from Pretoria were outrageously exploiting irreplaceable natural resources in total disdain for the rights and interests of the Namibian and South African peoples. By their investments, those interests were helping to maintain and shore up the racist Pretoria régime. They guaranteed it an impunity that encouraged it to intensify its repressive policy, adopt an arrogant attitude and perpetrate acts of aggression against the neighbouring African States.

54. His delegation was convinced that, if it were deprived of the means to pursue its policies and of the support it found abroad, the South African régime could not long resist international pressure and would end by submitting to the legitimate

(Mr. Fourati, Tunisia)

claims of the Namibian and South African peoples. No ideological, economic or strategic consideration should take precedence over the real problem facing those populations.

55. What mattered first and foremost was that certain Member States which failed to implement the resolutions of the Organization even while declaring themselves in agreement with the objectives of the United Nations should prove their goodwill and intercede with South Africa, their partner on more than one count, to induce it to return to legality and comply with United Nations resolutions. The attitude taken thus far by certain countries, which were at least hostile to the interests of the Namibian and South African people, worked in the long run against the interests of those countries themselves which were deriving the short-time benefits.

56. As for the role the United Nations should play, the Security Council should not hesitate, in the interest of international peace and security and when faced with the arrogance of Pretoria, to avail itself of the provisions of the Charter, especially Chapter VII, in order to take strong steps against South Africa that were fully justified by the situation. Even though there was an international consensus on denouncing the occupation of Namibia and condemning apartheid, there was unfortunately no denying that the political will to take coercive measures did not now exist. Those States which had thus far held back Security Council action owed it to themselves, in order to make their condemnation of the occupation of Namibia and of apartheid more credible, to endorse the adoption of coercive action, because the international community - and particularly the great Powers, regardless of their interests in the region - would have to take an energetic and consistent stand to put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia and the policy of apartheid.

57. Mr. OGNIMBA (Congo) said that the social and economic situation in the colonial territories was steadily deteriorating, especially in Namibia where the transnational corporations were intensifying their activities, as could be seen from document A/37/405. Namibia in particular was being subjected to systematic overexploitation by the transnational corporations working hand in glove with the South African régime. His delegation appreciated the work done on that question by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations which, despite the unwillingness of some countries to furnish it with complete information, had nevertheless prepared an extremely well-documented report. The report showed, in fact, that while the local population was living in appalling poverty the corporations were reaping enormous profits from the mining of uranium, diamonds and base metals, sometimes amounting to 18 per cent of the total profits of the parent company. It was obvious that such a situation could only reinforce the machinery of oppression that victimized the Namibian population. His delegation appealed to the international community to adopt vigorous sanctions against South Africa. It was gratified that the General Assembly had adopted draft resolution A/37/L.5 relating to South Africa's application for a loan from the International Monetary Fund and reiterated its unswerving support of the Namibian people.

58. Mr. ADAMOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the figures and facts cited in the course of the debate on the activities of foreign interests in the colonial Territories and especially in southern Africa testified to the significance of the work done by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations. It was to be hoped that the Centre would continue and expand its work with the co-operation of States. The arguments advanced, by the United States and the United Kingdom in particular, to justify holding back certain information from the Centre, far from being convincing clearly showed that the imperialist countries had not the slightest desire to curb the appetite of the monopolies that were exploiting the colonial Territories, or to make any changes in the conditions prevailing there. Under the pretext of defending "areas of vital interest", those countries were suppressing the nationalist aspirations of the peoples and protecting dictatorial régimes. Their economic and strategic interests demanded the maintenance of racism and colonialism and therefore they could be observed doing everything possible to delay the independence of Namibia.

59. Data provided by the United Nations and the world press showed that collaboration between South Africa and the Western Powers was steadily on the rise. Foreign investments in southern Africa amounted to tens of billions of dollars. The number of such corporations with interests in the region, based for the most part in the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, was in the thousands. Transnational corporations owned 30 to 35 per cent of South Africa's capital and had a hand in more than half of its industrial production. According to reports in the American press, during the first quarter of 1982 the corporations in South Africa had concluded a credit agreement involving more than a billion dollars. Finally, it was common knowledge that the Western Powers were now seeking to use the International Monetary Fund to channel further funds into South Africa. The amount contemplated was over a billion dollars and was equivalent to the increase in South Africa's military expenditures from 1980 to 1982.

60. At the last Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in Havana, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of those countries had strongly condemned the activities of foreign interests in Namibia and had accused the United States of having violated Security Council resolution 418 (1977) establishing an embargo against arms deliveries to South Africa.

61. Some argued that the activities of transnational corporations contributed to the development of the colonial Territories. United Nations documents clearly disproved such contentions. The facts set forth in document A/AC.109/702 showed in fact that the chief victims of the exploitation of Namibia were the African inhabitants and, according to document E/C.10/83, the income of the white population and that of the black population in Namibia were in a ratio of 12 to 1 for the Territory as a whole and 25 to 1 in the northern part. That such a gap existed was hardly surprising when it was known that close to half of Namibia's national income was exported in the form of dividends to swell the coffers of South Africa, the United States, the United Kingdom and other Western countries.

62. The diabolical alliance between South Africa and the Western Powers and Israel

(Mr. Adamovich, Byelorussian SSR)

in the military and nuclear fields and South Africa's almost unlimited access to Namibian uranium constituted a highly dangerous threat to world peace. General Assembly resolution 36/51 had strongly condemned the continuing collaboration of those countries and had called upon them to refrain from all such collaboration. Unfortunately those same countries were members of the "contact group". They were the ones who were impeding the independence of the Namibian people by resorting to all sorts of manoeuvres in the hope of imposing a neo-colonialist régime on those people, the latest manoeuvre being the attempt to link the settlement of the Namibian question to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. That subterfuge fooled no one and had been denounced repeatedly during the General Assembly debates at the current session.

63. The Western Powers, furthermore, were pursuing the same policy of repressing the local population and exploiting its wealth in the small colonial Territories. They were transforming the island Territories into military bases and steadily "absorbing" them, particularly in Micronesia.

64. In the resolutions which the Committee adopted on the activities of imperialist interests in the colonial territories, those activities must be firmly condemned as the principal obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and as contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter. The Security Council must also be urged to impose global mandatory sanctions against South Africa, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. His delegation would support any measures for ensuring the implementation of General Assembly resolution on decolonization and the other relevant instruments adopted by the United Nations.

65. Mr. GUBARTALLA (Sudan) said that, with regard to the item under consideration, the Fourth Committee represented the alert conscience of the international community, which was fighting to ensure that all nations of the world enjoyed equality and justice after the elimination of the last bastions of imperialism and racism. All the members of the international community shared that responsibility and all should fulfil it by respecting the rights of peoples to self-determination. That assertion led naturally to a reference to agenda item 98, which showed that economic factors were a serious and important obstacle to the independence of colonial people. The South African racist régime, confronted with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, constantly manoeuvred and evaded the issue or adopted an arrogant attitude to maintain its illegal occupation of Namibia and pursue its policy of repression against the South African majority with the help of foreign interests.

66. As the working document prepared by the Secretariat (A/AC.109/702) showed clearly and convincingly, South Africa was determined to continue to occupy Namibia and to plunder that territory in collaboration with many transnational corporations, thus depriving the Namibian people of its right to benefit from its patrimony. The crimes perpetrated by the South African régime against the Namibian people must cease immediately. The international community must strive not only to

(Mr. Gubartalla, Sudan)

enable Namibia to exercise its right to self-determination but also to ensure that the Pretoria régime undertook to respect the principles and resolutions of the United Nations. His delegation hoped that the Namibian people would be able to take its rightful place among the independent nations in the near future. Sudan had also always considered that from now on Namibia should be represented by SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian nation.

67. The Pretoria régime's increasing collaboration with Israel in the economic, military and security sectors was a cause of grave concern to his delegation. That collaboration was without a doubt hampering the attainment of independence by the Namibian people and was also enabling the racist régime to intensify its oppression of the African inhabitants of South Africa. Several documents and studies gave details of that collaboration between two régimes which had many points in common: in particular both denied the rights of the indigenous inhabitants of their territory. The African inhabitants in the case of South Africa and the Palestinian people in the case of Israel. That collaboration was absolutely contrary to the wishes of the African and Namibian peoples and the international community could do no less than condemn it. It was also incumbent on the international community to ensure compliance with the principles and resolutions of the United Nations condemning the racist régime of Pretoria and prohibiting any economic and military collaboration with that régime.

68. In conclusion, he said that he was greatly disturbed by the loan application made by South Africa to the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Draft resolution A/37/L.5, which had just been adopted by the General Assembly, urged all members of the international community to bring pressure to bear to ensure that that loan was not granted. If it was granted, there was every reason to fear that the Pretoria régime would exploit that support to build up its military and economic power, which would enable it to intensify its attacks on Namibia and the neighbouring African States, not to mention its oppression of the non-white inhabitants of South Africa. It was also the duty of the international community to impose sanctions on that régime, which continuously threatened the peace and security of southern Africa and the world.

69. His delegation congratulated the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations on its report on the activities of those corporations and hoped that it would be able to complete the register listing the benefits obtained by transnational corporations from their activities in the colonial territories. It appealed to all States to co-operate with the Centre and assured the Committee that Sudan would co-operate in any initiative designed to further the work of the Committee.

70. Mr. CAKPO-TOZO (Benin) said that both the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly had always paid special attention to the agenda item under discussion. The question was in fact extremely important and should not be considered solely from the economic point of view because it was also political and closely connected with the problem of decolonization. It should therefore be viewed as a whole and all the aspects - political, administrative, economic, social or cultural - should be considered.

(Mr. Cakpo-Tozo, Benin)

71. The system of decolonization and imperialist domination, as well as the despicable system of apartheid, formed a coherent whole, based on the logic of the imperialist Powers which imposed them. That logic naturally furthered the interests of those Powers and not those of the people oppressed by those systems. Those systems of colonial, racial exploitation were characterized by: the mobilization of the human and material productive resources of the country and the subject people for the benefit of the Power which imposed them; the dismantling of the institutional, political and social structures of those countries and their transformation into a system of colonial exploitation, the establishment of administrative and financial structures furthering the interests of the colonial Power with a view to continuing its exploitation and deploying means of oppression and repression to break any resistance on the part of the colonial peoples. The People's Republic of Benin, like most third world countries, had suffered that system of exploitation in various forms: that explained their sensitivity when the issue was raised, an issue which had led the General Assembly to adopt numerous resolutions, in particular, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

72. His delegation congratulated the Special Committee of 24, the Centre against Apartheid and the Secretariat for their remarkable accomplishments. It was extremely concerned about the situation in Namibia and its concern grew with the acceleration of the process of exploitation. In fact, according to document A/AC.109/702, in their mining industries, as in the agriculture and fishery sectors, South Africa and the other Powers which participated in the exploitation of Namibia were collaborating more and more closely and were frantically adopting measures to enable their companies to obtain the maximum profits from their activities, which were being promptly sent out of the country where they had been earned. The monopolies and the mechanisms they developed encouraged more intensive exploitation and the concentration of activities in the sectors selected as most profitable, for example the mining industries, which were run by two or three companies and the banking and financial sector, where 70 per cent of the deposits paid in Namibia were controlled by two banks. No administrative or fiscal measure had been taken by the Pretoria authorities to halt the plunder of the resources of the Namibian people. On the contrary, the indigenous inhabitants were being steadily marginalized and impoverished, a condition aggravated by the world crisis.

73. The support given by the apartheid régime by certain imperialist Powers whose co-operation extended to the military sector, especially the nuclear field, only encouraged the racist régime in its wildest plans. On the strength of that support, South Africa was developing a strategy of permanent aggression against the front-line States, especially Angola, aimed at weakening them and consolidating its control apparatus in Namibia as well as its hegemony over the entire region. The political manoeuvres and stalling tactics designed to delay self-determination and independence of the Namibian people made it possible to perpetuate a system of exploitation which sapped Namibia's wealth for the benefit of South Africa and the Powers which were assisting in that exploitation.

74. The People's Republic of Benin found it ridiculous to make a distinction

(Mr. Cakpo-Tozo, Benin)

between the economic and political sectors in this case because the two sectors were intertwined. It sincerely hoped that the Powers which had relations with South Africa and interests in Namibia, as well as those which were exploiting other colonial Territories and peoples, would adopt an attitude in keeping with the responsibilities they had assumed as Members of the United Nations and would encourage the effective implementation in those Territories of the provisions set forth in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The international community must do its utmost to ensure enforcement of the sanctions imposed against the apartheid régime.

75. He wished to express his country's profound concern over South Africa's application for a loan from the International Monetary Fund, which that organization seemed prepared to grant. If that occurred, South Africa's military arsenal would be strengthened and the apartheid régime could continue the destruction and oppression and consolidate its colonial and racist exploitation in Namibia. It would also continue its acts of aggression against the front-line States. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) could use that large sum of money for loftier purposes which promoted human progress. It could, for example, assist in financing development projects in the least developed countries or in funding a programme of action to combat hunger and malnutrition. It would be difficult to believe in the United Nations or in the usefulness of its debates and statements if the loan requested by South Africa was granted. It would be an affront to the human conscience, and his country hoped that there was still time to prevent it from happening.

76. Mr. JACOB (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he did not intend to speak of matters which were not within the Committee's competence and which were on the agenda of the General Assembly and of other Main Committees. His reply would relate solely to the item under discussion and to what had been said about Israel in that connection.

77. In his statement before the Committee on Friday, 15 October 1982, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic had claimed that Israel was the most important trading partner of South Africa. According to statistics published by IMF on South Africa's international trade, Israel accounted for only 1 per cent of that trade. It was therefore difficult to argue that with 1 per cent of the trade, Israel was South Africa's principal trading partner. The question also could be raised as to which States' trade relations accounted for the remaining 99 per cent. In fact, they included nearly all the States represented in the Fourth Committee, including some of those which had spoken against Israel during the debate.

78. In contrast to some speakers, Israel had never tried to conceal its trade relations with South Africa. As a country suffering from a permanent economic boycott by the Arab countries, Israel categorically rejected the use of that manoeuvre as a political instrument in the conduct of international relations. The Fourth Committee had once again heard groundless charges against Israel about arms deliveries to South Africa. Again, as in the past, no proof had been adduced to

(Mr. Jacob, Israel)

support those charges. The Israeli Government's unaltered position on that matter had been clearly set out in the letter of 4 September 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the Security Council Committee Established by Resolution 421 (1977) concerning the Question of South Africa. That letter, which had been issued as document S/AC.20/17, indicated that Israel would comply with Security Council resolution 418 (1977), and accordingly, would not provide South Africa with arms or related matériel of all types, including the sale or transfer of weapons and ammunition, military vehicles and equipment. That commitment had been reaffirmed in the letter of 23 June 1980 from the Israeli Ambassador addressed to the same Committee.

79. As for the unfounded accusations about Israel's alleged nuclear co-operation with South Africa, there again no evidence had been submitted to substantiate those statements. On 18 September 1981, the Secretary-General had issued the report of a Group of Experts entitled "Israeli nuclear armament" (A/36/431), which had been distributed under agenda item 56 of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. Paragraph 13 of that report, which was the only one which dealt directly with Israel's alleged nuclear co-operation with South Africa, recalled that in its resolution 34/76 B of 11 December 1979, the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to prepare a comprehensive report on South Africa's plan and capability in the nuclear field. Paragraph 37 of that report (A/35/402) noted that until specific examples of nuclear exchanges or transactions could be cited as evidence of such co-operation, the whole question remained in a state of uncertainty. It was therefore dishonest to present those arguments as absolute and established fact.

80. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that although the representative of Israel had quoted certain paragraphs of document A/36/431, he had neglected to mention paragraphs 44 and 45, which showed very clearly how the Zionist régime and the Pretoria régime were collaborating. The Washington Post had also mentioned that collaboration and had explained that the Central Intelligence Agency had informed the United States Government that Israel had collaborated in nuclear tests carried out by South Africa in 1978. In fact, everybody knew about that co-operation between the two entities. The two régimes had much in common, including the methods which they used to subjugate the indigenous peoples of their regions. In Namibia, with Israel's assistance, uranium was being mined to make South Africa a nuclear Power and to develop nuclear weapons which one day would be used against the neighbouring independent States and the Arab countries.

81. Mr. GUBARTALLA (Sudan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he wished to make it clear that in referring to the co-operation between Pretoria and Tel Aviv in the nuclear, military and other fields, his delegation had been commenting on aspects of agenda item 98, which had been allocated to the Fourth Committee, and that he had therefore been speaking of matters which were not only within the Committee's competence, but were also currently under discussion.

82. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, noted that the representative of the Zionist entity had begun, as he had done before in the Fourth Committee and elsewhere, by refuting all the accusations which had been made against that entity in connection with the items being considered by the Committee. However, there was an obvious contradiction in the statements of the representatives of the Zionist entity in the Fourth Committee and the statements, and even the behaviour, of Israeli officials. A representative of Israel had mentioned the IMF statistics on trade between Israel and the racist régime of South Africa. At first glance, the figures which he had quoted were valid, but if they were compared with the new, accurate figures which had been published and disseminated daily by media from all over the world, including the Israeli press agency, it was clear that they were much less valid, since according to those media, the trade relations between Tel Aviv and Pretoria had expanded by a factor of 20 from 1970 to 1982. If to that was added the trip of the Israeli Minister of Defence to South Africa, during which he had made a secret visit to northern Namibia, a strategically sensitive area, it was clear that the collaboration between the two entities was not limited to trade. The statements of the representative of Israel were therefore totally unconvincing, since he could not support his arguments with soundly established facts.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.